

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**FRIDAY, 18 DECEMBER 1908**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## QUESTIONS.

## DRY DOCK, SOUTH BRISBANE.

Mr. MANN (*Cairns*) asked the Treasurer—

1. What rate of pay do gangers get at the dry dock, South Brisbane?
2. What rate is paid to permanent hands?
3. What rate to casual hands?
4. What were the average weekly earnings during the last six months of (1) permanent (2) casual hands?
5. Is preference given to married men?

The TREASURER (Hon. A. G. C. Hawthorn, *Enoggera*) replied—

1. There are no gangers employed at the dock. If a leading hand is employed he gets time and a quarter when cleaning down a ship, for instance.
2. £13 per month to engine-drivers, £8 10s. per month to watchmen. There are no others.
3. All work is paid for at hourly rates. Tradesmen receive the ruling rates in their trade: casual hands receive 1s. per hour.
4. The work is of necessity intermittent, and men come and go. If a man is employed for a whole week he receives £2 8s. There are no permanent hands employed at the dock save as mentioned in question 2.
5. Yes, and to those with dependants.

## PIALBA-URANGAN RAILWAY.

Mr. RANKIN (*Burrum*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

When is it intended to continue the survey of the proposed Pialba-Urangan Railway?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. W. T. Paget, *Mackay*) replied—

As soon as a surveyor is available.

## SUPPLY.

## RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

(Mr. W. J. R. Maughan in the chair.)

## CHIEF SECRETARY'S DEPARTMENT—IMMIGRATION.

Question—That £53,530 be granted for immigration, upon which Mr. Bowman had moved that £23,530 only be granted—again proposed.

Mr. COYNE (*Warrego*): He desired to refer to the statement of the Premier with regard to the indentured immigrants for the services of the pastoral properties. In replying to interjections the night before last, the Premier said he regarded wages as the first consideration in indenting immigrants for pastoral properties. That was pretty well indicative of the policy of immigration now being pursued by the Government. His (Mr. Coyne's) opinion—and it was also the opinion of thousands of others in Queensland—was that the amount of labour available was actually the first condition to consider before they indentured any more immigrants, and, if there was a sufficiency of labour in that particular calling, there was no real need for introducing any more of these labourers. The Premier had not given them any idea as to whether there was a sufficiency of labour of that particular character, but he (Mr. Coyne) knew of his own knowledge—and his statement could be borne out by the hon. members for Balonne, Carpentaria, Flinders, Gregory, Barcoo, and the other representatives of pastoral constituencies—that there was no scarcity of labour of the description being introduced by the Premier for those places. If that were so, then there was no need for the Premier to introduce any more indentured immigrants. As to wages, he had looked through the return which the Premier showed them the other night, and he found that, in the districts he was acquainted with, at any rate, the return was very

FRIDAY, 18 DECEMBER, 1908.

The SPEAKER (Hon. John Leahy, *Bulloo*) took the chair at half-past 10 o'clock.

## PAPERS.

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

- (1) Report of the board appointed to inquire into the recent accident at Mount Morgan.
- (2) Annual report of the Marine Department for the year 1907-8.

[*Hon. R. Philp.*]

careful to show the wages that were paid in the lowest paid and worst paid stations in those districts.

Mr. KERR: It is misleading.

Mr. COYNE: It was absolutely misleading. He presumed the hon. gentleman got his information mostly from the police.

The PREMIER: From the labour agents.

Mr. COYNE: In a great many places the labour agents were the police. In the Balonne electorate there was a station that could be taken as a fair average of the wages paid in the Cunnamulla district. It was a station about 30 miles from Cunnamulla.

The PREMIER: What place is that—Glendilla?

Mr. COYNE: No; Glendilla was only a small selection. The station he referred to was Charlotte Plains—one of the best stations in Queensland.

Mr. KENNA: Who owns it?

Mr. COYNE: He did not know who owned it.

Hon. R. PHILP: Mr. Craig owns it.

Mr. COYNE: The wages paid by this station could be taken as a guide of the wages paid in that district. The return showed that the wages paid, with the exception of one place on the Darling Downs, was £1 a week. With regard to rations, he had been all over the Southern and Western portions of Queensland for the last nine years, and only one station doled out rations, and that was Thurulgoona.

Hon. R. PHILP: What are you trying to prove?

Mr. COYNE: He was trying to prove that the return which the Premier showed them was a misleading one, and that there was no necessity for these indented immigrants.

The PREMIER: If it is a misleading return, it is very desirable that that should be proved. Will you permit me to point out how to prove it? Will you point out here in this list the stations which are wrongly stated?

Mr. KERR: I will point out several in the Barcoo district.

Mr. COYNE: On each and every station mentioned he had no doubt the wages were correct in this way—

The PREMIER: Hon. members know that I did not prepare that statement.

Mr. COYNE: Nobody said you did.

The PREMIER: Those figures were supplied by Government officials.

Mr. COYNE: By the Pastoralists' Association.

The PREMIER: Hon. members know quite well that if Government employees supply incorrect figures, it is a very serious thing.

Mr. COYNE: They were misleading.

The PREMIER: Would the hon. member permit him to make a statement? He put the return on the table so that hon. members might be able to see it, and what he asked them to do was to point out any particular case in which they knew there was an inaccuracy, and he would have the matter inquired into at once. If there was any lying to be done, he could do that himself. (Laughter.) It was essential on the part of any Government official, when he was asked for information, to supply correct information. Hon. members could understand that. If any hon. member could point out in that statement where the figures were inaccurate, he would inquire into it at once.

Mr. COYNE: He could accept one statement made by the Premier while he was on

his feet. That was, if there was any lying to be done he was quite capable of filling that rôle.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. COYNE: He was only taking the Premier's own words. On each and every station mentioned in that statement he had no doubt there was a man or two working at those wages, but they were very old men, who were only capable of getting on a horse and riding round a fence. They were not capable of doing any of the arduous work that was required of the station hands, and it was only out of benevolence that the station people employed them. Besides which, they knew the run pretty well, and were kept for that purpose as well. If those men were thrown out of employment tomorrow, they would have to come to the State either for outdoor relief or go to Dunwich. Those were the men that were getting the wages mentioned in the return. It was nothing like the approximate average wage in those districts. The hon. gentleman asked the labour agents to send in the figures, and he (Mr. Coyne) presumed when he sent out a memo. to them he told them that he wanted the information, as the pastoralists wished to indent labour for their properties.

The PREMIER: No, no! They were simply asked to state what the wages in the districts were.

Mr. COYNE: Exactly. The hon. gentleman asked his officials to state what the wages in the district were, and he (Mr. Coyne) noticed that amongst others whom he asked was the Pastoralists' Association.

The PREMIER: That is not so.

Mr. COYNE: The Pastoralists' Association was mentioned on the list. If the hon. gentleman wanted to be fair, square, and aboveboard in the matter, why did he not ask the secretary of the Australian Workers' Union, who was as able and willing to supply the information he required as any other gentleman in the State? He did nothing of the sort. He said: "No, I will not have anything to do with the Australian Workers' Union," and he went to the Pastoralists' Association and asked for that information.

The PREMIER: I say the Pastoralists' Association was not asked—the figures were supplied by the pastoralists' labour agent.

Mr. COYNE: He could show within three days, if he had an opportunity, that there was an abundance of unemployed in those districts where they were indenting labour at the present time, and he was quite sure those hon. members he had mentioned, as representing pastoral constituencies, could bear him out in that statement. Between the shearing seasons there was an abundance of unemployed, and the only thing they had to fall back on in that slack season was the bit of fencing, and there was always a limit to that kind of thing. This was an indication that the only object of the Government at the present time was to swamp the country with cheap labour—as cheap as they could possibly get, and if they could not get them cheap at the present time, to bring about such a state of circumstances as would reduce the price of labour.

The PREMIER: You know very well the facts do not bear out that statement.

Mr. COYNE: If the hon. gentleman made inquiries with regard to the labour market, he would find that Western Queensland was never scarce of labour.

Mr. THORN: A lot of them do not care to work.

*Mr. Coyne.]*

Mr. PAYNE: There is no better worker in the State.

Mr. COYNE: There was no harder working men on the face of the earth to-day than the men in Western Queensland. There were no loafers there—they were an absent quantity altogether.

Mr. THORN: Oh!

Mr. COYNE: He was speaking of what he knew something about. The hon. member might know something about Aubigny, but he knew nothing about Western Queensland. The hon. member had visited that country at the time they were compulsorily idle.

Mr. THORN: Who made it compulsorily? I will tell you all about it.

Mr. COYNE: The only policy the Government had got at the present time was a wild policy of immigration—nothing else but immigration—and they were asked to vote £53,000 to carry out that policy. The taxpayers would have to pay thousands of pounds besides to bring labourers to Queensland, and when they were brought here there would be no employment for them. He objected to dumping down men in Queensland when there was no employment for them, and dumping down men who wanted to go on the land when we had no land for them. Those were very good reasons why they should not vote the £50,000. Let them experiment with £20,000 first. That would be a fair thing. The Labour party were prepared to stretch the matter and allow £20,000 of the taxpayers' money to be spent on immigration. They wanted to give it a fair trial, and were quite satisfied that the trial would convince everybody on the opposite side that it was a wasteful expenditure of public money. The senior member for Toowoomba last night interjected that people could not get labourers. Well, taking the return which had been supplied by the Premier, he found that last year only five agricultural labourers were required in Drayton and Toowoomba. In Aubigny there was only one solitary demand for an agricultural labourer.

Mr. THORN: You cannot get them when you want them; there are none there.

Mr. COYNE: They could get more than they wanted. In Cambooya they required five during the whole of last year; and he would direct the attention of hon. members to the fact that the wages they were getting were £1 4s. 10d. a week and found. He would ask any honest member of the Committee if those were the wages paid to agricultural labourers in the off season? No; they were the wages paid during the harvest time only, when the men worked for as many hours as there was daylight, and then only for about five weeks.

Mr. THORN: There are some who are getting from £1 5s. to £1 10s. a week all the year round.

Mr. COYNE: The Government were pursuing a wicked, mad policy, and one which would wreck not only them but the people of Queensland in a very short time. If any evidence were adduced that there was a scarcity of labour in any particular calling, he would be one of the very first to vote public money to bring in labourers to supply that demand; but they had not been given a tittle of evidence that there was any such scarcity of labour. They had heard mining members state that there were hundreds—aye, thousands—of miners idle in Queensland.

Mr. D. HUNTER: And yet you are willing to vote £20,000 to bring in more.

[Mr. Coyne.

Mr. COYNE: The hon. member exploded occasionally in that senseless fashion. There was no reason in what he said. He had already explained that the Labour party were prepared to vote £20,000 in order to give the thing a trial for one year, without penalising the taxpayers to the extent of £50,000.

Mr. D. HUNTER: In order to show that your party is opposed to immigration. That is what you want.

Mr. COYNE: In order to show that the Labour party were not against immigration, as they had stated scores of times; and what they said on the floor of that Chamber they had also stated before their constituents, and they were prepared to tell it to them again. They were not like the hon. member for Woolloomgabby, who would tell his constituents one thing now and in five minutes would turn a complete somersault. In Rosewood only two agricultural labourers were wanted during the whole of last year; one in Stanley; eight in Logan; and he was pleased to see that in Albert, the electorate of the Secretary for Public Works, they did not want any at all.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: We cannot get them. They say it is too far away from Brisbane.

Mr. COYNE: The Government were paying these labour agents to ascertain what demand there was for labour, and to endeavour to supply it, and the report from the Albert was that the demand was nil.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: We want any amount of them.

Mr. COYNE: What was the use of the hon. gentleman talking like that?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I speak from experience.

Mr. COYNE: So were the members of the Labour party talking from experience. The Premier told them that they must go by the official returns, and now the hon. gentleman was telling them that those returns were misleading. The returns showed that last year there were no agricultural labourers required in the Albert.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: They will not go there.

Mr. COYNE: How did they know that, when they were never asked to go? It was within his knowledge that the Premier was pursuing a criminal policy, so far as pastoral properties were concerned, by indenting labourers for those properties; and he entered a strong protest, on behalf of his constituents, against the Government indenting any labourers for that district.

\* Mr. MANN (*Cairns*): He did not intend to vote against the amount set down on the Estimates, although he differed very largely with the Premier's immigration policy. He quite agreed with the hon. member for Warrego that it was a fallacy to bring out men to the Western districts when there were already men there who could not find work. He hoped, before sitting down, to be able to show the Premier how he could put the money on the Estimates to good use without inflicting any hardship upon people who were now looking for work. Last year he asked the Premier certain pertinent questions in order that the hon. gentleman might make some inquiries into the system on which immigration was being conducted; and, although the hon. gentleman made a promise to inquire into the matter, no such inquiries had been made, and the hon. gentleman was appar-

ently going to bring in more immigrants without ascertaining first whether work could be found for them without displacing men already in Queensland. The whole system in the old country was utterly wrong. The Premier said yesterday that the shipping agents were the people who selected immigrants. Now, the shipping agents did not care a dump whether a man was an agricultural labourer or not. All they cared for was getting a full complement of passengers for the B.I.S.N. boats. The way to get the best class of immigrants was by sending home men to go round the agricultural districts and see for themselves what like the men were, and ascertain whether they had any experience or any capital. He spoke rather strongly against the idea of bringing people over here and attempting to settle them on the land straight away under present conditions. They had any amount of labourers in Queensland with a small amount of capital who were desirous of getting upon the land. The junior member for Toowoomba showed him a letter the other day from four men who were looking for land, and the Government could not find land for them. If the Government were fully alive to the importance of the great question of land settlement, they would have agents scouring every district picking up the best workers with a bit of capital—men who wanted to go upon the land; and they should make herculean efforts to get them settled on the land. We should deplete the labour market, and then bring in men from the old country to fill up the vacancy, but the Government sought to bring in immigrants and put them on the labour market instead of putting them upon the land. He did not intend to vote against this grant for immigration, as it could be very well expended on proper lines. The Premier was in the old country lately, and if he had studied the home papers he would have read that a number of

[11 a.m.] crofters who could not get land in Scotland took possession of some land to make a home for themselves, and they were arrested and brought to Edinburgh, and sent to gaol. While the Premier was over there he should have got a man who spoke both Gaelic and English to go amongst the crofters to tell them that in Queensland there were millions of acres, and that they should leave their own wind-swept islands. He should have arranged to have a whole colony of these people brought out and settled on our coasts, and supplied with boats and nets for fishing, for these men were both crofters and fishers, and they would have made good colonists. At home most of these young men had gone through a system of training in the naval reserve, and they would have formed a splendid nucleus for an Australian navy, and they would have made good citizens.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Cannot they do it now?

Mr. MANN: He was not going to vote for the amendment, to see if that could not be done. The hon. member for Brisbane South last night had really put his finger upon the sore in this matter—we should fill up our vast empty spaces with people who would defend the country against the incursion of Asiatics, and he would vote for the Government on this occasion. Immigration was too serious a question to be made use of for party purposes. He was backed up in his attitude by the Labour party in the Federal Parliament, which advocated immigration on the lines he had suggested. But he did not believe in bringing

out men to the West, which was already overcrowded, or to sugar districts, to an already overflowing market. He did not think there had been a single complaint from the sugar districts about the scarcity of labour; they had never had a better season as far as good cane-cutters were concerned. At the Mulgrave during the first few months the men were cutting more than the mill could crush, and it was only when some of the men were down with influenza that they were short of cane. He hoped the Premier would bring out the crofters as he had suggested. It would be a godsend to those people to come out here. A ship could be chartered to bring them out, so that there would be no breaking of family ties, and a Government inspector could give them enlightenment as to the mode of cultivation here, and they would make the best class of settlers, and be a splendid nucleus for building up an Australian navy. That had been done in Canada. Whole islands had been practically depleted, and the people put down to form one township in Canada. That was perhaps the reason why Canada was making a success of immigration, and we did not. There had been too much haste to rush in agricultural labourers and servant girls here. At home servant girls got better wages and accommodation than they did here.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: No.

Mr. MANN: Their duties were more special; they were not general servants. The only advantage we could point out to them was that there was a better chance of getting on in this country. In the old country, once a servant girl always a servant girl, but a girl coming out here had a chance of bettering herself.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Even marry—ing a member of Parliament.

Mr. MANN: For that reason he would recommend the bringing out of these girls—(laughter)—but not under false pretences. He was sorry the Chief Secretary was not in his place, as he wanted to ask him a question. In his district there was a man whose daughter and son-in-law went home some eight or ten years ago. There were two or three children born in Queensland, and four or five in England. Things had gone hard with them there. The children born in England could be nominated, but the parents themselves could not get nominated. The man was a carter, and had had to pay the passage of his daughter and son-in-law and some of the children. He would like to ask the Chief Secretary if, under the circumstances, he could not see his way to give this man a refund.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Ask a question about it.

Mr. MANN: He had written to the Immigration Department several times over the matter, and had been told in reply that the law would not allow them to nominate people who had been former residents of Queensland. Those people would make as good settlers as persons who had not been in Queensland before, and possibly better. He did not agree with the statement made by the hon. member for Leichhardt last evening, that the less the population was the more prosperous was the country.

Mr. HARDACRE: I did not say that. I said a big population did not bring increased wages.

Mr. MANN: But it caused increased production. We had 5,000,000 people in Australia at the present time, and if we had ten

*Mr. Mann.]*

times that number there would be ten times more boots and hats and other commodities required to supply their wants, and that meant more production and more employment.

Mr. HARDACRE: We would not be one penny the better.

Mr. MANN: We should be better in this respect: that we should have the country settled, and there would be more consumers, and consequently more producers to supply their wants.

Mr. HARDACRE: What about the price of land?

Mr. MANN: If we imposed a graduated land tax—and he had always been in favour of such a tax—that would inevitably keep down the price of land.

Mr. HARDACRE: Do that before you bring immigrants here.

Mr. MANN: We could do both.

Mr. AIREY: Do both together.

Mr. MANN: He was in favour of imposing a graduated land tax to cheapen land, but even without a land tax people could get plenty of land in his district.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The question of a land tax is not before the Committee.

Mr. MANN: Quite so, but a great deal had been said about the dearth of land for immigrants, and he wished to point out that within a few miles of Cairns good land, with a navigable river flowing through it—good arable and dairying land—could be obtained for £4 an acre. The only drawback to it was that the scrub had been felled and left on the land by Chinese, and the land had become overgrown with burr. But he could clear that land within twelve months at a cost of about £2 an acre. That might seem a big price, but he had bought land at £10 an acre, and paid for it out of the proceeds of the land. He believed that men could get the land he referred to on lease for a period of years on the condition that they cleared it of burr.

Mr. HARDACRE: What wages would you pay for clearing it?

Mr. MANN: Any person taking it up could clear it himself, and he would get as wages the reward of his labour. He could clear such land by cutting the burr with a mowing machine, and then putting a fire into it. He hoped the Premier would give serious consideration to the suggestion he had made, and see if they could not get crofters and fishermen from congested districts in Scotland to come to Queensland.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He wished to say a few words on this most important matter to Queensland—the matter of filling up our vacant places. He must confess that, after hearing what had fallen from members on both sides of the House, he could not understand why they could not come to a division on the question. With regard to the rates of wages and the work available in agricultural districts, he could only speak of his own district, and he could tell hon. members that there was a scarcity of necessary and suitable labour for developing the agricultural resources of the Albert district.

Mr. BARBER: What do you mean by “necessary and suitable labour”?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Men who could and would do the work for which they were engaged and paid.

[Mr. Mann.

Mr. BARBER: £4 worth of work for about fifteen bob.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The hon. member who made that interjection knew absolutely nothing about the subject. Where men had the necessary knowledge to do the work required of them, he ventured to say that in all agricultural districts they got a fair wage and fair food.

Mr. BOWMAN: What do you say is the average wage?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: That was a matter which was practically determined by the ability of a man to do the work for which he was engaged, but a man who was able to do his work as an agricultural labourer could practically get any wage he liked to ask for.

Mr. LENNON: That is not an answer at all.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: It was an answer; but the majority of men going round agricultural districts seeking for work had no knowledge of the work, and would not do the work.

Mr. BOWMAN: I ask what is the average wages paid to agricultural labourers in the district you represent?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Taking all classes of labour, the average wage paid in the Albert ranged roughly from £1 5s. to £1 7s. 6d. a week and found. A good deal had been said by some hon. members about the hours worked by agricultural labourers. He ventured to say that those members knew absolutely nothing about the matter. The agricultural labourer in Queensland had a considerably better time than men employed in other occupations. They must furthermore consider that they had passed legislation which placed it in the hands of the worker to obtain the treatment that he ought to receive if he was not getting it. Any men brought into Queensland at the present time were in the position that, if they did not receive the rate of pay to which they were entitled, they were able to obtain it through the operation of the wages boards, and that fact seemed to be entirely overlooked by hon. members opposite who spoke against the proposed immigration scheme of the Government.

Mr. NEVITT: Did not you do your best to prevent the Wages Boards Bill applying to agricultural labourers?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He did, for reasons which he adduced at the time. (Opposition laughter.) But that Act had now become law, and it was in the hands of the agricultural labourers themselves. Men coming to Queensland from henceforth, if they did not receive the rate of wage they considered they were entitled to, then a majority of the men employed in a particular district had only to apply for the establishment of a wages board, and they would get it. A good deal had been said about the indentured labour, and hon. members opposite made the statement that there were thousands of men walking about anxious to get work, but the employers would not give it to them.

Mr. BOWMAN: What was said was that after the sugar season and the close of the pastoral season that there were thousands of men unemployed.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: From his own personal knowledge he knew that that statement was incorrect.

Mr. BARBER: Come up to a sugar district, and you will see them for yourself.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Was it likely that employers would go to the expense of indenting labour from the old country, knowing that they would require a certain period to get used to their new surroundings and the altered conditions in Queensland, if they could get reliable and suitable labour in Queensland?

Mr. KERR: The men who are being indentured are experts.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The employers were keen business men, and they would not take that course if they could get reliable and suitable labour for the purposes they required.

Mr. KERR: But these men are experts with sheep and cattle.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Quite true. Even then the conditions were different in Queensland to what they were in the highlands of Scotland. In connection with the labour to be paid it was provided that £1 a week would be paid for the first six months, and then £1 5s. a week for the second six months, and when they saw the wages actually paid to these indentured immigrants they would see that the amount was a fair one. The list which had been placed on the table for the information of hon. members had been questioned.

Mr. COYNE: What about the supply of labour already in those districts?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: It was an absolute statement of fact so far as they could ascertain, but, if it was not, then it was the duty of hon. members who knew otherwise to supply that information to the leader of the Government to enable him to find out where these misstatements had come from.

Mr. HAMILTON: You are bringing men out at a reduced wage of 10s. a week less than what some of the men get now.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The pastoralists were permitted to bring in indentured labour at £1 a week for the first six months, and then an increase—

Mr. BOWMAN: No, there are no conditions relating to that. It is £1 a week for the first twelve months. The Premier said, after discussing the matter with the representatives of the pastoral industry, that it was intended they should get £1 5s. a week after the first six months.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He had no doubt that would be carried into effect.

Mr. BOWMAN: But it is not in the agreement.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: If hon. members would examine that list laid on the table, they would see that the wages paid for all classes of labour in the pastoralist districts worked out an average of £1 2s. 6d.

Mr. BOWMAN: No. During the shearing season they get £1 10s. a week.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He referred to the permanent class of labour, and if the hon. gentleman worked it out he would find that it averaged £1 2s. 6d. a week. Hon. members opposite assumed that the Government wanted to bring out men who would be unemployed. He regretted to say that in Queensland at the present time there were a number of men to whom unemployment was practically a disease. That had been his experience in Queensland.

Mr. HAMILTON: That is an old gag.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The hon. member for Gregory knew it was a fact.

Mr. HARDACRE: It is a libel on the working men of Queensland.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He said that a certain section of them in Western Queensland were not disposed to settle down to permanent occupation, because they were of a roaming disposition, and they could always obtain food and shelter.

The CHAIRMAN: I must ask hon. members to refrain from carrying on a conversation in such loud tones, as it is almost impossible for the *Hansard* staff to hear what is being said by the speaker. (Hear, hear!)

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He was glad to notice that the hon. member for Cairns, in replying to an interjection from the hon. member for Leichhardt, said that a man could work and clear the ground himself. The hon. gentleman then interjected "What about wages?" That was the whole trouble. A section of hon. members on the opposite side could not conceive of a man having a desire, in the first instance, to secure a free home for himself, and that by clearing his land and providing a home he would render it an asset which would enable him to maintain himself and family, and be a factor in the development and improvement of the State. Let them consider the old immigrants who came out here in the old days. They came in ill-found immigrant ships, taking up to 160 days to get here. They had bad conditions, and typhus was often amongst them, and they were indentured and landed in Queensland to get £20 a year and rations.

Mr. HAMILTON: That is what you want now.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He was simply giving the class of men who came out in those days, with all the disadvantages that then existed. Those men came out here determined to better their condition. They saved as much as they could of the small amount of money they received, and as soon as they had enough, they took up a bit of ground. There was no railway communication, and none of the advantages we have to-day. See [11.30 a.m.] what those men and their descendants were to-day. That was the class of men they wished to bring out to settle in this fair State. He ventured to say if they could still get that class to come out they would assist in doing what those early settlers, who came out under those disadvantageous conditions, had been enabled to do.

Mr. HARDACRE: Thousands of people want land in Queensland and cannot get it.

Opposition members interjecting,

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I would ask hon. members to cease from interrupting.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He did not think anything he had said would give rise to a discussion amongst hon. members, because to all intents and purposes he was simply giving the history of the early days as a descendant of one of those immigrants. (Hear, hear!) In his youth he had seen all that those immigrants had to undergo. They were men who were determined not to be unemployed.

Mr. MACKINTOSH: So they were.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: They were men determined to improve their condition in life, and they became what they are to-day, and had assisted materially in the development of this great State. He quite agreed

*Hon. W. T. Paget.*]

with the hon. member for Cairns that it was absolutely necessary that suitable agents should be sent to the old country to select the immigrants it was desired to bring out.

Mr. BOWMAN: There is a very great deal of dissatisfaction at present.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: A certain amount of money was necessary to pay those agents, and yet Opposition members were attempting to cut down the sum of money proposed for that purpose, which would practically take away the ability of the Government to provide agents of character. He admitted that the matter of selection was one that would require the greatest care. As had already been stated, the best immigrants received in Queensland were brought out by men from the State who knew the proper class of people to bring to the State. Starting at the beginning with the Rev. Dr. Lang—under whose auspices his own grandparents came out—he selected a class that he knew was suitable for this great State.

Mr. HUXHAM: Do you believe in scalp money?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He ventured to say that that principle was a very bad one. (Hear, hear!) Hon. members, by endeavouring to reduce the vote, were practically compelling the Government to adopt that particular manner to get immigrants. Then the late Henry Jordan selected men who to-day were respected by every man in the community, and deservedly so, because they, of all others, had assisted in making this State what it is.

Mr. HAMILTON: We do not want the flotsam and jetsam of the old country.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: When the hon. gentleman thought over the matter he would regret the reflection he cast on a large number of females by the statement he had made the other night.

Mr. HAMILTON: It is absolutely true.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He ventured to say the hon. member had slandered a number of virtuous females who were doing their part to make this State what they hoped to see it in the future. It was an uncalled for and cruel statement.

Mr. HAMILTON: You read the evidence taken at the inquiry.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The statement would reflect no credit on the hon. member for having made it. With regard to the crofters, he thought no more suitable class of men could be introduced into Queensland than the crofters from the Highlands of Scotland, and he hoped to see a large number of them introduced under the scheme which the Government proposed to carry out. There was no more striking example of what this State could do for men—he understood the hon. member for Cairns also came from a family of crofters—and to-day he was an independent man and a member of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland. These were the attractions they were able to hold out to those who wished to come here. Hon. members had endeavoured to show that in bringing men to this country we were actually doing them a cruel disservice, and yet several hon. members had got up and stated that they themselves came out here as immigrants, and to-day they were members of Parliament. How many countries in the world could hold out such inducements to men coming to our shores? In a few years they might become independent men, and also members of Parliament. In all countries in the world, it did not matter how prosperous the country might be, they always had the unfortunate class who called themselves

the unemployed, and who were the unemployed. The trouble here at the present time was that the men did not care to stay for any length of time in one place. In his own experience, he had found men of that class who, after working a fortnight or a month, had come and told him they wanted to leave. He had said to them on different occasions, "Is there anything wrong with the wages?" "No." "Is there anything wrong with the food?" "No." "What do you want to leave for?" "It is too far from Brisbane." And as a matter of fact, it was only 14 miles from a railway station, and that railway station was only 50 miles from Brisbane. That was one of the disadvantages men who were endeavouring to develop the country were placed in. If all those areas of Crown lands which had recently been selected were to be cultivated, a class of men, to whom they were willing to pay the best wages, were required to put them under cultivation.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: Is all this done for the benefit of the working man, or yourself?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He ventured to say that the hon. member employed labour, in the first instance, for his own advantage. They were not philanthropists; and they wanted a suitable class of men, not alone for their own advancement, but for the advancement of the State as well. Hon. members had said that, so far as the sugar industry was concerned, there was a surplussage of labour. Well, he would like to tell his experience on the Mossman. In inspecting the mill there, he noticed a considerable number of Japanese employed in overhauling the rolling stock of the tramline. He said to one of the directors, who was showing him round, "I don't like to see this. How is it that you are employing the brown man here?" He said, "I assure you that we are unable to get white labour to do that work. We would prefer to employ white men." He believed that statement, because he knew that the gentleman who made it had an objection to coloured labour.

Mr. WOODS: He did not tell you the truth.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the pearl-shell industry disclosed the fact that the brown man had practically monopolised that industry. In the beautiful Atherton district—one of the most magnificent districts, he ventured to say, in the whole world—they found the yellow man.

Mr. HARDACRE: And what has caused that? Only land ownership.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: If they analysed the reasons from the state of things that prevailed at Atherton they would find that the men who were giving the yellow man the opportunity of occupying the land were not men who could be condemned for being employers of labour. He spoke as a native Australian, who had the advancement of his country very much at heart, and as one who desired to see it settled with a white race of people.

Mr. BOWMAN: We desire it just as much as you do.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Then why did the hon. member endeavour to reduce that vote, which he knew was absolutely necessary to bring people here to develop the State?

Mr. BOWMAN: Some of those you have been bringing out are mechanics, and not agricultural labourers at all.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: They only desired to bring out people of the same class as those who had made the State

what it was to-day. It was necessary to expend a considerable sum of money to enable them to appoint suitable agents; and he trusted those agents would be men who had come here as immigrants, and had made an independent position for themselves out of the soil, and who would be able to show those whom they desired to induce to come here what a man could do in this fair land. He appealed to hon. members to regard the question quite apart from party considerations.

Mr. BOWMAN: So we do.

**THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS:** As the senior member for Townsville said last night, they had one of the finest countries in the world—(hear, hear!)—a country that was absolutely flowing with milk and honey, and which only required people to make it one of the greatest States in the world. He appealed to hon. members to pass the vote, and assist in developing the State, and putting them in a position of being able to defend their great heritage.

\* Mr. RANKIN (*Burrum*): In his opinion, the vote under discussion far transcended many of the votes to which a great deal of attention had been given. Some of those who had spoken had regarded the question from a parochial point of view, whereas it should be regarded from a national point of view. It was a vote on which, sooner or later, might hinge their very existence as a State. Their friends on the other side endeavoured to make out that they did not want population in Queensland.

Mr. NEVITT: That is not true.

Mr. RANKIN: That had been the burden of their song.

LABOUR MEMBERS: No, no!

Mr. RANKIN: So far as he could gather from the interjections coming from the other side while the senior member for Townsville was speaking, those hon. members simply wanted to close the door against immigrants.

LABOUR MEMBERS: No, no!

Mr. RANKIN: He was not going into any heroics, but asked hon. members to regard the question as practical business men. They had some 429,000,000 acres of land, and a population of a fraction over half a million. Did any sane man suggest that the country was sufficiently peopled either for development or defence? He did not think so. On looking over the history of the State for the last ten years, the figures were interesting and startling. In 1897 the population of Queensland was 498,523. In 1907 the population was 546,467—a net increase in the ten years of only 47,944. If they turned to the Vital Statistics of the State in connection with births and deaths, they found that during the same period the birth rate was some 140,000 and the death rate some 58,000—an increase of births over deaths of 82,904. As a matter of fact, the increase of population in this State itself was only some 47,000 people. The figures in themselves were most appalling. They took us back to the very thing that was happening in France to-day. It was a simple matter to work out how long at this rate it would take to have anything in the shape of a decent population.

Mr. HARDACRE: You alter the conditions.

Mr. RANKIN: It is one of those natural questions that we had not to look at from a narrow point of view.

Mr. MACKINTOSH: Why don't you try to make them better? (Laughter.)

Mr. RANKIN: Honestly speaking, he thought it was a short-sighted policy to raise any objection to this vote. Instead of £50,000, he should like to make it four times that amount.

Mr. McCLACHLAN: Oh, take a million.

Mr. RANKIN: If that million was spread over four years he should have no objection to it. It appeared to him that the Opposition had taken to themselves the title of the "stinking fish party." Nothing could be stronger to damn this country in the eyes of the people in the old country than some of the speeches of members on the opposite side.

Mr. HARDACRE: You are doing it yourself now by showing how little the population is growing.

Mr. RANKIN: The advancement of population in this State was appalling, because they were not doing anything for it.

Mr. HARDACRE: Is not that a "stinking fish policy"?

Mr. RANKIN: No, they could not call it a stinking-fish policy when in ten years the births exceeded deaths by 82,000.

Mr. HARDACRE: It is not growing enough in that way.

Hon. R. PHILP: What are you doing yourself? (Laughter.)

Mr. RANKIN: But notwithstanding the increase of births over deaths in that period of ten years, the net increase in our population during the period was only 47,944.

Mr. NEVITT: Showing that you could not keep your natural increase.

Mr. RANKIN: Showing that instead of offering any objection they should offer every inducement to bring people here. He was somewhat surprised the other evening when the Premier referred to the reductions in labour caused by the departure of the kanaka. Some 6,000 kanakas had been deported by the Federal Government. The Premier pointed out that only 600 men had been brought in to take their place, implying that there was a deficiency of labour in the State, but he (Mr. Rankin) thought that was a mistake. What happened was this: In place of the kanakas, large numbers of men came from the Northern Rivers of New South Wales and the other States to work on the plantations during the crushing season, and they made good cheques and went straight back with them to the other States. It would be better if this capital were kept for the development of our own State. That was the difficulty we had to contend with. We were further taxed in sugar districts in this way: During the harvesting season, when the greater number of labourers was employed, men from the Southern States came in and made anything from £100 to £150.

LABOUR MEMBERS: Ease off, and laughter.

Mr. RANKIN: He was not speaking of something he knew nothing about; he could produce papers to prove that several gangs had averaged between £3 and £4 per week for the whole season. The figures he was giving were utterly unassailable.

Mr. BARBER: I challenge them.

Mr. RANKIN: He thought the hon. member would challenge anything. He had in his possession particulars of the exact amount of money paid to the different gangs by the Colonial Sugar Refining Company and by the Goodwood people, and the figures were accurate and unassailable even by the hon. member for Bundaberg, who posed as knowing something of the sugar industry.

Mr. BARBER: He knows as much as you do, and a lot more. There is no man who has made a £100 cheque in that district this year.

*Mr. Rankin.]*

Mr. RANKIN: Those men, after the season was over, went back and took their cheques with them—that was the best of them. There were sometimes amongst them some who were less thrifty, and those were left behind, and we were saddled with a class of labour that was utterly unsuitable. The hon. member for Bundaberg would agree with him that there was a considerable section of these sugar-workers during an off-season who were not reliable.

Mr. BARBER: Not much more than 10 per cent.

Mr. RANKIN: He should put it considerably higher. One point which had been missed in connection with immigration was the fact of not being able to put the people on the land quickly enough. He did not know that he was entirely in sympathy with the late Minister for Lands the other night when he said it was caused by the absence of surveyors. He did not think any department had a right to claim privilege for the want of men of that class. The difficulty was that surveyors were a professional class in themselves, and they were underpaid. That was why the staff was undermanned. And why was it? He saw in the Estimates a draftsman put down for the lordly salary of £140. A miner working eight hours a day for five days a week could earn more than that.

Mr. HAMILTON: We have trained men, and then they have left the State.

Mr. RANKIN: Exactly, because the conditions were not of such a nature as would keep them here. Men engaged in that class of work were professional men, who had to serve a certain period and attained a certain educational standard before they were qualified, and yet all that was paid this officer was £140 a year.

While men were climbing over one [12 noon.] another's shoulders to get into the public service, there was a scarcity of draftsmen, and that was probably because they did not receive the consideration they were entitled to. If a man served an apprenticeship to a trade for four or five years, he expected when he became a journeyman to receive a higher rate of pay, and a man who spent five or six years learning his profession was entitled to similar consideration. But there was another matter connected with the question of immigration which was, perhaps, more important than all the other matters referred to, and that was the matter of defence. With such a huge territory and great coast line as we possessed, the important question of defence should receive a great deal of thought from public men, and he was very pleased to see that the Federal Government were beginning to realise the importance of it.

Mr. HARDACRE: The most miserable bogey of the lot.

Mr. RANKIN: It might be a bogey in the eyes of the hon. member for Leichhardt, but anyone who called it a bogey had not studied the subject. Australia was a small continent in the Southern Pacific.

Mr. NEVITT: A big continent.

Mr. RANKIN: Well, to please the hon. member for Carpentaria, he would say it was a large continent. The Chinese and Japanese, about whom hon. members opposite had so much to say, were within a few miles of our shores, and yet the hon. member for Leichhardt said the question of defence was a bogey. It was only the other day that President Roosevelt pointed out that the one need in Australia was to beware of an empty North, as an empty country spelled disaster, and invited invasion. If one spoke to those men who said that nobody was going to attack us, they would answer that if we were

attacked we had the British navy. But was it not conceivable that there might be circumstances under which the whole strength of the British navy would be required elsewhere? Japan, which was at present the ally of Great Britain, but might not always be so, had 3,000,000 whom she could put into the field; so that the question of the defence of this continent was a most important one. He was pleased to see that the Commonwealth Government were to some extent taking the matter of immigration out of the control of the States. He noticed in the *Brisbane Courier* that morning that they were sending abroad a cinematograph, with the view of securing immigration to Australia, and he thought that was a very good thing, as it showed that the Federal people were seized of the necessity of getting more people in this country. He hoped that no strong effort would be made to reduce the proposed vote for immigration, but that within the next year or two it would be largely increased, as we wanted people to develop the country, and also, if necessity arose, to defend it.

Mr. NEVITT (*Carpentaria*): The hon. member who had just resumed his seat showed conclusively that Queensland had not been able to retain the natural increase in her population during the past ten years. He (Mr. Nevitt) used similar figures when speaking on the Address in Reply, but he went a little further than the hon. member, and pointed out that in 1899 the population of Queensland was 512,604, and that in 1907 it was 535,110, an increase of only 22,506 in eight years. That was only a little over one-third of our natural increase in population. The hon. member for Burrum also showed that a draftsman in the Government service was paid the magnificent wage of £140 per annum. Did the hon. member want to bring out draftsmen from other countries to work under similar conditions? The hon. member really proved that the immigration system of the Government was a false one. With regard to the statement that the Labour party were opposed to immigration, he gave the statement a most emphatic denial. There was not one member of the party who was against a proper system of immigration. The Premier stated the previous evening that he was led to believe that the average wage of workers in the pastoral industry was £1 per week, and at a later hour of the evening he placed on the table a return which he said had been prepared by responsible officers of the department, showing the wages paid in pastoral districts. He had no fault to find with that return, as far as his district was concerned, but he said that instead of the wages being £1 per week, they were over £1 10s. a week. Yet the hon. gentleman was indenting labour for that district at £1 per week. He noticed that the name of the Warrego Pastoral Association was printed at the bottom of the return, which the hon. gentleman said had been compiled by responsible officers in his department. It was news to him (Mr. Nevitt) that the Warrego Pastoral Association were in the employ of the Queensland Government.

Mr. RYLAND: The present Ministry have become the employees of the Pastoralists' Association of Queensland.

Mr. NEVITT: The hon. member for Gympie hit the nail right on the head. He (Mr. Nevitt) received a letter to-day stating that forty men in the Camooweal district were out of employment. These men followed pastoral occupation, such as fencing, boundary riding, and stock riding. They found the pastoral associations writing to other associations—and a letter sent by the secretary had come into his possession—trying to

[Mr. Rankin.

get all the associations to unite and resist paying a fair and reasonable wage to their employees. The Minister for Works told them that they had the wages board, which they could apply to these people. It was fortunate that that was so, but it was not at the wish of the Minister for Works, who tried to hide behind it now, nor was it the wish of the party behind that hon. gentleman, who tried hard to prevent these very men coming under the operations of that Bill. He had come to the conclusion that this form of immigration was adopted for the purpose of reducing wages. During the Address in Reply he gave two instances where pastoral properties were paying at the rate of 30 per cent. per annum, and yet they turned round and said that £1 a week was a fair wage. Then he raised his voice against this Government circulating false literature. (Hear, hear!) The Government were advertising for blacksmiths for the Ipswich workshops for 9s. 6d. per day, yet they were distributing literature throughout Great Britain, stating that the minimum wage for blacksmiths was 10s. a day. That was a misstatement.

Mr. SUMNER: If the Government do not pay 10s. for blacksmiths, private firms do. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. NEVITT: Both statements were not facts. One of them must be a lie, and a deliberate lie.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. D. HUNTER: 9s. 6d. and privileges is not a lie.

Mr. NEVITT: He knew a man who served in the same workshop as he served in himself as a mechanic. He worked for the London and North-western Railway Company, and afterwards put in six years with the Lancashire Railway Company, and as a member of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers he always got 10s. a day. Yet when he came to Queensland he was asked to work for 9s. 6d. a day. He was not like a young man just out of his time, but was a man who was entitled to his full rate of pay. These conditions should not prevail in a young country like Queensland. The Labour party were not against immigration in itself. Better work would be done if this £50,000 was spent in developing the mining industry. They were promised £50,000 on the Estimates, but they had not got half of it.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: You have got £32,000.

Mr. NEVITT: If they developed the mineral resources of the country they would not need to spend any of the State's money in bringing out immigrants. The Labour party believed in the nominated form of immigration, because under that system the men and women who were brought out were provided for by relations and friends, and were not placed on the Labour market in Brisbane and other places, which at present were overstocked. Unfortunately, their big industries in Queensland, such as the sugar and pastoral industries, only required labour to run them for a small proportion of the year. With regard to the pastoral industry, in the majority of the stations in the far North-west, where any aborigines were left, the employees on the station consisted of a head stockman and manager, and the rest were blackfellows.

Hon. R. PHILP: Where is that? Name them.

Mr. NEVITT: He did not care to name the stations on the floor of the House, but he would tell the hon. gentleman privately.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: And has not an aboriginal of Queensland a right to be employed?

Mr. NEVITT: Certainly. He did not object to that. But the aborigines were not employed at the same rate of wages as white men, although they did the same work. If they received the same pay for doing the same work, there would be no complaint to make about it. During his first election campaign he saw two aborigines in charge of a seven-horse dray, taking rations from Burketown to the station. He did not care to give the name of the station on the floor of the House, more especially as the owner had since died. If they saw the Inspector of Aborigines they would find that a number of the cattle stations in North Queensland had a number of aborigines registered; they did the same work as the white man, and they were entitled to also get the same rate of pay. The Premier told the Committee that the first forty men who were being indentured were being brought at the rate of £1 a week. If they looked through the list on the table they would find that that was not the average rate of wages paid. If the Premier were still employed at his trade as a moulder, and the average rate for that trade was £2 a week, and there was a proposal to indent moulders at £1 10s. a week, the hon. gentleman would raise the biggest howl of any man in Queensland about it.

Mr. HARDACRE: Let us indent lawyers, and pay the public money to bring them out, and see how the Cabinet like it.

Mr. NEVITT: This was too big a question to go into fully, owing to the fact that they had to discuss the whole of the Estimates in one day, whereas they should have two or three days to discuss this vote. It was absolutely impossible to discuss this question apart from the land question, as the two went together. Everyone knew that increased population increased the value of the land, and the unfortunate position to-day was that if anyone wanted land near to market, he had to pay such an exorbitant price for it. The Minister for Works referred to the men who did not work. His (Mr. Nevitt's) idea of the man who did not work was the man who was dressed in a good suit of broadcloth with a good big watchchain across his vest.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Is that the man you allude to as unemployed?

Mr. NEVITT: Those were the men who never did any work. They did not produce anything, and yet the Minister for Works turned round and insinuated that a large percentage of the working men of Queensland did not want work.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: A large percentage of unemployed do not want work.

Mr. NEVITT: The hon. gentleman referred to the old immigrants who were brought out when there were no railways. Well, he had no railways in his district, and he had given an instance of forty men being out of work there. These men had gone out into the backblocks and borne the heat and burden of the day, and when they could not get work, they were told that they did not want work. A gentleman occupying a position as a member of the Government ought to be ashamed to make a statement of that kind. (Ministerial laughter.) He would not delay the Committee any longer, but would give other hon. members an opportunity of speaking.

Mr. RYLAND (*Gympie*): He did not think it was an advertisement for Queensland to buy population in the old country. The very circumstance of having to go to all this expense in advertising and immigration agents to get people to come here—was that an advertisement that Queensland was the sort of promised land that everyone should go to. It was practically a

*Mr. Ryland.]*

libel on Queensland—a black mark against Queensland. If it was the desirable land it was said to be the people would come here, and the Government would not have to pay them to come here. That was not the way to get a larger population, or a desirable population—to bring out a lot of people who were left destitute when they came out here, and had to compete in an already overcrowded labour market for something to do to provide the necessaries of life. The Secretary for Works spoke about bringing out those who had been in close proximity to the soil in the old country and transplant them here to make homes for themselves. Was he prepared to follow that out in practice?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Of course he is. That is our proposal.

Mr. RYLAND: They were not bringing people out from the farming districts; they were bringing out mechanics and people of that class. There was a good deal in the suggestion of the hon. member for Cairns. He had advocated for a long time that they should bring out men who would make successful colonists, and put them in the vacant places, but that should be done on an organised system.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: That is exactly what we propose to do.

Mr. RYLAND: That was not what they were doing.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: You won't grant us the money to do it.

Mr. RYLAND: They would give the money for that purpose. The Government were bringing out 200 immigrants every month, and were subsidising steamers to the extent of £37,000 a year. Was it for the benefit of those workers they were bringing them out? He did not think it was for their benefit. It was for the benefit of the employers, and landlords in particular, that those immigrants were brought out.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: How are they to pay wages if we do not do something for them?

Mr. RYLAND: He admitted that an increase of population meant an increase in the productive power to a certain extent. But an increase of wealth did not mean an increase of wages. The great problem the world over today was not how to increase production of wealth, but how to procure a better distribution of that wealth. By bringing people out here they might add to the wealth of the country, but that wealth would not be distributed amongst the workers of the State.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Has not an immigrant the right to aspire to become an employer?

Mr. RYLAND: He might become the owner of a Mount Morgan or a member of Parliament. What was the use of flouting that in the face of the immigrants coming out to Queensland, and telling the domestic servants that all they had to do was to come here and the squatters would be down at the wharf to meet them and take them home to the stations and honour them as wives. That had been stated in England. They had been told by men like the Secretary for Works that they should respect the law of supply and demand, that that was the law that governed wages, not whether the industry could afford to pay higher wages. We were told to regard that law, but in this very proposal the Government did not recognise the law of supply and demand, because they were bringing about an artificial supply of labour to come here and compete with the workers already here. The capitalists, and the capitalistic Press, came along now and said, "This law of supply and demand is bad. It is

not what we want. We will break this law and we will bring out cheap labour at State expense."

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Cheap labour is no good. Cheap labour is dear labour.

Mr. RYLAND: The working men in Queensland had to depend on their labour, and the Government were making those working men contribute to bring out more labour to compete in the market with them. Was that fair? Would the hon. member's class submit to conditions like that? No.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: You talk about the hon. member and his class. Which class do you refer to?

Mr. RYLAND: I refer to the class backed up by the financial institutions and the Pastoralists' Association, and backed up by land monopolists in Queensland and Australia generally. That was the class the hon. gentleman represented, and he could not deny it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I belong to the class which is trying to develop the State and improve the conditions of its people.

Mr. RYLAND: He had heard several estimates as to the value of each immigrant to a country. The value was variously [12.30 p.m.] put down at from £400 to £600.

But did the immigrant get any part of that £400 or £600? No. He was brought out here simply for the benefit of the employer and the landowner. He admitted that wealth increased with the increase of population. In 1900, according to the "Year Book," there were 26,000 hands engaged in manufacturing in Queensland. They produced £277 per head, allowing 10 per cent. interest on capital. In 1907, according to Mr. Weedon's "A.B.C. Year Book," there were 29,000 hands engaged in manufacturing, and they produced £360 per head. Now, what proportion of the increased production of £83 per head had those factory workers got? Were their wages one penny better now than they were seven years earlier? The whole of that £83 had gone to the capitalist and landlord. If they doubled their population, and doubled the productive power of labour, the working man and working woman would not get even the smallest percentage of that increased production; and that was the problem they had to solve. That state of things was not confined to Queensland.

Hon. R. PHILP: What do you pay your wife for washing?

Mr. RYLAND: He did his own washing. (Laughter.)

Hon. R. PHILP: What do you pay your servant girl per week?

Mr. RYLAND: In 1835 the wealth per head of the population in America was £64; seventy years later, in 1905, it was £266—an increase of £202 per head. The population now was 80,000,000, whilst in 1835 it was only about 10,000,000. Still, the working men and women of America were no better off than they were seventy years ago. There was a story told of some good fairies who saw a lot of poor girls working long hours in a factory. They felt so sorry for those poor girls that they went to the queen of the fairies and told her. The queen said, "We will see if we cannot do some of this work for them." So she and all the good fairies went and did all the work in the factory. When the girls arrived in the morning, they were met by the manager with a smiling face, and he rubbed his hands and said to them, "Oh, somebody has been here and has done all the work in the factory, so we won't want you for a long time—until there is more work for you!" (Laughter.) So the poor girls were in a worse position than they were in before. In the same

[Mr. Ryland.]

way, when immigrants came to Queensland as good fairies to help us to work, employers would be able to get workmen cheaper than at present, and there would be no work for those who were now here. The hon. member for Townsville, or the Treasurer, might go down to the wharf when a ship arrived with immigrants, and, as an employer or landlord, give them a welcome; but the poor man on the wharf, in the store, or in the mine would find his work taken away from him. The tendency and the object of this immigration policy was to reduce wages for the benefit of the employer and the big landowner. In every case the increased competition was against the working man. The Labour party were not against immigration conducted in a proper way. They did not say to the population in Queensland at the present time that they should be the owners of Queensland, and no others, but they were prepared to divide it. At no time, as far as he remembered, did the Labour party object to assistance being given to nominated immigrants. If anyone out here thought their brothers or sisters at home could better their position in Queensland, there was a provision under which they could nominate them. He had never quarrelled with that. Although it was an expenditure of the taxpayers' money, it was the least objectionable way. The immigrants brought out by that means were not strangers in a strange land, who had to take the first work that presented itself; they would have friends to meet them, and they could get over the home sickness. If we had a proper scheme of land settlement, he would have no objection to people being brought out, but what was the use of bringing them out at the present time? Take our sugar plantations or our Western plains. What paradise was there there for working men? What was the position at Gympie or Charters Charters at the present time? At Gympie or Charters Towers there were 400 or 500 miners unemployed. They were good, strong, expert miners, not loafers. Then take our railways. On the Caboolture line or the Boyne Valley line there were strong, stalwart men working for 6s. 6d. or 7s. a day. That was not a rate of wages which would encourage men to come out from the old country, to break all the home ties, and come out here and compete on our railway lines for that rate of wages. Then they had to run the risk of broken time; in wet weather they did not make full time. If they worked five days a week they thought it was very good time all the year round. Then the conditions provided for the workmen were not very encouraging to bring men out here. We had the unemployed in every part of the world to-day. There were large numbers in Germany. There were a great many in all the large cities of the world, but it was no solution of the problem to bring them out to Australia. There was an evil in our present system of production and distribution. No matter how good the workers might be, no matter how expert they might be in their particular trade or industry, under our system of production and distribution at the present time a certain number would be out of employment.

The PREMIER: Do you propose to alter the system?

Mr. RYLAND: He did. Nothing else than the reconstruction of society in regard to the production and distribution would meet the case. Nothing else would prevent one man from robbing the producer of the result of his work. As long as we allowed the present state of society to go on, no matter how much we might increase production, we would have poverty in the land.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: What is your solution—a land tax?

Mr. RYLAND: We had socialistic production at the present time. Our production was practically by socialism—by co-operation. Production was not carried out now by the individual as it was in early times. In the primitive state of society every man was a hunter, or had to produce the necessaries of life for himself, but now we had a division of labour by which one man could do the work of many. One man could do the work of ten by socialistic production in our big factories, and mines, and industry generally. But in order to make this socialistic production a success, it was necessary to have socialistic distribution. He only mentioned this in passing to show where the real weakness was. When we got a state of society in which the producer could get a fair price for his labour, we should not have to pay for immigrants to come out; people would come of their own accord, and stay here. During the debate it had been shown from statistics that our population had practically decreased. People came here, and when they saw the conditions were not what they ought to be they left, but if conditions were better they would stop here. He noticed that there had been an increase of about 12,000 during the last twelve months. He supposed that came about through people getting to know that we had a democratic Government, which had passed democratic legislation, such as the Wages Boards Act and the Factories and Shops Act, which gave some protection to the worker. The Federal Government had also removed the kanakas, and there was a kind of hope raised in the breast of the worker that there would be a good time in Queensland. But the democratic Government had disappeared. It had been broken up by the agency of financial institutions and the Pastoralists' Association. He thought the change would be to discourage people from coming here, or to cause some of those here to try fresh fields. There was a great deal of talk about the need for immigration, but the primary object of those who talked in that strain was to reduce wages, to make it hard for the persons who had nothing but their labour to make a living, and to supply the employer with cheap labour. The object of the old black labour party was to get black labour, or any other sort of labour, so long as it was cheap, and now that the kanaka had been returned to his island the cry was "Give us cheap labour; we cannot have black labour, and we must have cheap labour of some kind."

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Won't immigration improve the position of the labourer?

Mr. RYLAND: No. The production of the nation would increase, and the landowner would benefit, but the labourer's position would not be improved. By confining the vote for immigration to a small amount, they would restrict immigration to nominated immigrants, whose friends here might be in a position to put them on the land, and in that case they would not be thrown on the labour market. If we had a proper system of transplanting the population of the agricultural districts in the home country on to the soil of Queensland, he believed that that would help to make this a prosperous State; but to bring out here a lot of men to compete for work in the labour market with those already here would be to increase the difficulties with which our workers had now to contend. The Government were introducing immigrants at the rate of 200 a month to compete in the labour market, and naturally that must bring down wages.

The PREMIER: Will you kindly get the conditions in regard to immigration and read them to the Committee, and show where there is anything that means indiscriminate immigration?

*Mr. Ryland.]*

Mr. RYLAND: If he read them to the Committee, the hon. gentleman would probably get up and propose "that the question be now put," on the ground that he was stonewalling. (Laughter.)

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Why did you oppose the Workers' Dwellings Bill?

Mr. RYLAND: He opposed the Workers' Dwellings Bill not because of what it did, but because of what it left undone. They should endeavour in a measure of that kind to assist men who did not own land—

Hon. E. B. FORREST: And do no work.

Mr. RYLAND: If they were like the hon. member, and did no work but barrack for the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, one of the biggest monopolies in Australia—a monopoly which should be nationalised—

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The question of the Colonial Sugar Refining Company is not before the Committee. I trust the hon. member will confine his remarks to the question before the Committee.

Mr. RYLAND: He was aware that he would not be in order in discussing that company, but he would point out that that company was interested in cheap labour, and that there was no company in Australia which was so much against doing away with the kanaka. They wanted cheap labour, and the Government of this State, ignoring the law of supply and demand in regard to labour, had subsidised a steamship company to the amount of £37,000 a year to bring out cheap labour to Queensland.

The PREMIER: You believe in interfering with the law of supply and demand.

Mr. RYLAND: No; he did not. He believed that if the law of supply and demand were properly worked out it would give every man a fair reward for his labour. Give free competition in land, free competition in capital, and free competition in labour, and he would be with them every time in that. But the Government did not do that.

The PREMIER: Do you tell the Committee that you are a unionist, and yet would not interfere with the law of supply and demand?

Mr. RYLAND: Yes; he did. The reason why the Labour party advocated interference, by means of wages boards and other Acts, with the law of supply and demand in regard to the remuneration of labour, was that it was necessary to counteract the effect of private ownership in economic rent.

Mr. MURPHY (*Croydon*): Last year Parliament passed £53,000 for immigration. It went through without a dissentient vote, [2.30 p.m.] and he failed to see why they should object to the granting of £53,000 this year. Last night the hon. member for Brisbane South dealt with immigration from a defence standpoint, and it was pointed out that the defence question was merely a bogey. But the leading politicians in Australia, and the leading military authorities in Australia, considered that an Asiatic invasion was no bogey at all.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MURPHY: He recollected that Mr. J. C. Watson, one time leader of the Federal Labour party, and formerly Prime Minister of Australia, wrote two articles in the *Lone Hand* in August of last year, in which he dealt with the immigration question from the defence standpoint. In two very interesting articles he pointed out that it was necessary that the empty spaces in the North should be populated if the

[*Mr. Ryland.*

Labour party's policy of a white Australia was to be maintained. Mr. Watson wrote as follows:—

"Beware of keeping your North empty, and remember that an unmanned nation invites disaster." So wrote President Roosevelt to a touring Australian a little time ago, and the warning should not go unheeded. From a defence standpoint, the call for additional population throughout Australia is sufficiently clear. . . . When the Northern Territory comes to be considered, the call is clamorous. An immense area, practically unguarded, stretches there at our most vulnerable point, while distant a few days' steam cluster the myriads of Asia, threatening ever to swarm across to the rich fields of a land attractive in all respects to a frugal, industrious people, condemned at present to exist in much poorer country.

Members would recollect that the Federal Parliamentary party visited the Northern Territory in 1906, and it was in consequence of that visit that Mr. Watson wrote these articles in the *Lone Hand*. Mr. Watson's remarks on the Northern Territory were particularly applicable to North Queensland. Referring to the alleged bogey of an Asiatic invasion, Mr. Watson said—

Optimists declare: "Japan is our ally; the Chinese are asleep." But alliances are, as a rule, short. They change with kaleidoscopic suddenness, and always disappear when the interests of the contracting parties cease to be common. When China was somnolent, the Japanese sought the assistance of Great Britain to guard joint interests in Eastern waters. But since their victory over Russia the Japanese are evincing national foresight by encouraging to the utmost the modernising of China, clearly with a view to securing for the future an Asiatic ally as an alternative to a European one. . . .

The Australian policy of excluding Asiatic races as unmixable with our blood—essential as it is to our national welfare—necessarily leaves soreness in the minds of those adversely affected, and must eventually depend for its maintenance upon actual or potential military power.

Having in view, then, the probable trend of events, Australians should at once begin to put their house in order, if not for their own, at least for their children's sake. In the South, East, and West we could make some little show of resistance to any serious attempt to occupy our territory. We have there, at least, the material from which an army could be fashioned. In the North, however, we have unguarded gates and no garrison. A garrison can only be provided through white settlement, numerically strong enough to hold out until assistance arrived from other parts of the Commonwealth.

Mr. HARDACRE: You will never get them in 100 years.

Mr. MURPHY: If they never made a start they never would get them.

Mr. HARDACRE: It is only a little stream, anyhow.

The PREMIER: A little stream is better than nothing.

Mr. MURPHY: Those articles written by the late leader of the Federal Labour party were written as regarded the Northern Territory, but in Northern Queensland to-day there were very few people.

Mr. AIREY: Precisely the same argument applies to North Queensland.

Mr. MURPHY: Precisely the same argument applied to North Queensland as to the Northern Territory. (Hear, hear!) But what was the Queensland Government doing to try to open up North Queensland?

Mr. NEVITT: Robbing it of its revenue.

Mr. MURPHY: If they asked for a railway for North Queensland they were met with the reply that the population was too small, and that the country could not afford to build railways in North Queensland. Look at the immense mineral wealth in Northern Queensland waiting to be opened up, but what did they find?

The PREMIER: There are three railways being built in the North at the present time.

Mr. MURPHY: He would deal with that later on. For twenty-five years Cloncurry, which was one of the richest mineral districts in Queensland, was left neglected. He gave this Government—or rather the late Government—credit for extending the railway from Richmond to Cloncurry, and also for building those two railways in the Atherton district.

The PREMIER: And we are assisting to build a fourth, that line to Mount Elliot; and also the line to Lawn Hills.

Mr. MURPHY: The Government were only prepared to put up a portion of the money for the construction of those lines, but were not prepared to put up all the money. He was not quarrelling about the Burketown line, as he voted for it, because he found that that was the only system the Government would adopt to open up the great mineral belt of North Queensland.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope the hon. gentleman will not continue his remarks in that strain unless he connects them with the question before the Committee.

Mr. MURPHY: In the articles written by Mr. Watson, he argued that from the defence standpoint they must have more people in the North, and he was arguing that the Government ought to spend more money to encourage people to go to North Queensland. What had the Government done this year? They had wiped £20,000 off the mining industry for a start.

The PREMIER: No. As a matter of fact we put £20,000 on.

Mr. MURPHY admitted that the Government added to the vote, but the Premier took £20,000 off the vote which he promised the mining members he would allow.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: No, he did not.

The PREMIER: That is not fair.

Mr. MURPHY: It was perfectly fair. The ex-Treasurer and the ex-Secretary for Mines said that they had placed £50,000 on the Mining Estimates.

Mr. WOODS: And the Mines Department worked on that.

Mr. MURPHY: And the Mines Department were under the impression that they were going to get that £50,000.

The PREMIER: Not from what I said.

Mr. MURPHY: Yes; from what the hon. gentleman said.

The PREMIER: You know better than that.

Mr. MURPHY: He did not know better, and if he did he would say so. The Premier gave the mining members to understand that there would be £50,000 available for the mining industry this year.

The PREMIER: The Premier gave the mining members to understand that he would not name any sum at all.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: He said he would increase the vote, and that was done.

Mr. MURPHY: The matter was discussed in the House, and if the Premier looked up *Hansard* he would find that he led the mining members to believe that that £50,000 they were asking for as a deputation was going to be placed on the Estimates this year, and the ex-Treasurer and the ex-Secretary for Mines placed that sum on the Estimates.

The PREMIER: And neither of them was there at the time I was speaking to that deputation.

Mr. MURPHY: No. At that particular time the Premier gave the ex-Treasurer instruc-

tions, in the presence of himself (Mr. Murphy) and the senior member for Mackay, to make that money available at once.

The PREMIER: And it was made available at once, but not £50,000.

Mr. MURPHY: A certain amount was made available, but not £50,000. That was what he was complaining about.

The PREMIER: What are you complaining about?

Mr. MURPHY: He complained that the Premier had broken his promise in the matter.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: Croydon did not get enough.

Mr. MURPHY: That was not the question. They were considering the question of immigration. The Government should bring people to the country for defence as well as other purposes, and they ought to be prepared to spend money in the North to make the conditions suitable to live under. The climate was good, and the land was good.

The PREMIER: And the mines are good.

Mr. MURPHY: Unfortunately all of them were not good, and it was because the mines were not good that the Government should be a little more liberal to the mining industry. When things were good the mining people did not want any money.

Mr. THORN: What money do the agricultural people get?

Mr. BARBER: They live on the State

Mr. MURPHY: If the hon. member looked at the Estimates, he would see what money they got in the agricultural districts. He believed Queensland could support more than 550,000 people, and if Australia could not support a larger population than it had to day, what was the good of a white Australia policy? (Hear, hear!) If they could not support a larger population, then it was time they got out and let somebody else come in. It was a good country, and Mr. Watson pointed out, so far as the Northern Territory was concerned, that the Commonwealth Government ought to be prepared to spend a large amount of money in peopling that part of Australia, and he considered the Queensland Government should be a little more liberal to North Queensland than it had been in the past. He intended to support the vote for £50,000 for immigration.

Mr. REDWOOD (*Drayton and Toowoomba*): He was very pleased indeed to see this vote of £50,000 placed on the Estimates. Personally, he should like to see more. He had always been a very keen advocate for immigration, believing that it was absolutely imperative to populate this great State. It was with very keen satisfaction that he saw the Government were dealing with the matter in a very earnest manner. He honestly thought that the present Ministry would do their best to advance settlement by immigration, land settlement, and railway construction. Many members said that the present labour market was congested—that there were any amount of unemployed people in Queensland, and that they did not require immigration. He said they did. He spoke as one that had suffered considerably last year for the want of labour. His company in Toowoomba had to close several of their malting establishments on account of not having sufficient labour to do the work.

Mr. HARDACRE: At what price?

Mr. REDWOOD: They paid up to £2 10s. a week; they paid what a man was worth, and they were treated as well as in any hotel in Brisbane.

Mr. HARDACRE: You can get any amount of men at that price.

*Mr. Redwood.]*

Mr. REDWOOD: There were any amount of men in the State who would not work. They stayed at a job for a week or two, until they got a few pounds, and then went somewhere else. They paid the men from £1 10s. a week with food.

Mr. HARDACRE: Was it skilled work?

Mr. REDWOOD: They had to learn how to use a shovel. The older hands had been three or four years in the employ of the company, and they were paid good wages, and last year the company offered a bonus to any man who stayed the season. They endeavoured to keep the staff together that way. There was a class of men going about who did not want work. The question of immigration was discussed in Toowoomba, and a scheme was unanimously carried which was backed up by both the local papers. That scheme was submitted to the Premier, and in it they advocated strongly the introduction of a desirable class of settlers. He was pleased the Government had carried out the Franco-British Exhibition exhibit. It was an excellent advertisement for Queensland, and it was time the people of Queensland realised the fact that they had to settle this country or else somebody else would. No reasonable man could show him by logical arguments how the influx of desirable people was going to interfere with the present rate of wages. The more people they brought here, the more work there would be for labour, provided they were placed on the land if possible when they got here.

Mr. MULCAHY: Hear, hear! That's the point.

Mr. REDWOOD: That was a very important factor, and it was receiving the earnest consideration of the Government. Likewise the Premier showed he was thoroughly alive to his position by sending Mr. Graham, of the Lands Department, to Canada to find out the excellent methods that were adopted there for settling their immigrants on the land.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: Do you also know that we cannot settle the people that are at present in the country?

Mr. REDWOOD: He knew that the Lands Department had not been able to cope with the demand for land.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: That is true.

Mr. REDWOOD: That was because the Lands Department had not been able to get sufficient surveyors to open up the land. It was for that very reason the Government sent Mr. Graham to Canada to see how they were able to settle so many people and so quickly, and that was what was wanted in Queensland. He trusted the Secretary for Lands would grapple with that question, and would not hesitate to run railways into Crown lands, and would not wait for the people to get on the land before a railway was built. Because any practical man who knew anything about agriculture must realise the fact that he could not profitably carry on that industry if he was more than about 15 miles from a railway. The policy they should adopt was that of bringing out immigrants with a little capital, and giving them free land. Free land was passed in this Chamber last session, but up to the present he had heard no more about it.

Mr. LESINA: Is not the land our chief asset?

Mr. REDWOOD: Exactly.

Mr. LESINA: And you propose to give it away to strangers. That is a mad policy.

[Mr. Redwood.

Mr. REDWOOD: For years he had been an ardent advocate of free land. Free land was the secret of the success of Canada, Argentina, Siberia, and Western Australia.

Mr. BARBER: It is not free in Canada.

Mr. REDWOOD: It was free, with the exception of survey fees. It had been absolutely proved that the Canadian land policy was a most excellent one, and one which had done more than anything else in the development of that great country.

Mr. HARDACRE: It has ended in disaster.

Mr. REDWOOD: What was the use of talking nonsense?

[At this stage Mr. Redwood paused while several members of the Opposition conversed in loud tones.]

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must insist upon hon. members observing the rules of debate, otherwise I shall certainly have to put Standing Order 166 into active operation.

Mr. REDWOOD: The statement of the hon. member for Leichhardt was quite incorrect. He (Mr. Redwood) had a brother in that part of the world, and he had received authentic information from him at various times with regard to the great progress Canada was making. America was absorbing 1,000,000 immigrants per annum, yet wages had not been brought down by the influx of population. He hoped the Secretary for Lands would do all in his power to settle men on small areas of suitable land. Nobody knew better than the hon. gentleman the class of country that was suitable for close settlement. Surely they were not going to allow the land to be overrun with prickly pear, as had been done in the past. Then what were they going to do with it?

Mr. HARDACRE: Open it up.

Mr. REDWOOD: Unless they brought out immigrants, wallabies, kangaroos, or prickly pear were all they were likely to have upon it. People were not likely to come to Queensland unless their passages were paid when they could get to Canada for £3. They would have to offer more liberal terms than were offered by other countries or they would not get them.

Mr. LESINA: People say, "It cannot be a very good country if you are willing to pay us to go there."

Mr. REDWOOD: There was no logic in that argument at all. What would Queensland be to-day if they had not adopted a vigorous immigration policy in the past? On the Darling Downs and in other parts of the country there were thousands of men who were now independent, who had come here without one shilling. There was not one man on the Government bench who wanted to dump people down in Queensland. What they did want was a stream of desirable people, properly inspected at home, and properly provided for when they got here; and that was what the Government were advocating.

Mr. LESINA: No. You misunderstand their policy. They have deceived you. The Premier is a gay deceiver. (Laughter.)

Mr. REDWOOD: As was pointed out last night by the hon. member for Townsville, Queensland had made very slow progress in agriculture. He could speak authoritatively of the Darling Downs, as he knew every inch of the country and practically every farmer there, more or less, and he was in a position to say that the cause of the poor progress in cereal production was the fear of not being able to get sufficient labour to harvest their crops. It was not a matter of

wages at all. There were many men who got £1 5s. a week in the slack season, and in harvest time 8s. to 9s. a day.

Mr. LESINA: Must they not be big strong men to earn that much?

Mr. REDWOOD: Not necessarily.

Mr. LESINA: Could they do navvying?

Mr. REDWOOD: Not necessarily. Ploughing was not hard work; but there were thousands of men who did not care about navvying. They preferred the more comfortable life on a farm, where they had their homes, instead of shifting about from camp to camp on a railway line. There were young adventurous spirits who liked that kind of life, but there were others who did not like it at all.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: Is not the real difficulty that the farmer does not give permanent work—but only temporary?

Mr. REDWOOD: The farmers on the Darling Downs could give employment nearly all the year round. He could not speak of the hon. member's district.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: I was on the Downs for years.

Mr. REDWOOD: He knew that. When a man got his harvest off, he had his ploughing to get through; and there was no question that the majority of the failures that took place in the farming areas were due to people not thoroughly understanding how to cultivate the soil scientifically.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: They must be children on the Downs.

Mr. REDWOOD: There were plenty of excellent farmers on the Downs, but there were some who were not excellent farmers, just the same as everywhere else. The Darling Downs was one of the most prolific and magnificent tracts of country in the world, and the farmers did the best they could for their men.

We had a debt of about £40,000,000, [3 p.m.] which practically meant that any man who came to the State was carrying about £300 on his shoulder, as our national debt was about £77 per head of our population. He could not understand people objecting to this vote of £50,000. When we could bring into the State an able-bodied man for £12, he certainly thought it was the best investment the State could borrow money for.

Mr. PAYNE: But if the State has got to feed them when they come here?

Mr. REDWOOD: The State had not to feed them. Any man of integrity and honour would not be fed by the State. He had clearly stated that the Government were going to open up the land, and if there was a desirable class of men coming here, the agricultural areas would absorb them. Men who knew nothing about farming had the audacity to get up and attack men who were all the year urgently engaged in the development of that industry.

Mr. SUMNER: Some of the best settlers in Australia never saw a farm till they got here, and some of the worst men we have cannot unlearn what they learned in the old country.

Mr. REDWOOD: He hoped the Minister for Lands would give the free land which he had asked for, and that the Agricultural Bank would be liberalised. The bank was too circumscribed, and did not meet the needs of the settlers. It should assist these men to get a start—he did not mean to give them the money, but the bank should assist them to get the necessities to start farming forthwith rather than let them wait until by hard plodding they could get them for

themselves. In conclusion, he sincerely trusted that the Government would pursue a vigorous immigration policy, and that would mean a vigorous land policy and a vigorous railway policy. They were all allied to each other. He believed the Ministry were earnest in their desire to see this carried through, and it would result in the rapid development of the State. He would not like to see money spent foolishly, but he was prepared to borrow £1,000,000 or £2,000,000 a year, if necessary, for the development of the State, and for reproductive works, such as conservation of water, railways, land settlement, and immigration, and by that means they would lighten the burden of the people in the State. We would double the population in a few years, which would mean half the present taxation. It should be our earnest desire to utilise the great heritage we had got, to utilise the great areas which Providence had given us, which were waiting to yield up their untold wealth.

Mr. HARDACRE: You should borrow £2,000,000 straight away.

Mr. REDWOOD: He only wished to borrow money for reproductive or necessary works, not for foolish schemes or ideas, but for reproductive works which would bring millions into the Treasury, and that was what would follow the policy of the Government. As the hon. member for Brisbane South, in his logical speech, had pointed out last night, we had no right to this country if we did not populate it. He trusted to see a vigorous policy carried out, and not only £50,000 but £150,000 placed on the Estimates next year. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. ARMSTRONG (*Lockyer*): It could easily be understood that if the seventy-two members spoke on this question there would be seventy-two different ways of approaching the subject. Those concerned in farming had different ways of looking at it, and the hon. member who had resumed his seat, being a representative of a farming constituency on the Darling Downs, had placed a new aspect before the Committee in regard to this question. He was not going to deal extensively with the parochial nature of the debate. In regard to the constituency which he represented, they were short of labour. He was speaking for the largest producing agricultural district in Queensland.

Mr. GRAYSON: No.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: It was the largest. There were 15,000 people and 5,000 voters in it, and 1,200 square miles were under cultivation and dairying.

Mr. WOODS: There are plenty larger.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: He was speaking, at any rate, for an electorate which was not second to any in Queensland. Wages, whether in one part of Queensland or another, meant the commodities which could be procured with them. If 12s. in the South would give a man the same commodities as he could get for £1 10s. in the North, the wages were equal.

Mr. HUXHAM: But you would not like to work for 12s. a week, would you?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: If a farm labourer in England and a farm labourer in Queensland both got 15s. a week, would they say they were both equal? They should discuss this question of wages, not as so many tokens of shillings or sovereigns, but from the point of view of the commodities which an individual got for his labour—the purchasing power of his labour. The value of work in Queensland was as much as in any other part of the known world. Whether they went to the States where the wages were 10s., or 2½ dollars a day, in Canada

*Mr. Armstrong.]*

where they were 8s., or in Japan where the rate was 1s. a day, or in China where it was the same, taking the power of wages in the shape of the commodities that he could consume, there was a better rate in Queensland than in any other nation of the world at the present time.

Mr. HARDACRE: Wages have gone down lately.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: They always fluctuated in every country of the world, and the greater the production so the greater the amount of commodities available as wages for the worker; and so as production is restricted so do wages become restricted and lowered.

Mr. KENNA: The standard of living.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: The standard of living was higher here than in any other part of the world. Consequently, with our conditions, the men's earning power was here greater at present than elsewhere. Immigration might be likened unto a stream that broke out on a mountain range. As the stream pursued its course, it filled up each indentation in its channel. And in the same way the stream of immigrants from the over-filled countries of Europe found its way into various parts of the world, and until Canada, the United States, and South Africa had been filled, no special inducement that we could offer would bring those people to Australia, which at present was so far removed from the overflow of populous nations. There was no royal road for filling up our vacant spaces. A great deal had been said about what had been done in Canada. He was there a few years ago, and he went about with his eyes wide open, seeking information and studying the question of immigration. Hon. members should not apply everything they heard to the whole of Canada. There were portions of Canada which belonged to the Dominion Government, and there were other portions which did not come under the control of the Dominion Government. The provincial lands were under an entirely different régime and control from those which belonged to the Dominion Government. The settlement of the lands of the Dominion Government had been brought about largely with the help which had been given to the country by the Canadian-Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. LENNON: Then if we only had syndicate railways we should be all right.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: No; he was not one of those who thought that. He believed that if certain syndicate railways had been constructed at the time they were proposed in Queensland, some twenty-five years ago, it would have been a good thing for the State, but he thought such propositions should not be accepted at the present time, because we had lived beyond the psychological period. What was causing the great influx of population to Canada was that the Canadian-Pacific Railway Company received a large amount of money for building a railway through the country on certain terms. The whole of Canada was mapped out into sections 1 mile square—that was, 640 acres—and in each of those 1-mile square blocks there were four 160-acre subdivisions. Every alternate 1-mile square block belonged to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and the rest belonged to the Dominion Government. The Dominion Government gave the company the right to go all through Europe and get people, on the condition that if they took up any of the company's lands they should get the same terms as were given by the Government in connection with the lands which belonged to them. The conditions of occupancy included clearing and cultivation, and the right to secure a further 160 acres in the same locality at the price of from 3 to 5 dollars

per acre. The price on the company's adjoining blocks was not to exceed 5 dollars per acre. The company, in order to recoup themselves for the expenditure on the railway, had to make the lands along the line of some value by settling them, so that they became the best immigration agents it was possible to secure in Europe. They did not bother about taking this or that individual *dépôt*, but picked out the men who would till the land and grow the greatest amount of produce to carry over their railway, and it was a good business transaction. The consequence was that people went to Canada, and took up and occupied the lands. The hon. member for Clermont said the other night that those lands were all under mortgage. He would tell the hon. member his experience in connection with that matter, which was personal. A landlord required his land to be worked, and it paid him to be lenient with the lessee, so that if his railway became a paying concern he would not be hard on the lessees of the land if they were doing their best, knowing that in time conditions would improve. And in the case of the men referred to, they had received far greater consideration than it would have been possible for them to get under any other set of conditions. There was a strong feeling among hon. members that we had reason to fear an influx of immigrants from China and Japan. But he could tell hon. members that there were larger areas of land in Siberia and Manchuria than we possessed—land which was as rich as any in Australia, and with not a single inhabitant on it. Hundreds and hundreds of miles of land in that country had yet to be developed under a railway system. The only settlement that had taken place there was along navigable watercourses, and there had been an immense amount of settlement in those places. But there was still an immense area in that huge continent that had yet to be developed by railway, and as it was being developed by railway, there would not be any desire on the part of the people in the adjacent countries to travel to this part of the world. China required 35,000 miles to give access to her known country suitable for close settlement. When railway construction became general in China, though there were 400,000,000 people in that country, they would have no desire to come here. As for the Japanese, whose country was over-stocked, when he was there only 12½ per cent. of the country was uncultivated.

Mr. SUMNER: Even the tops of the mountains are cultivated.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: He said there was only 12½ per cent. of the country uncultivated.

Mr. SUMNER: They have no land monopoly there.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: He was dealing with the question of cultivation. When they arrived at such a condition of things, they must take some steps. They now had Korea, one of the richest countries in the East—without a railway—and if they had to spill over the country of their birth, was it not reasonable to suppose that they would rather spill over to the country nearest their own country? That was what they were going to do. They were going to Manchuria and Korea. While he believed that this was absolutely the case in regard to the argument that the country might be overrun by Mongolians, Chinese, or Japanese, he thought they should do something to prevent the possibility in the future, but he did not see anything to be frightened of at present. They should go along quietly, and adopt the principle of getting people from the older countries of Europe, especially our own kith and kin, to settle here under the best conditions. Even if they had to give them some little concession,

[Mr. Armstrong.]

they should be prepared to give their own kith and kin the first opportunity of coming here. In conclusion, he would ask whether any man could come to the country and not be of value? He must either produce or consume something of value, so that the matter balanced itself. The mere fact of a man coming here gave the country more human wealth, and he looked upon a highly prosperous people as the most wealthy asset a country could possibly have. But they should not attempt to surround the country with a wall. When his father came to the country he happened to have the money to pay his way out here; another man's father, who came at the same time, had to come out as an assisted immigrant; but they both came to the country to benefit their condition. He maintained that this country offered better opportunities to immigrants than any other country, and were they human, honest, or religious when they refused to others the advantages which this country offered to their fellow-creatures. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. LAND (*Balonne*): He was opposed to State-assisted immigration, because he did not believe that the taxpayers should be called upon to pay for bringing people here from other parts of the world to compete with them for their daily bread. If there was such a desire to settle people on the land, why not settle the sons and daughters of the people already here on the land? He could point to country towns in Queensland where people could not get houses to live in and could not get land on which to build houses to live in. That was the condition in the Western towns; and plenty of people had to live in hotels or on the banks of the rivers because they would have to pay £60 or £65 for an allotment on which to build. Those who owned those allotments gave very little for them when they acquired them, and now they were holding them for speculative purposes. It would be a good thing for the Government to survey 40 or 50 acre blocks and lease them to people who wished to make homes in the Western townships. He remembered the time in 1879 or 1880 when there was a vigorous immigration policy before, and the streets were full of prostitutes and men were spending thousands of pounds. To-day Queensland was prosperous. Every man who had a bit of property—farmer, agriculturist, dairyman, or grazing selector—was doing well. And what was the reason? The reason was because the markets of the world were opened up and there was a demand for everything produced from the ground. But was there one man game to get up and say that the wages of the men, women, boys, and girls—or their surroundings—were as good as they ought to be?

The TREASURER: They are undoubtedly better than what they were.

Mr. LAND: Why? Because the State subsidised steamers, and because they had been visited with good seasons for a number of years. That was the reason that things were better than they were. No man could live in Queensland and take an interest in his country without knowing something about it, and he admitted that things were better than they were. But, allowing that everything was prosperous and better than it was, what would it be like in a few months if they were visited by a drought such as they had in 1902, which was very likely to come on, as no one could stop it. In a [3.30 p.m.] general way, there was not much unemployed in Queensland. There was no starving unemployed. He did not want to raise an unemployed cry, but he knew from practical experience in the Western country that men could not be employed there

for twelve months in the year. Every man required to be employed twelve months in the year to live, because he did not get much wages. On one of the best stations in Queensland the wages were down to £1 a week, and some of them had to keep a wife and family on it, and, as hon. members knew, living was very dear out West. They were hit with a railway rate, and had to pay railage on 600 miles on their foodstuff and other requirements, which made it twice as dear as it was in the town. After the 1st of January, any member could go out West and he would see what he (Mr. Land) described, and they could find out whether he was speaking correctly or not.

Mr. BOWMAN: The Premier will go out in his motor car.

Mr. LAND: That was not the way to go out. The Premier should carry his swag and go out there, as that was the only way to find out how things were. He was talking to a man who spoke about the part the Premier had taken in the 1891 strike, and gave him credit for being the king of Labour men in Queensland. Now the hon. gentleman was supposed to be going out in the Western country in his motor-car with a select few on board with him. He would not find out the conditions in the West in that way. The proper way was to go by train, then get out and go along the bank of the river. He did not think the figures giving wages in the West, which had been supplied by the Premier, were correct, but for the sake of argument he would assume that they were correct. By and by he would quote one station, which would make the Premier agree that the figures were not correct. The wages mentioned in the list ran from 12s. a week to 40s. a week, from the South to the North, from Tweed Heads to the Gulf. The man who got 40s. a week was set down as head stockman on a station. He was the man who did the work. The manager gave the orders and the head stockman carried them out. He might have 60,000 cattle there, or 10,000, or 20,000. If they went through the list it would average about 35s. or 24s. a week all round. Would the Premier allow that that was a fair wage for these men to receive?

The PREMIER: It is not for me to say it is a fair wage. It is for the man and the market to say what is a fair wage.

Mr. LAND: It would pan out at £1 4s. a week. There were not many getting £2 a week, because there was only one head stockman on country that might run to 1,000 square miles.

The PREMIER: That list averages out at £1 2s. 6d per week.

Mr. LAND: He was not concerned about the wages the new chum was getting just now. If a working man undertook to come out to a new country for his own benefit, more especially from a country like Great Britain, where the chances are they never got £1 a week in their lives, and if he got an offer of £1 a week for twelve months, and the chance of getting colonial experience, which would enable him at the end of that time to compete with other men in Queensland, then he thought that man was all right. But these men were being sent into the pastoral country where the men employed there were getting more than £1 a week. The Premier put it at an average of £1 2s. 6d. a week. If men worked in the Western country for £1 2s. 6d. a week, it proved that there was not a scarcity of labour there. The fact that the average wages were so low was a proof that labour was not scarce. He had known the time when they could not get men to accept wages like £1 2s. 6d. a week, even when they were starving, so there must be any quantity of labour

*Mr. Land.]*

there for them to do it now. He was strongly opposed to indented labour of any sort, as if they made the conditions good the people would come. Here was another proof that there was no scarcity of labour in the back country. There was a harvest time in the West, just as there was a harvest time in the sugar districts and with the farmers. No man could get up and prove to him that shearing had been kept back for one day for want of labour.

Mr. COYNE: No.

Mr. LAND: They always started shearing towards the end of the year, generally commencing on the 1st of August, and they managed to finish in proper time for Christmas. Did not that prove that there was not a scarcity of labour even in the busy time? After the 1st of January there were a lot of unemployed, but they never attempted to go to the bureaux—they would not go for relief. They went to an hotel, and their mates would help them. If they met any member at the corner of the street and he was "stiff," they would not hesitate to give him a pound, and just the same thing applied to the shearers and other workers in the back country. There were any amount of unemployed in the West for the first six months in the year, and that was the reason, when he first came to Brisbane, he told the Premier that whatever public money he had to spend, to be ready to spend it on the 1st January, because there was not sufficient work on the stations to keep the men employed all the year round. The average wage for the shearers was about £1 4s. per 100, and the rouseabouts got £1 10s. per week. On Thurulgoona the boundary riders got £1, and the general station hands £1, and that was absolutely the best station in the back country. It was owned by the Scottish Investment Company, but it was a real good station, and one of the smartest men in Queensland was managing it. He wanted to emphasise the point particularly that everything about that station was good as far as he knew, and the wages they paid were £1 a week, which included boundary riders. If there was any scarcity of labour there, would they not be compelled to pay more than £1 a week? Of course they would. He noticed some other stations in his district gave the wages at £1 5s. a week. Take Victo as an instance. Victo was only a 20,000-acre block, and had only one or two reliable men. They had no need to pick up workers from the country side. Glendilla was another place. Most hon. members had been disputing those figures, and they appeared to make out that the wages were rather better than shown on the list, for the purpose, he thought, of showing that the Government were not making such a great bargain for the newchum. He did not want to do that, because he thought it was wiser to argue the other way. He protested against indented labour, especially for the district he represented. His reason for saying he was not in favour of assisted immigration was because those immigrants went straight into the labour market. It was all very well for the Premier and others to say what they were going to do. He knew just as well as any man in Queensland that those new chums, when they arrived in Queensland, could not go on the land, with the exception, perhaps, of a few men who had £200 or £300 and some friends here. The general run of the people that came here—he did not care how they were examined or inspected—would go straight on the labour market. They did it before. Was it ever said in the early days that the men were brought out here to be placed on the labour market? The argument was the same argument the Government were using to-day. Yet they found they were dumped in the depot here, and the employers rushed down from Too-

woomba and paid them what they liked. That was absolutely the case now. He would recommend the Government to turn their attention to their own lands. If the Lands Office were liberalised, and the administration as good as they could make it, they could settle the people who were already here on the land. There were plenty of people here with sons and daughters who would be only too glad to get on the land. What about all the people born on the Darling Downs and other places? If, years ago, they could have got land on the Darling Downs, which was locked up in large stations, they would not have cleared out; they would have been there to-day, and the population of the State would have been much larger. It was their duty to prevent the people of the State being taxed to bring more people out here free. Make the land laws more liberal, and make the place worth living in, and the people would come here of their own accord.

Mr. COWAP: Where would the average farm labourer ever get sufficient money to bring him here?

Mr. LAND: He was not at all concerned about them. He was more concerned about the men already here. They had only to go round the restaurants in the city and see the wages those girls were getting, and the hours they worked; also the wages the men were getting, and the hours they worked. There was plenty of room for improvement.

Mr. COWAP: Is all this country only sufficient for half a million people?

Mr. LAND: He was prepared to admit that they could take all the people in Australia and put them on the Darling Downs, and they would have any amount to live on, and plenty to spare. But Queensland was not developed. What was the good of resources unless there were facilities to work them? He had no intention of misrepresenting things; but it was his duty to try and point out that the people who were already here were not sufficiently paid. There were plenty about Brisbane, and he felt ashamed when he heard those girls, who were doing special work, were only receiving 12s. a week. How could they expect the women to live honestly? Their parents could not afford to keep them, and they had to go out to work, and were forced to dress decently, and how were they going to do it? It was a shame. The Premier referred to the ration scale for the indented newchums the other day. He remembered the old ration scale, and he supposed other hon. members had not forgotten it. The hon. member for Mitchell and the hon. member for Warrego said that the system was different now to what it used to be. Still, there was a ration scale in existence to-day; and he had no doubt the hon. member for Warrego would remember it, as it was on the back of the last agreement, though it was not enforced as a rule. Thanks to the unions, the conditions were better in many ways than they were in the past. It was all very well from the employer's standpoint to get Parliament to agree to bring cheap labour to Queensland for him; but the working man, who was just as much a taxpayer as the employer, got nothing. He was strongly opposed to the taxpayers of the State being called upon either to bring out immigrants to go on the labour market or to indent labour. They would not find one working man or one working woman who approved of the action of the Government in indenting labourers for pastoral properties. He was now going to tell the Premier that the return which he produced the other day was not correct; and, if it was not correct in one instance, it was a very fair proof that it was not correct in another. (Govern-

[Mr. Land.

ment laughter.) If it was not correct in a case like Thurulgoona, it was just as likely not to be correct in the case of the next station. He had not been on Thurulgoona since 1897, and knew nothing about it directly; but at that time they had a saddler, a blacksmith, and he thought a wheelwright; and he thought he was pretty correct in saying that they got as high as £2 10s. per week.

The PREMIER: Does that return give the remuneration of saddlers and wheelwrights?

Mr. LAND: No. It only gave boundary-riders and general station hands. The return was misleading. When he was on Thurulgoona in 1897 the wages ranged from 8s. a week for a boy up to £1 15s. a week.

The PREMIER: The latest information you have is eleven years old.

Mr. LAND: That was direct information—when he was on the place. Of course, he had met the men since and knew what he was talking about. The Premier said that he would not ask union secretaries for information. He was sorry to hear the hon. gentleman say that, because he supposed there were more men in the Western unions to-day than ever before.

The PREMIER: I was not casting any reflection on the unions. What I meant was that I would not ask the unions for information any more than I would ask the employers' unions. What I wanted was independent, unbiassed information. I wanted to get the truth about the matter.

Mr. LAND: Well, the union secretaries were responsible to their unions for every official word and action; and he was sure they would have given the hon. gentleman thoroughly reliable information. The Secretary for Works had stated that the wages paid in the Albert ranged from £1 5s. to £1 7s. 6d. a week. Perhaps it would not be parliamentary to say that he did not believe the hon. gentleman, but he did not think he was correct, because he did not think those wages were ever paid in Queensland. If men could get £1 5s. to £1 7s. 6d. a week in the Albert, half the men in the country would flock there. Besides that, he had a faint recollection of the present Speaker saying that the first place he worked in Queensland was in the Albert electorate, for Mr. Grimes, and that he was paid 12s. 6d. a week.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Well, Mr. Grimes does not happen to be there now.

Mr. LAND: He had always thought the Albert was one of the worst paying districts in Queensland.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I beg your pardon.

Mr. LAND: Well, that was what he had always been led to believe.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: You must not believe all you hear.

Mr. LAND: And he thought that accounted a good deal for the inability of the employers in the district to get labour; the pay was so low that nobody would go there.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: No member of the unemployed will go there, and I gave the reason.

Mr. LAND: He had heard hon. members saying that men would not work. In the district he represented, during a good season they would not find a single man out of work, so long as there was work for them, and they would not find men travelling about with their swags on their backs. As far back as 1891 they might have travelled the country and never found a man out of work. He was afraid that the eighty

men whom the Premier had indented were only an instalment, and nobody could say that it was going to end there, because what was the use of bringing eighty men to Queensland? It would not be worth a rap. Was it the intention of the Ministry to commence bringing indented labour for pastoralists. He

[4 p.m.] would like to tell this House that the pastoralists were well able to indent their own labour. A man need not think for one moment that he was doing it for the individual, because he supposed 95 per cent. of the pastoral holdings to-day were in the hands of rich companies, who were well able to look after themselves. He was strongly opposed to the action of the Government in using the taxpayers' money to indent labour to-day for men who were better off than many of those who were called upon to pay for it.

Mr. SUMNER (*Nundah*): This vote was a very important one, and he thought the discussion which had taken place upon it had been justified. They had had a good speech from the hon. member for Brisbane South last night, and one from the hon. member for Townsville. He thought when those speeches got into *Hansard*, and were circulated throughout the State, it would have a great effect upon the minds and feelings of the people.

Mr. MACKINTOSH: You had better be careful.

Mr. SUMNER: He was able to take care of himself. He did not think that anybody could deny that what we wanted in Queensland, and Australia generally, was more people. He thought that, independent of party, this was the universal opinion among members of the House. The question was, how were we going to get the people, and what conditions were we going to apply to them when they came here? There had been a lot said about the economic relations between wages and population. He did not profess to be an economist, though he would say that he held a first-class Cambridge University certificate in political economy. He had been a student of economics ever since he was a young man, and he had read almost every work that had been published on the economic question. There had been a lot said about the economic relation between population and wages, but to his mind there was no relation whatever. Because there might be 5,000,000 people in New South Wales, it would not affect wages one iota if there was only half a million in Queensland. Wages were not affected by population in any shape or form. Only in so far as you could affect development and bring prosperity to the country could you affect wages in any shape or form.

At 4.5 p.m. the CHAIRMAN: Under Standing Order 171, I have to call upon the hon. member for Leichhardt to relieve me in the chair.

Mr. HARDACRE thereupon took the chair.

Mr. SUMNER: They knew what took place here years ago when times were bad and wages low; and it was only as they had been able to increase confidence that industries had developed and the general prosperity of the State increased that they had affected wages. In connection with the question of immigration was the question of land settlement; but, before dealing with that, he would like to refer to what he would call the serious figures alluded to by the hon. member for Brisbane South last night—that during the last seven years the increase of population, including the birth rate and immigration, and everything, had only been a little over 1 per cent. That was something which ought to set the whole of the people

*Mr. Sumner.]*

of Australia thinking. The hon. member for Leichhardt said last night, give the people better wages, and the population will increase. He thought that was a fallacy. Take New Zealand, for instance. New Zealand for the last ten years had been held up as a pattern to Australia—as the emblem of prosperity. Wages had been high, and what had happened? The birth rate had gone on decreasing year by year. Adam Smith, he thought, settled that many years ago, when he said—and anybody who knew anything at all about economic history knew—that it was poor people who always had the largest families, and, according to that argument—he was not saying whether it was a good argument or a bad one—the theory of the hon. member for Leichhardt fell to the ground. As the wages had increased in New Zealand the birth rate had gone down, and that applied to almost every country on the face of the earth. To say that if they increased wages the birth rate would also increase was a fallacy. He thought the argument was like a good many things in our arithmetic—in an inverse ratio. As a man got prosperous he said he was not going to have such a large family. Now, as to the land question, with which the question of immigration was closely allied. He did not think there was much dispute among members that we wanted more people here. He had an article in the "Lone Hand," written by Mr. Watson, the late Federal Labour leader. That gentleman looked at the question above party issues, because, after all, party issues might blind us to a real danger which might be menacing us on every hand. Every line of the article was worthy of the attention of every patriotic Australian. In the article he said—

An immense area, practically unpeopled, unguarded, stretches there at our most vulnerable point, while, distant a few days steam, cluster the myriads of Asia, threatening ever to swarm across to the rich fields of a land, attractive in all respects to a frugal, industrious people, condemned at present to exist in a much poorer country.

They were told that that was a bogey. Any serious student of history knew that it was not a bogey. They knew that the struggle for existence was as keen in the world to-day as ever it was. There was a great law operating in the world to-day—you could call it a divine or natural law, or what you like—but it was a law above this or any other people. And they had a right to do it. We had no right to withhold this great continent of Australia, with all its rich resources, from cultivation—from the great masses of population in the world; and if we would not allow our own people to use it, then other people would use it in spite of us, and they had a perfect right to do so. They knew what happened in another part of the world a little while ago in the case of a nation which kept itself secluded and guarded, and refused to allow people to go into its territory with the same rights as others. That kind of thing would never be allowed. There was a law above the laws of any Parliament, which said that "if you will not use your lands they will be used in spite of you." Therefore he contended that the greatest problem of Australia to-day was that of getting more people into the country; but, while saying that, he did not agree with all the proposals put forward by hon. members opposite. Much had been said about the large number of people going to Canada. What were the conditions under which those people migrated to Canada? An area of 160 acres of land was granted to them free; they were able to get on the land soon after they arrived in the country, and they were able to plough it and get a crop within the first year. A few months ago, when returning from the North, he visited a German settlement at Baffle

[*Mr. Sumner.*

Creek, in the Gladstone district. There he saw a few score of women and children who had come from Germany and settled on the banks of the creek. They were in a deplorable condition; they were living under a few sheets of iron, the children were half eaten with mosquitoes, and the people had to cross two creeks in order to get to the township, one of which was infested with sharks. Those people had been living in the locality for some time, but had not been able to get their land, and the surveyor, who was there, told him that it would be six months from that time before the land was surveyed and available. When he got back to Brisbane, he called on the Acting Chief Secretary and got something done for those people. They came out under an arrangement with their German pastor, so that the matter had nothing to do with the Lands Department. He believed that only recently had they been able to get their land surveyed and do some work. He mentioned this fact to emphasise the need of having land ready for the people on their arrival in the State. Last session they passed an Act in which a provision was inserted allowing a free grant of 160 acres of land to an immigrant or the son of any settler, but nothing had been done under that Act. They were told that something was going to be done "in the sweet by and by." We had such a thing in Queensland as land greed—not land hunger. Mr. Wade, the Premier of New South Wales, stated last week that he was afraid it was not land selection that was going on in that State, but land speculation. This meant that speculators were securing land with the view of holding it until they could squeeze something out of the people who were brought into the State when they sought to acquire land. There was no doubt that we could settle an immense number of people on the land in Queensland to-day. The leader of the Opposition a few weeks ago stated that in France people paid as much as £20 per acre per annum as rent for land, and that he hoped that in the near future we should be able to do that in Queensland. There were only three factors in the problem of production—land, labour, and capital—and whenever a higher price than usual had to be paid for one of those the others had to suffer, and the one that generally suffered was labour. The higher the rent, or the higher the price of land, the more difficult it was to secure settlement. People were leaving Victoria at the present time because land there was too dear. When Victoria started the dairying industry, the Government gave a bonus on butter, with the result that the value of land rose beyond the "living point." A man who bought land at the "living point," as many were doing in Queensland to-day for dairying purposes, would fall in when a slump came. He hoped that the Government would do their utmost to solve the problem of small settlement in Queensland. He had great faith in the Home Secretary, who was a live business man, and he believed that gentleman would do all he could to assist in solving this problem. Between North Pine and the Blackall Range there were 500 or 600 farms which had been abandoned. Those farms were taken up by men from town, and after spending all their savings on the land they abandoned them because they found they could not make a living there. That land, though advertised by the department—not in the time of the present Ministry—as agricultural land, would not sustain a bandicoot in a dry season or grow a crop without manure.

Mr. W. H. BARNES: Surely there are not as many as 500 or 600.

Mr. SUMNER: He believed that was under the mark.

The HOME SECRETARY: I venture to doubt the accuracy of your statement that it was called agricultural land by the department, because in my time in Queensland I never remember the department giving such a description of land.

Mr. SUMNER: They were advertised as agricultural farms.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is merely a tenure.

Mr. SUMNER: Any land described as agricultural farms ought to be fit for agriculture.

The PREMIER: Any man starting agricultural pursuits ought at least to know whether the land is suitable.

Mr. SUMNER: They don't know in many cases.

The PREMIER: Then they have to pay for their experience.

Mr. SUMNER: Some members talked about the necessity for getting farm labourers to come out to Queensland. His experience was that those who made the best farmers here were men who never did farming in the old country. If a farmer of mature age came here from the old country, he had a lot to unlearn, and was handicapped by prejudice. A young man who had perhaps worked on a farm at home as a boy, but had never farmed for a living, would start at the beginning and learn Queensland methods, and become successful. They were told by one speaker that there were 400,000,000 acres of land in this country. Was it not strange that for years past they had been repurchasing estates for people to settle on—often at a big price. An estate in the Lockyer was cut up and sold at £8 an acre by a private firm. A man who bought 100 acres of that land was handicapped to the extent of £800. He was aware that some of them had got what they paid three times over; but what about the purchaser? Suppose a slump occurred in the dairying industry, where would he be? He was just at the living point now. When an industry advanced in prosperity, the price of land went up till it produced only a living for the purchaser.

The PREMIER: How can you remedy that? If you give them a lease, they will sell the lease just the same.

Mr. SUMNER: He believed that in New Zealand, where they had the leasing system, land monopoly was greater than in Queensland. The Premier knew better than anyone else in the Chamber how to remedy the matter if he could only get a majority behind him. In New Zealand wages had gone up, and prices had gone up, and there was no country where rents were higher. He believed the solution of this question was the solving of the immigration question. Suppose 100 newchums came here with £100 or £200 each, could the Premier say where he could place them on the land where they could get a living?

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes—anywhere they want to go.

Mr. SUMNER: I know plenty of our own people who cannot get land.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is simply owing to the fact that we have created a demand by bringing people from the South that Queenslanders are now anxious to get land themselves.

Mr. SUMNER: A great deal had been said about the scarcity of labour. He could not say whether it was true or not true; he could only give his experience. The farmers in his district came to him and said they could not get

men, and that was the reason why they did not extend their orchards and their cultivation. They were prepared to give 6s. a day or £1 a week and keep. He thought that was a fair thing. He had worked for 7s. 6d. a week and tucker, and he had never regretted coming to Queensland. He supposed he had experienced as hard times and as much adversity as any hon. member, still he considered that Queensland was the best country on God's earth to live in. (Hear, hear!) It would be a great thing for Queensland if the Premier could only manage to settle the land question. There was such a thing as land greed, and he disapproved of large areas being alienated. People had taken up prickly pear areas with no intention of clearing them or using them, but simply with the object of making a bit of money if anything was discovered to destroy the pear. He did not think it was a good thing for people to go on the land to make a living out of it as soon as they came to the country. They should go to work for somebody else for a time till they learned something of the conditions of the country. He supposed that in a short time they would have Mr. Graham's report on settlement in Canada, and there would probably be some alteration in the system of land settlement here in the near future. He hoped that when the

[4.30 p.m.] Chief Secretary got Mr. Graham's report they would have some alteration made in the system of land settlement.

He did not say anything derogatory to the late Minister for Lands, when he was discussing this land question, because he considered that the late Minister for Lands had made a step forward in land settlement that had never been done before in Queensland; in fact, that hon. gentleman had initiated a new era in land settlement, and if it was not as successful as some people wanted, it was a step onward.

The HOME SECRETARY: Can you make any suggestions as to what you think should be done?

Mr. SUMNER: There was room in Queensland for more intense culture. At the present time men were never satisfied until they got more and more land. If a man had 160 acres, although he only had 10 acres of it under cultivation, he was doing all he could to get the next selection of 160 acres. (Hear, hear!) The Chief Secretary told him about the intense cultivation which was carried on in France, and the small areas there on which the farmers got a living. He thought it was possible to do the same in Queensland. Hon. members had been speaking about the high rents that were charged for land, but he (Mr. Sumner) believed that he paid a higher rent for land than any man in Queensland. He paid a rent of £75 an acre for land in Queensland for five years.

The HOME SECRETARY: Was it improved?

Mr. SUMNER: There was no house on it, and very little cultivation, and he succeeded in making that place pay for five years.

The HOME SECRETARY: How many acres did you have?

Mr. SUMNER: Only two acres. He paid £150 a year for two acres, and made the place pay.

Mr. AIREY: Was it pineapple country?

Mr. SUMNER: Yes, pineapple country; but that could not be done to-day. They must stop land greed in Queensland—stop the people from getting too much land, because those who took up a lot of land were only hanging on to it until it increased in value, when they

*Mr. Sumner.]*

could sell it. If they could live on small areas in France, he did not see why they could not do the same in Queensland. In the future they would come to realise the great possibilities they had in this great territory of Queensland. They had no Imperial matters to deal with, as the British Government looked after them, and they had no national questions to discuss, because the Federal Parliament dealt with them. The only duty of the Queensland farmer was to look after the internal development of this great territory which had been entrusted to their care, and any Government that would look after the development of the country and extend these settlements and population would be worthy of its name. He did not think that the great body of electors cared much what Government was in, so long as it was doing its duty towards Queensland itself. The members divided themselves into parties, and called themselves by one party or the other, but electors did not care so long as the Government was helping to develop the country. There were great possibilities for the dairying industry. It was hard work, very trying work, and if a member of Parliament wanted to go in for dairying he would find that it was not as easy as sitting in Parliament House—even sitting till 11 o'clock at night. If a man went in for dairying he had to be at it morning, noon, and night, and the Sabbath day as well, and he did not get any holidays. There was plenty of room for the development of the dairying industry in Queensland if they could only keep the price of land down. They wanted to keep the price of land down to "living point." Twelve years ago, in speaking at a public meeting in Brisbane, he prophesied that they would find that the scrub lands on the coast of Queensland would become the best dairying land in the State, and that had happened. He saw that they only had to clear the scrub and plant it with natural grasses to make it good dairying land. He hoped the Government would not sacrifice these scrub lands to speculators, because they would be useful for settling hundreds of thousands of people, who could exist on a few acres of that land. He paid a visit to the selection of the late member for Nundah the other day, and he found he had paspalum grass growing all over it as high as the fence—in some places 5 feet high. That showed the richness of the land, and it should be kept from speculators, who only took it up to hang on to it and get the enhanced value.

The HOME SECRETARY: I suppose you know that I only opened up scrub land that came under my jurisdiction under personal residence conditions. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. SUMNER: He believed that the hon. gentleman had done more for land settlement than any previous Minister for Lands in Queensland.

Mr. BARBER: He might have done more. (Laughter.)

Mr. SUMNER: He believed the late Minister for Lands had always been actuated by the best motives, and if it could have been proved to him that the agency system was a bad one for Queensland, he was sure the hon. gentleman would have abandoned it.

The HOME SECRETARY: I consider it was a success.

Mr. SUMNER: There was plenty of room for the expansion of the fruit industry in Queensland, and that was something he knew something about. He was sorry that this year was a bad year, but that did not affect the general principle. In the coastal ranges

[Mr. Sumner.

of Queensland they had the best fruit country to be found in Australia and New Zealand. (Hear, hear!) The Tasmanian apple people, who controlled the apple export trade of Australia, came to Queensland last year for the first time to get apples to send to England. (Hear, hear!) That showed the quality of the Queensland country for fruit-growing. Formerly they used to grow ten different kinds of apples on 20 acres of country, but in Tasmania they only grow one variety of fruit in so many acres, and kept a certain quantity for export, and that practice had now been adopted in the Stanthorpe district. They had land in that district on which they could settle hundreds of settlers with their families, and they would find the fruit industry remunerative and pleasant to the people engaged therein. Not only was that the case, but there was great room for expansion in many of the by-products. If they went into any Queen-street shop they had to pay 11d. per pound for bacon, and the same bacon could be bought wholesale in London or Liverpool for 6d. per pound. Was it not a serious state of affairs—that in a country like Queensland they had to pay 11d. per pound for bacon?

Mr. KEOGH: It is all the better for the farmers.

Mr. SUMNER: There was room for a tremendous expansion in the bacon industry. Was there any country in the world where they could keep pigs in the open air and feed them on so little? America was not in it. They had not touched the fringe of Queensland's resources yet, and the time had arrived when they should take a step forward in the development of this great territory. A great deal had been said about the quality of the immigrants that were coming out here. He did not suppose they themselves were very much better than the rest when they came out. When he was in the dépôt he was locked up in gaol, and he did not know that he was any the worse for it. (Laughter.) It was said, "Sumner is a blackguard," and he was brought up the next morning and told he was a gentleman. He was an assisted immigrant, and when he got to the dépôt he found there a nice dinner of roast beef and potatoes in jackets, and a man stood up and spat on the beef and said, "Is that the stuff they are giving us?" He (Mr. Sumner) said—he did not know what he said, but some words ensued and the man fell down and broke his arm. (Laughter.) A good many of the people who were looked upon as undesirable immigrants very often made the best immigrants. If the Government could induce any able bodied man to come here, he must be of a value of £200 to Queensland, even if he came with empty pockets.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. SUMNER: Every child born in Queensland had to be nursed, fed, and educated until they were about eighteen or nineteen years of age, and able to earn their own living. What did it cost the country to do that? It must cost at least £200. He had eight children himself, and he knew what it cost him to educate them and make them fit to take their place as citizens of the State. He believed it cost him at least £200 for each one, and if they could get fully equipped, stalwart men of twenty-one years of age ready to do their work, brought here for £12 a head, they must be a very good asset to the country.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. SUMNER: The great problem attaching to the immigration question was land settlement and railways.

The PREMIER: They are part of the same scheme.

Mr. SUMNER: He had travelled up North during the recess, and in every district with railway communication they found successful settlement; but when they got away from the railway they found the people struggling to get a living, and when those men were settled on the land, unless the Government provided them with facilities to get their products to market, they would make a failure of it. He was going to vote against the amendment, because he believed in adding to the population. He certainly would impress upon the Government—he was in earnest—he did not come there for any frivolity—he desired to see this great country developed. (Hear, hear!) He believed in the country—his whole stake was in the country, and his children's stake was in the country, and he believed it was the duty of the Government to see the State was developed. It was one of the finest countries in the world, and he believed those who came after us would look upon Queensland as the finest country on God's earth.

The HOME SECRETARY: He desired briefly to reply to one or two remarks that fell from the hon. member for Nundah. The hon. member addressed the Chamber with the prestige that properly belonged to a man who had made a success of his settlement on the land. They were fortunate when they had men who were not only able to talk about land and land settlement, but were in themselves an exemplification of personal success in such an undertaking. After all, unless he were under a misapprehension, the hon. member's experience—that was as long as he had been in Queensland—his experiences in Queensland were chiefly suburban.

Mr. SUMNER: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: He was glad his assumption was not an incorrect one.

Mr. SUMNER: Within 100 miles of a railway.

The HOME SECRETARY: He should say a great deal less. At all events, not very many miles from the suburbs and districts around Brisbane. That would explain at least some of the statements that the hon. member had made—and made, he thought, under a misapprehension. The hon. member proclaimed that we ought to have the land ready here for the people who were coming into it. That was an axiom to which, he supposed, no one would decline to subscribe. The only thing was the expense of doing it. He (Mr. Bell) subscribed to that axiom as enthusiastically as anyone, and as enthusiastically as the keenest member in opposition, because, after all, they generally found those wholesale axioms, as to what ought to be done in the country, proceed from the Opposition benches—he subscribed as enthusiastically as anyone to the principle that you ought to have the land ready for any number of people who might come here.

Ms. COYNE: The Opposition have not the power to bring that about.

The HOME SECRETARY: And what was more, the Opposition had not the ghost of an idea as to how it was to be brought about.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MANN: I gave you a scheme.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member might have done so—he (Mr. Bell) might have been out of the Chamber—but he never heard it. He had enjoyed for a considerable

period the privilege of sitting on the same side of the Chamber as the hon. member, and he also had the opportunity, here and elsewhere, of discussing that question with him; but whether that was owing to his obtuseness, or whatever the reason might be, he did not remember receiving any practical suggestion from the hon. member.

Mr. MANN: Will you allow me to explain at this stage?

The HOME SECRETARY: Perhaps that would be the best course to adopt.

Mr. MANN said that he had suggested to the hon. gentleman that instead of waiting until the land was designed, and all the work was done in the office, the Department might allow men to go upon the land. He had made that suggestion to the hon. gentleman, who asked him to see the Surveyor-General. He saw that gentleman about one case where men were waiting six or seven months before the licenses to occupy were sent up. The Surveyor-General had told him the real difficulty was the lack of draughtsmen to design the land, not the lack of surveyors to make the preliminary surveys. That was one suggestion at least that he had made, and those men were allowed to go on the land before the designs were completed.

The HOME SECRETARY: That was an arrangement made some time before he left office.

Mr. MANN: No; this happened since you left office.

The HOME SECRETARY: He had discussed the matter several times with the Surveyor-General and the Chief Staff-Surveyor as to whether men might not go on the land after the preliminary survey was made; but it was pointed out that there was a great deal of danger in doing it—that a man might put his improvements in the wrong place, and there were distinct disabilities attaching to such an undertaking, although in some instances it might be done. They decided to do it before he left office.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: That happened in my electorate.

The HOME SECRETARY: It was easier to do that sort of thing in open country than in thick scrub country. The delay that the hon. member for Cairns complained about in regard to the tableland behind Cairns was due to the fact that a survey in jungle land was a tedious and prolonged work. They heard a lot about Canada. That country was always held up as an exemplar. There were some Queenslanders who went to Canada and came back; and he had them brought to the Surveyor-General to learn what the Canadian practice was. They found that the land there was surveyed before the people were put on it; and it was surveyed under conditions far more favourable for expeditious survey than prevailed in Queensland. They had hundreds of miles of prairie where surveying was practically like drawing squares upon a map. Then, again, they had not got the difficulty that was experienced in Queensland in connection with water. In Queensland access to water was the first consideration in designing a tract of country for selection. Allusion had been made to the report that Mr. Gordon Graham had made upon the Canadian system. The Premier had very wisely, when in London, sent Mr. Gordon Graham to Canada to report upon their system. He (Mr. Bell) was responsible for Mr. Gordon Graham—with the sanction of the Premier—going to London, as he told the Premier Mr. Graham was a good man, and obtained his sanction to his going over. He did not think anybody had yet read Mr.

*Hon. J. T. Bell.*

Graham's report, but he was told by a man who saw a letter written by Mr. Graham, that that gentleman said that Canada could not teach Queensland much in the matter of putting people on the land. It all came back to this—that they had got to survey the land before they put the people upon it; and that depended upon the number of surveyors engaged in the task of preparing the land, and the number of people waiting for land. He mentioned the other night that when he took office there were about fifty-four land surveyors in Queensland. He made every effort to increase the number, and the department had strained every nerve to get surveyors. When he left office there were 106 men engaged in preparing land for settlement. He believed those 106 surveyors were so rapidly preparing the land that the reproach which had been hurled at the department hitherto would cease before very long. He forgot the figures, but he thought he was correct in saying that during the next two or three months an area exceeding several hundreds of thousands—he believed it ran into 1,000,000 or 2,000,000—additional acres would be ready for settlement; so that, he ventured to think, hon. members would find that the Lands Department had not been working on such wrong lines after all.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I have allowed the hon. gentleman to go on because, to some extent, he is replying to the remarks made by the hon. member for Nundah. In an indirect way, the administration of the Lands Department has to do with the question of immigration; but I would point out to the hon. gentleman that he is dealing too much with land administration. I would ask him to connect his remarks directly with the question of immigration, which is now before the Committee.

The HOME SECRETARY: The Acting Chairman might be right, but what he had been saying was in the direction of showing that they had been getting land ready for the people whom they proposed to bring to Queensland as a result of the vote at present before the Committee. He would like to refer to the statement made by the hon. member for Nundah in connection with the Germans who settled on Baffle Creek. The hon. member described the conditions under which he had seen them there, and said that there was a delay in getting the land ready, and he also gave a distinctly depreciatory account of the land on which they were settled. He wished to tell the hon. member that the Lands Department took no responsibility whatever for those Germans settling in that particular locality. It was one of several areas that were indicated to the representative of those people—the man who was responsible for them coming to Queensland—and he chose it deliberately. He had allowed him to have the land at the lowest price that the land laws permitted, and he lost no time in telling off a surveyor to go from another district and prepare that land for settlement, and no responsibility and no reproach attached to the Lands Department for the presence of these people there, or for their condition. He could only say that nothing had reached him, or reached the Lands Department, which led him to think that these Germans regretted they went there, and certainly nothing of a pessimistic nature had been heard of.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Pastor Niemayer told me that they were thoroughly satisfied.

The HOME SECRETARY: As the Chief Secretary just mentioned to him, you could not go anywhere in a garden without seeing things in a rough state.

[Hon. J. T. Bell.

Mr. MANN: The Chief Secretary knows nothing about it.

The HOME SECRETARY: He supposed he knew a great deal more than some people who talked a great deal about it. He was glad to hear the interjection of the Secretary for Public Works that the Germans whom the hon. member for Nundah held up as an example of the neglect of the Lands Department were contented. After all, the proof of the pudding was in the eating. When these people had been on the land some time, Pastor Niemayer approached the department and said he wanted to get some more land for another German group, and he chose some land on the Binjour plateau, near Gayndah.

The PREMIER: Pastor Niemayer thanked us for what we had done.

The HOME SECRETARY: Another matter he wished to refer to was this: The hon. member for Nundah talked about the Government having sold, or told off for selection, a quantity of land for agricultural selectors. He had specially told off a surveyor—he thought it was Mr. Lewis—to go down there; they took him away from some other district and put him on this work. The point he wished to bring out was this: The hon. member for Nundah talked about some past Government opening land as agricultural land, whereas it did not in the least degree deserve such a term.

Mr. SUMNER: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: He thought the hon. member was under a misapprehension. No Government, under any Land Act that he was aware of, ever definitely or formally proclaimed the character of the land when it was thrown open for selection. It was thrown open under a particular tenure, and those who wanted land could go and inspect it, and determine what they would do. He had never heard of any government throwing land open, and saying, "This is first-class agricultural land." The hon. member had fallen into the fashion that a number of people in Queensland had fallen into who were not intimately acquainted with our land laws; they imagined from land being termed "agricultural homesteads," or "agricultural farms," that the land offered was agricultural land. As a matter of fact, it might be so, but these terms "agricultural farms" and "agricultural homesteads" simply meant under a particular tenure. There were 1,280-acre unconditional selections, and they were not subdivided. It was an erroneous deduction to make, that as a consequence the land was not fit for agriculture. Before you took up the land you had to take two or three weeks for consideration. The hon. gentleman had told them that he was a political economist, and went back to Adam Smith.

Mr. SUMNER: You know as well as I do that it is right.

The HOME SECRETARY: He did not say it was not. He merely desired to say that there was no fixed rule for anything under the sun. There was a time when the greatest brains of England used to think that the axioms of free trade were inviolable. We had men like John Stuart Mill and Richard Cobden talking about freetrade and its tenets as though they were inviolable principles of universal application. These little things got whittled away by experience, and they began to find it all depended upon the conditions that surrounded these particular axioms, as to whether they were illimitably and inviolably true. He would like to point out, in connection with these agricultural

farms, that before land could be cultivated you had to have two or three factors, and the chief factor of all was the personal factor.

Mr. SUMNER: Good land.

The HOME SECRETARY: There was something better than good land. To have good settlement you must have a good settler. They talked about immigration—

Mr. MANN: I beg to move that the question be now put. (Laughter.) The hon. gentleman is stonewalling.

The HOME SECRETARY: He thought he could answer straight what the answer of the Chairman would be—that it was entirely frivolous.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: While I have the jurisdiction of the Chair to say whether the matter has been sufficiently discussed, I must say that at the present time the discussion has not been sufficient. (Hear, hear! and laughter.)

Mr. MANN: I want to discuss the Lands Estimates, and I cannot. The hon. gentleman is stonewalling.

The HOME SECRETARY: He had never known an hon. member who had had so much to say in so short a time as the hon. member for Cairns had had this session. He wanted to make his point clear to the hon. member for Nundah, when he said these agricultural farms had been taken up, and we saw no agricultural farms there, and consequently the deduction was—

Mr. SUMNER: That the land is not fit for agriculture.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is what he was going to deal with. In the vast majority of agricultural farms in this country that were not cultivated, the land was fit for cultivation—that either they had not got the right men on the land, or they had not got the right market, or they had not got communications. After all, the three chief things in successful settlement was good land, communication, and market, and—above all—the right kind of man on the land.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: After all, the great thing in the world's affairs was the personal equation. And the personal equation would loom as large, and be as intensely vital, in the greatest socialistic arrangement that any party could devise or bring about. They could never eliminate the personal equation. And in regard to land settlement and the development of the country by putting people on the land, over and above communication, market, and good soil, the real thing was to have the right kind of men on the land. He was extremely obliged to the hon. member for Nundah for the kindly compliment he paid him in connection with his efforts to settle people on the land. What he did he could not have done without the consent of his colleagues, for it was part and parcel of the policy of the Government. The inauguration of the public estate improvement fund, as he said on a previous occasion, was distinctly the suggestion of the Premier; and the Opposition, keen critics as they were, never said a word about that fund. He ventured to say that at the back of their minds, though it would not suit their book to admit it, there was a keen sense of appreciation of the action of the Government in initiating that new departure, under which the department prepared roads, sank wells, and did everything possible to make the lot of the selector when he got on the land happy. A great deal had been said in condemnation of the agency system of introducing people for settlement on the land. He was entirely

responsible for that system. He had said more than once that he recognised the danger attached to it and that he was ready, as far as he was concerned, to abandon it the moment he saw any evil arising from it. But he challenged anybody to come forward and say that there had been any serious scandal under that system. He did not think that any responsible man could come forward, and, with any justification, say that the system had not succeeded.

Mr. W. H. BARNES: It is a good thing it is going to be done away with all the same.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member was entitled to his view, but he did not know why the hon. member held that view.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I do not agree with him.

The HOME SECRETARY: He was glad to hear that from a member who represented a large settled constituency. The system was, after all, payment by results.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but I am afraid his remarks are scarcely connected with the question before the Committee, and unless the hon. member connects them with the question before the Committee, he will not be in order.

The HOME SECRETARY: He thought the Acting Chairman was perfectly right, and that he was straying somewhat from the matter under discussion. But he wished to say that though he had heard allusions to the evils of the land agency system he had never perceived what they were. With regard to retaining land for groups, he wished it to be clearly understood that such land was set aside for only a brief period, and the agent was informed that unless he got his group filled within a certain period the land would not be reserved for that purpose. Before he left the department he altered the system, and decided that all groups should be made up inside the department. He might be wrong in his anticipations, but he was afraid that it would be found after they had put an end to the agency system—the system of payment by results—there would be a gradual diminution in the volume of land settlement. But whether he was right or wrong in that assumption he thought that no fair-minded man could say that any mistake was made in introducing the agency system. Hon. members ought not to be contented with vague allusions to the dangers of the system, but should be prepared to submit definite concrete examples of the evils it had wrought, if it had wrought any. Those definite concrete examples had never been brought forward. One other thing he would say, and that was that the House and the country were entitled, whenever they heard people criticising the land laws, to ask that, instead of denouncing them in a vague, wholesale way, there should be a definite concrete statement put forward to their amendment. The land laws of this country consisted of a long series of sections, and the only way to improve the laws was by amending those sections, and any man who wanted to be a true amender and improver of the land laws should put his suggestions in the form of a section or sections. But when members were charged with making unfair statements about the land laws, instead of suggesting a definite amendment, they took refuge behind the expression, "Have cheap land ready for the people." They did not show how that could be done, and he said that no man was worth listening to who condemned the existing order of things and did not come forward with a practical, well-defined suggestion for the improvement of the system.

*Hon. J. T. Bell.*]

Mr. WALKER (*Wide Bay*) wished to make a few remarks on the question before the Committee, and he would not occupy much time. They knew that the discussion must close to-night, and that several members wanted to speak, so it was only fair to be brief in order that other members might have a chance of speaking. (Hear, hear!) He approved of the vote for immigration, which he did not think was a bit too much; at the same time he realised that it would not do to go in for indiscriminate immigration to the injury of our workmen and those engaged in commercial life. The first consideration should be to get a proper class of people, and he was opposed to the present system of paying agents so much a head for the people they induced to come here. Of course their sole object was to get as many as they could to come out in order that they might get all the more money. He thought the proposal to send half a dozen farmers from Queensland to lecture to the people in the old country was a step ahead of the present system; but he thought it would be better still to get half a dozen farmers in the old country to come here and see what opportunities there were for people who wished to settle on the land, and then go home and tell the people there what they had seen. (Hear, hear!) There had been a good deal of criticism with regard to the class of people coming here. He thought it would be as well to go over to the depot and see for himself before criticising, so he went over there this morning and had a talk with the men, who were a first-class lot. It surprised him that the Agent-General could send out such a good lot of men.

Mr. HAMILTON: Nobody complained of the physical condition of the immigrants.

Mr. WALKER: It had been stated that the medical examination was a farce. He questioned five or six of those men and found that the doctor made them strip, and the examination was as severe as the men who went to South Africa had to undergo. He also questioned them as to the statements made to them in the old country, and they told him that no misleading statements were made to them, that they came out entirely on their own, having read reports as to our climate and other matters. He also ascertained that two or three of the single men and two or three families were engaged to come here. With regard to the report of the rate of wages paid to workmen in Queensland, he regretted that a mistake had been made by stating that 15s. a week was the rate paid for ordinary farm work. The pay should have been stated at 15s. a week and rations; but the usual rate was £1 a week and rations. If they carried the amendment to reduce the vote, they would be doing a great injury to the Torres Strait service, because only about one-third of the number of immigrants would be brought out, and the service would be run at a loss.

Mr. HAMILTON: They will get the subsidy whether they carry immigrants or not.

Mr. WALKER: They would get the money, and it would be a loss as far as the country was concerned. If they were going in for an immigration policy they must settle people on the land. He was given to understand that the reason why Canada was ahead of Queensland in the matter of settling people on the land was because they had surveys made before the people came to the country, and the land was ready for them when they arrived. Years ago the old Philp Government had surveys made before selection.

Mr. MANN: Poor land that was never taken up.

Mr. WALKER: Within two miles of his own home six blocks of land adjoining one another were

[*Mr. Walker.*

taken up recently. That land was surveyed by the old Philp Government, and was lying idle for a number of years. The Minister for Lands had pointed out how the scarcity of surveyors sometime ago had contributed to the difficulty of having plenty of land available. One mistake made with regard to land settlement in some places was that people took up too large an area. On the Blackall Range people had taken up 500 or 600 acres of the finest fruitgrowing country in Queensland, and if they had taken up only 40 acres it would have been quite enough for any of them. He knew a man on the Blackall Range with 10 acres under fruit cultivation, and his returns last year amounted to nearly £300. He considered that land in this country should be classed as fruitgrowing, agricultural, dairying, and grazing land, and the maximum area to be taken up should be fixed. It had been stated that the descriptions on maps with respect to the kind of soil, etc., were sometimes misleading. He did not think that such was the case, because a surveyor who wilfully placed false marks on a map was liable to be punished severely—in fact, was liable to be dismissed.

In every case where the map was [5.30 p.m.] marked it could be relied on as being fairly accurate. He would like to see immigrants introduced from the defence standpoint. Queensland had a big coastline to defend, and any member who had any idea of the fighting qualities of a nation should never oppose this estimate of £50,000 for immigration. If an invasion was made, the population of Queensland would not be sufficient to supply enough troops to defend it. All the vacant spaces wanted to be filled up, and, when that was done, they could go in for a system of defence. He hoped the vote would be carried.

Mr. PAYNE (*Mitchell*): The Government had put the gag on and yet the Government supporters were monopolising the whole of the time that was left for members to make their speeches. (Laughter.) He did not apply these remarks to the hon. gentleman who just sat down. But there was three times as much talk on the Government side as on the Opposition side since the Government put the gag on them.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: What about the last four weeks?

Mr. PAYNE: He did not think that was a fair thing. (Hear, hear!) Surely the least the Government could do was to allow the Opposition to have some say between now and 10 o'clock at night, when the guillotine would fall. The attitude the Labour party took up on the question of immigration was that they did not want men to be brought out to flood the already overcrowded labour market in Queensland. (Hear, hear!) He regretted very much, while the question of indented labourers was being discussed, to hear the hon. member for Aubigny say that the working men in Central Queensland were a lot of loafers. A more incorrect statement was never made in the Chamber, as there were less loafers amongst the working men in Central Queensland than amongst the workers in any other part of the State. The members representing pastoral districts had pointed out that there was no scarcity of labour in those districts, so why should the Government pack a lot of new-chums out into the pastoral districts without first ascertaining whether there was any place for them to go to work? The fact was that the new-chums would push out the old hands who had been there for some time, and take their places. The Premier had shown them a list of the wages paid in the pastoral districts of Queensland. That list was provided by the Pastoralists' Association, and it was a most misleading list. There was no man working in the pastoral

industry in Central Queensland for £1 a week, unless it was a man who had passed the prime of life, and he was given a job at boundary riding or something like that. After the House adjourned the previous night he went to the Premier and asked him to seriously look into this list before he was guided by it, and the Premier said, "Can you give me some proof?" He (Mr. Payne) asked him if he would take the assurance of the secretary of the Australian Workers' Union at Longreach, and the Premier said, "No." He then asked what proof could he get, as he had not time to run around the Mitchell electorate getting men to say what wages they were paid. The assurance of the secretary of the Australian Workers' Union ought to be good enough.

Mr. HAMILTON: There was a day when he would take it.

Mr. WOODS: That day might come again.

Mr. PAYNE: The Premier should have got a list from the secretary of the Australian Workers' Union, as well as the list from the Pastoralists' Association, and then he would have had the two lists to guide him. The men in the West were only kept employed during shearing time, and if anyone went out West in the off season they would find these men camped about rivers and staying in boarding-houses and hotels and having nothing to do. As the Pastoralists' Association had been asked to give the wages paid, was it natural to expect that they were going to say that they paid big wages?

Hon. R. PHILP: Can you name one in that list that is not correct?

Mr. HAMILTON: The men that are being brought out are getting less than the average wages mentioned in that list.

Mr. PAYNE: That list was not sufficient to go by. If he had known that matter was coming on, he would have been able to get some facts to show that the wages mentioned in the list were incorrect.

Hon. R. PHILP: Name one station in that list that is incorrect. Can you name one?

Mr. PAYNE: He could name two or three.

Hon. R. PHILP: Name them.

Mr. PAYNE: As a matter of fact, they had taken the stations in Queensland that were paying the lowest wages, and the stations paying the best wages were not included. The Labour party were not opposed to immigration; all they asked was that the immigrants should not be brought out and dumped down where there was an already big number of men who could not get employment. In Central Queensland, along the banks of the rivers and billabongs, they would find men camped at the present time, because the busy season was over and there was nothing for them to do. If the Government were in earnest in wanting to bring immigrants out it would be right enough if they could be settled on the land, but they should not be sent to any place where there was no employment to be had, and thereby add to the hardships of the people already there. That was not right.

\* Mr. BARBER (*Bundaberg*): During the debate this morning the honourable and gallant colonel, the hon. member for Burrum, made a statement to the effect that certain cane-cutting gangs in the Burrum district had drawn cheques during the past cutting season for over £100. He (Mr. Barber) interjected that that was not correct, but the hon. member persisted in his statement. He had procured some information since that statement was made, and he found that his interjection was absolutely correct.

Hon. R. PHILP: What about the man who cut 10 tons a day, who was over seventy years of age? He would earn more than £100. (Laughter.)

Mr. BARBER: Yes. He supposed it was seven years since he had made that statement, and he was prepared to stand by it now, and he could bring witnesses from Bundaberg to prove that that man did it. It was stated that one gang made a cheque of £100. The cheque was really between £95 and £96.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: That is near enough.

Mr. BARBER: It was not £100. Last year the highest cheque was £98. The hon. member had made that statement to prove that it was possible for anyone to go into the cane-cutting business and earn a large amount of money. In accordance with the usual statements made in the House by hon. members who represented constituencies like the hon. member did, he took the highest figures he could get. While that one particular gang might have made that cheque, he did not think there was another gang that earned more than £60, and very few at that. As a matter of fact, they had struck a very good crop; the cane was not affected by frosts, and they were working two or three months.

The TREASURER: That shows it was possible.

Mr. BARBER: According to Scripture, "All things are possible." The leader of the Opposition had moved an amendment to reduce the immigration vote from £53,000 to £23,000, and he intended to support that amendment. He was not prepared to vote for the spending of a large sum of money to bring immigrants to this country while there was a large number of unemployed in Queensland. Hon. members on the other side stated that there was a scarcity of labour in Queensland. That was not a correct statement. He could assure the Committee that not only in the Bundaberg district but also in the other sugar districts there was a big surplus of labour. As a matter of fact, during the past two months over 200 men had registered their names for employment, and so far only about forty or fifty had obtained work.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Can't they get work on the Boyne Valley line just now?

Mr. BARBER: About forty or fifty were sent there.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: What about the Winton line?

Mr. BARBER: All the lines were full at the present time. The labour inspector in Bundaberg had done his best to get positions for those men on the line. He applied himself very closely to his work, and if at all possible he would secure work for those men, but there was a very large number of unemployed there since the plantations cut out.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The Dalby to Tara line is starting next month.

Mr. BARBER: That was a long way for them to go. Probably after the nice rains that had fallen a number of the men would be put on chipping in the New Year. Many of them had been looking for work for the last two or three months, and only about forty or fifty had been placed on the railway lines. As a matter of fact, some of the men who had already been brought to Queensland during the last twelve months had not been able to secure more than three months' work, and while that state of things existed, he thought the Committee would be taking a very foolish action in spending a lot of money to

*Mr. Barber.]*

induce other people to come here. Personally, he thought that every encouragement should be given to people who were already here to nominate their friends.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Won't they compete in the labour market just as well as the other?

Mr. BARBER: The people who came here under the nomination system were not likely to become a burden on the State, because the people who nominated them would be able to look after them until they could take care of themselves. The Secretary for Works got away altogether in the clouds when he was painting the splendid conditions that prevailed in Queensland. As one who had travelled over the best part of the globe, he believed that Queensland was the best country in the universe, provided that they went on right lines. He had always been under the impression that they adopted wrong methods in regard to settling people on our lands. One of the greatest mistakes was this: In looking over the Vital Statistics for the last twelve months, he noticed that the death rate of children under five years of age was 1,400. A large number of people were at present living in congested centres of population, and if facilities were given to those people to settle on the land, many of those young lives might be saved. The hon. member for Croydon had read a contribution appearing in the "Lone Hand" magazine from the Hon. J. C. Watson, in reference to defence. One of the principal things that Mr. Watson advocated was the bursting-up of large estates by means of a graduated land tax, and preparing those lands for the people they brought to Australia. In the opinion of most hon. members on that side of the Chamber, that was one of the great essentials in populating Australia. What they objected to was the Government of Queensland endeavouring to bring out people when the land was not ready for them. He supposed that at present there were 1,000 people who had applied for land, and there was no land ready for them.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: No.

Mr. BARBER: He had heard the hon. gentleman say that there were about 450 applications for land at Atherton.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: But there is a congestion there for which the department are not blamable.

Mr. BARBER: Probably not; but there were 400 in Bundaberg, and how many in other places he did not know. Those people got tired of waiting for land. Some of them had waited for weeks, and others for months. Before other people were brought here they should give facilities to their own people and to people from the neighbouring States to get land. He knew a great deal of good work had been done by the late Secretary for Lands, but he did not think the hon. gentleman had done all he might have done. He did not seem, in the opinion of many people, to rise to the occasion. The Secretary for Mines and Works might be able to assist in settling some people on the land. He believed there was a large area of valuable scrub land held by the Mines Department at Mount Larcombe. A friend of his had secured 80 acres and had taken his family there, and he had told him (Mr. Barber) that he would be satisfied if he could cultivate 40 acres of it, as it was splendid scrub land that would grow anything. He would like the hon. gentleman to ascertain how much of that land there was. There were a number of men in the Bundaberg district who would be prepared to put in applications for some of it.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES AND WORKS: I might inform the hon. member that the usual course is for applications for land to be made to

[Mr. Barber.

the Lands Department. The Lands Department request the opinion of the Mines Department. The Mines Department then get a report from their warden as to the condition of the land with regard to mining, and if there is no objection, the Mines Department do not raise any to its being opened to selection by the Lands Department.

Mr. BARBER hoped the hon. gentleman would go into the matter, as he understood that there was a large area of splendid scrub land there. The present system of selecting immigrants had been condemned by some hon. members and eulogised by others. During the last few months he had come across some of those who had been sent out to the State; and, while he found that some of them were good agricultural labourers, a number were mechanics. He did not know what method of selection was adopted; but, while the matter was being discussed, he was reminded of an experience of his own in connection with the inspection of a medical officer at Calcutta, when fever was raging there. The doctor used to board the ship and order everyone on board to put out his tongue, and he would also feel their pulse. But it got to be monotonous after a time, so he rounded them up on the poop, and then sang out, "Pulses!" "Tongues out!" He was inclined to think that the medical examination of immigrants in the old country was something like that, because Dr. Taylor pointed out in another place the other day that one or two of the immigrants, at any rate, were physically unfit to come out. Probably the medical examination had been lax. Last year a number of men had been indentured and had gone to the Mossman River under engagements for six and twelve months. He understood that the employers had collected £5 from their wages during the first two months, and that in many cases the agreements had not been carried out, nor had the money been returned to the men. He would ask the Premier who held that money? Was it the Government?

The PREMIER: Yes.

Mr. BARBER: And who was to get it?

The PREMIER: That will depend upon what the Director of Labour says as to who deserves it. The men will get it if they deserve it. The Government will get it if neither man nor master deserves to get it.

Mr. WOODS: Seeing that there was a large number of members yet to speak on this question, and that there were only three hours in

which the question could be discussed, it was not his intention to delay the Committee at any length, but he must certainly refer to one or two statements which had been made. Before doing so, he would point out what he considered an injustice on the part of some of the Ministers since this motion was carried. The Home Secretary rose in his place this afternoon to reply to the hon. member for Nundah, but he thought he could safely say that the hon. gentleman never touched the point at all. He did not say that in any offensive way, but after a motion of this kind had been carried the Government should have more consideration for members whom they had tied down to a limited discussion. The Premier, in reply to the hon. member for Mitchell, stated that he refused to take the assurance of the secretary of the Australian Workers' Union in the Central district in connection with rations and wages. He thought that was entirely unfair.

The PREMIER: I do not think I did.

Mr. WOODS: The hon. member for Mitchell made that assertion. He was not accusing the hon. gentleman of doing it.

The PREMIER: What I said was this: That I would not take the information from the employers or the employees, I would get it from the department.

Mr. COYNE: You got it from the Pastoralists' Association.

Mr. KERR: No, the department got it from the Pastoralists' Association.

Mr. WOODS: But the hon. gentleman had not denied that he made that statement to the hon. member for Mitchell.

The PREMIER: But I did not make that statement.

Mr. WOODS: If the hon. gentleman said he did not make it, he was satisfied to accept his assurance. The Secretary for Public Works, in discussing this question, said that when at the Mossman he saw a lot of Japanese working at the Mossman Mill, which was quite true. He was quite prepared to admit that for a few years some Japanese had been stacking firewood for the Mossman Mill Company, but he objected to the other statement which the hon. gentleman had made. The hon. gentleman stated that he was informed at Mossman by the chairman, or some responsible official, that they could not get white labour to do this work. He wished to say that that statement was absolutely without the slightest foundation. There had been no year in the history of the white labour period in the Mossman district when the Mossman Mill Company had ever been short of white labour, either for cutting or stacking wood, or for cane-cutting, and the man that said so was making a statement which was entirely without foundation. Statements had also been made that there had been a shortage of labour in the sugar-fields. He was prepared to say that there were no cane-fields in Queensland to-day that had ever been short of white labour since 1902.

THE SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You are going a bit too far back.

Mr. WOODS: He was not going too far back. He was prepared to admit that, in the first year of the white labour question, there were certain men who went to the sugar-fields, a certain proportion of whom were unreliable. But the hon. gentleman knew that in a gang of twenty men under the contract system, one or two men could destroy the reputation of the whole gang, and for the white men in these particular districts to be branded as unreliable through the action of one or two men in a gang was unfair to the working men of Queensland.

THE SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The men themselves are firing those undesirables out.

Mr. WOODS: He was aware of that. The hon. gentleman knew that when these gangs were formed in 1902 there was a provision in the agreement giving the men the power to do that, but a party of working men did not care about taking drastic steps with one or two men in the gang. Not only the hon. gentleman himself had said so, but it had been stated in this Chamber, and in the Federal Parliament and Senate, that the white labour in the cane-fields of Queensland was unreliable. He resented that statement. The white men of North Queensland who had been working in the cane-fields were as good as any that could be found in any part of the world. They had been told during this debate that they wanted agricultural labourers to come to Queensland, and that there had been a dearth of labour in the agricultural districts. He had a list with him that would put that suggestion entirely in the shade. If there was a dearth of labour in an agricultural district, one would take it for granted that there

would be no need for relief in those districts, and that the State would not have to expend large amounts of money in that direction. For the benefit of those agricultural representatives who said that one of the reasons for this £50,000 for immigration was that we wanted agricultural labourers, he would read the list to show that their statement was without the slightest foundation. The relief given at Biggenden last year was £13 17s. 8d. Surely there could not have been a dearth of labour there! At Bundaberg it was £136—no dearth of labour there. At Beenleigh, the hon. gentleman's district—

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: No.

Mr. WOODS: It was very near it. These were the places where they had not sufficient agricultural labourers.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Who was that relief given to?

Mr. WOODS: It must have been given to unemployed.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Not necessarily; it may be to widows and children. You have not specified what was given.

Mr. WOODS: The Government were very generous, he knew, in helping widows and children. If the hon. gentleman would only keep quiet he would give him the rest. He was reading from the official report of the inspector. At Caboolture it was £23 13s.; Cairns, £23 5s.; Childers, £48 1s.

THE PREMIER: Is that for a year in the Cairns district?

Mr. WOODS: Quite correct; it was an agricultural district.

THE PREMIER: It is quite clear there cannot be a large number of unemployed there.

Mr. WOODS: But the hon. gentleman said we wanted more agricultural labourers in Queensland.

Hon. R. PHILP: Some men ran away and left their wives behind them in Cairns, and relief had to be given to those women.

Mr. WOODS: The only people who ran away from their wives and families were the people who resided in Townsville, and the people at the back of Cairns had to find police to discover those runaway husbands and send them back to Townsville. The amount paid away in relief at Childers was £48 1s.; at Dalby, £12 8s.; at Emerald, £111 7s. 2d.; Gatton, £41 18s.; Harrisville, £11 15s. 6d.; Howard, £43 15s. 6d.; Hughenden, £38 6s. 8d.; Kilkivau, £19 6s. 9d.; Mackay, £34 13s. 7d.; Mareeba, £41 7s. 6d.; Marianvale, £18 10s.; Nambour, £17 6s. 9d.; Nanango, £21 19s. 1d.; North Pine, £30 6s.; Roma, £40 18s.; Tiaro, £23 7s.; Warwick, £16; Winton, a pastoral district, £43 7s. 1d. Total, £851 6s. 7d. The whole argument in favour of this vote was that the country wanted cheap agricultural labourers.

THE PREMIER: We did not say cheap.

Mr. WOODS: The hon. gentleman did not say "cheap," but he (Mr. Woods) said it, and those figures proved that there was not a dearth of labour in the agricultural districts.

THE PREMIER: There are a number of women and children getting relief.

Mr. WOODS: He was aware of that, but that did not prove that there was not sufficient labour in the country. (Laughter.) He had always been opposed to free immigration.

THE PREMIER: What do you want to prove by reading all those figures?

Mr. WOODS: He wanted to prove that the statement that there was not sufficient labour in Queensland was not true.

*Mr. Woods.]*

The PREMIER: The two things are not connected, and how can you prove that?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Aren't you going to tell us to whom that relief was given?

Mr. WOODS: The hon. gentleman had one of his officers sitting in the lobby and could get the information from him, and then deny what he had said if it was not correct. One Minister spoke about three-quarters of an hour that afternoon, after gagging members on the Opposition side the previous evening.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Surely you don't think we should have said nothing!

Mr. WOODS: He did not object to a Minister speaking, but he objected to a Minister getting up for the purpose of stonewalling, so that members on that side should not have an opportunity of discussing anything. The figures he had quoted proved that there was not a dearth of labour in the agricultural districts. No man in that House had opposed more strongly the spending of public money on immigration than the present Premier when he was sitting in opposition.

The PREMIER: Didn't you assist to vote £50,000 for immigration last year?

Mr. WOODS: It did not matter what he did. (Laughter.) The hon. gentleman knew perfectly well that nobody had an opportunity of opposing the vote for immigration last year. The Labour party, of which the hon. gentleman was deputy leader at that time, had fought this vote year after year, with the result that it was practically wiped out before the hon. member for Townsville left office. The total amount of money spent on immigration by this State since 1860 was no less than £3,347,637 19s. 8d., and that money was voted with the object, and with the result, of populating New South Wales and Victoria. The amount spent on immigration during the last ten years was as follows:—1898-9, £21,784 5s. 5d.; 1899-1900, £47,398 4s. 6d.; 1900-1, £57,050 17s. 6d.; 1901-2, £21,726 18s. 11d.; 1902-3, £13,877 13s. 6d. Hon. members would notice that in 1902-3 there was only £13,877 13s. 6d. voted, as compared with £21,784 5s. 5d. in 1898-9, and the reduction made in the vote year by year was due to the strenuous opposition of the present Premier and those sitting with him when he sat on the Opposition side of the House.

Hon. R. PHILP: That is not correct.

Mr. WOODS: Did the hon. gentleman deny those figures? In 1903-4 it was £9,456 0s. 6d.; in 1904-5, £8,458 6s. 2d.; in 1905-6, £7,645 11s. 6d.; in 1906-7, £5,332 0s. 9d.; and in 1907-8, £22,662 0s. 7d. For the ten years the amount was £215,399 19s. 4d. Those figures should justify every member in voting against £50,000 for immigration, particularly when they had undeniable evidence produced in the Federal Parliament, in reply to some of those gentlemen looking for cheap labour, that the wages in Queensland to-day for artisans and labourers were worse than in England.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Is that what you are going to prove?

Mr. WOODS: Yes.

Mr. D. HUNTER: You've got a job.

Mr. WOODS: He was just reminded that the hon. member for Fitzroy the other night said that things were better in England than in Queensland.

Mr. COWAP: I did not say that.

Mr. WOODS: Didn't he deny that living was cheaper in England?

[Mr. Woods.

Mr. COWAP: I said living was about on a level here with England.

Mr. WOODS: Now, they would see. Senator De Largie, in reply to that acrobat, Senator St. Ledger, said—

It is the same old National Ass. bray every time. Its members may get a fresh name to sail under, but as soon as they bray we know at once where we are, and who are bowling. The Labour party has had no occasion to change their name. We have rejoiced under that name for fifteen years or more, and we have no intention to change it. There is no necessity for the Labour party to follow the example of other parties. I desire to make only one more reference to Senator St. Ledger. That barracker for the Employers' Federation worked himself into an awful rage when he was referring to the immigration question. He said that the indignation which was seething in his bosom was so great that he could not give expression to his feelings and at the same time observe the Standing Orders. He may have been in a terrible passion, but I do not know that he had any reason for being excited. He referred to the statement of Mr. W. M. Hughes in the old country that there was not room in Australia for artisans. I take the responsibility of saying that it was perfectly accurate.

Senator GRAY.—Nonsense.

Senator DE LARGIE.—I am quite prepared to prove that during the last twenty or thirty years, to my knowledge, that statement has been made over and over again.

Senator GRAY: And all over the world, too.

Senator DE LARGIE.—To my knowledge, for the last twenty or thirty years, the Immigration Office in London has been sending out that statement. They have always declared that as regards skilled labour the market in Australia was sufficiently stocked, and that there was no room for artisans there. Mr. Hughes only gave expression to a fact which has been mentioned over and over again by persons in London, by the Agents-General, and by the Immigration Office which is established in connection with the Board of Trade. In fact, it is so hackneyed that I was surprised that even Senator St. Ledger should challenge its accuracy here.

Senator TERREY.—At different times instructions have been sent from several States to their Agents-General not to send out artisans as immigrants.

In the last two or three ships that came here there was a large amount of skilled labour.

Senator DE LARGIE.—That is quite true. Only the other day there appeared in the local Press a letter in which the Secretary to the Boiler-makers' Union in Melbourne pointed out that there was no necessity to bring artisans to Australia. He stated that some boiler-makers had come from the old country recently, and that they had gone to the Trade and Labour Council in Sydney with the complaint that they had been supplied with false information at home.

Senator GRAY.—Have not those statements been made in America and Canada for many years?

Senator DE LARGIE.—I know nothing of the statements made in the United States and Canada. It is sufficient for me that I should know what is happening in connection with the country in which I am living. I know that immigrants made these complaints to the Sydney Trade and Labour Council, and said they had been supplied with information to the effect that there were large shipbuilding yards in Newcastle and in Sydney, and yet when they arrived in this country they found that they could not secure employment. In the face of these facts, how can any honourable Senator profess to be indignant when he learns that information is supplied to artisans in the old country as to the true state of affairs existing in Australia?

Hon. R. PHILP: What are you trying to prove? Does it refer to engine-drivers?

Mr. WOODS: He would not be surprised to notice in the next shipload of immigrants brought out to Queensland that [7.30 p.m.] there were a number of imported engine-drivers aboard, who were brought out to cut down the wages of the railway men in Queensland. (Laughter.) Then the Senator went on—

This information has been supplied over and over again in London by the responsible officials of the various State Governments, and it cannot be contradicted.

And they were asked to place in the hands of one of these responsible officials in London the sum of £50,000 so that he could mislead artisans and workers in the old country. Was that a fair thing? He would go a bit further with this matter and quote a little more.

After a pause,

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Go on. You have only two and a-half hours more.

Hon. E. B. FORREST: What is the matter? Are you played out? (Laughter.)

Mr. WOODS: Perhaps the hon. gentleman would like him to get on to the sugar company. (Hear, hear! and laughter.)

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: You have not finished reading about Senator De Lurgie.

Mr. WOODS: He had quoted quite enough for the hon. gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope the hon. gentleman will keep to the question before the House. (Hear, hear! and laughter.)

Mr. WOODS: So many interjections were coming from the representatives of the big monopolies in Queensland that it was hard for a member sitting in opposition to keep to the question. (Laughter.) Every time he spoke the whole Cabinet wanted to jump at him with both arms and jump on him with both feet. (Laughter.) He had no desire to upset hon. gentlemen. Those were the statements made in the Senate, and because he quoted them here the hon. gentlemen did not like it. He noticed the Ministers had been wriggling on their seats ever since he started. (Loud Ministerial laughter.)

Mr. MURPHY: What about the mining industry; what have they done for it?

Mr. WOODS: He saw in a list which the Premier had prepared that there was said to be a dearth of labour in the mining industry. In North Queensland alone there were 1,000 miners out of employment. Yet hon. gentlemen came there and said there was a dearth of labour, and they must have more immigrants. What did they want immigrants for? They found that the men in Queensland to-day knew what their labour was worth, and they wanted a lot of unfortunate newchums from England—men who did not know the conditions prevailing in Queensland—to come out here and get experience, and compete with the men already here. It was pointed out in the pamphlets issued in London, "Come to Queensland, where you can get a plot of land as soon as you arrive. It is a land flowing with milk and honey." He (Mr. Woods) admitted that it was a land flowing with milk and honey. Queensland was one of the best States in Australia, if not in the world. (Hear, hear!) But how long would it remain that way if they brought out people from the slums of London and dumped them down into the cities of the State and let them take pot luck? Was that the treatment they were going to mete out to them? If the Government spent that £50,000 in advertising the resources of Queensland in a reasonable, useful, truthful, and straightforward manner, there would be no need to spend any money in bringing out immigrants, as they would come of their own accord. They just wanted to be told the sort of country we had here and the opportunities it afforded for people who came here, and people would come here and pay their own passages. If they looked at any of the daily newspapers they would find advertisements for domestics from the most prominent citizens of Brisbane, and they offered a wage of 12s. a week. All sorts of inducements were made to people to leave their old homes in England

and come to Queensland. They were told, "Get away from the horrid streets of London. Come to Queensland, and you will be safe."

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You do not want them to have a show in the new country.

Mr. WOODS: He was prepared to give them a show. The hon. gentleman was not prepared to give them a show. He was prepared to give those people an opportunity of knowing the conditions of this country, and there would then be no need to bring out men and women free to Queensland. Men, he believed, would come out here who would have the means to come, and they would send for the people they wanted to come afterwards, when they found out the conditions. There was no getting away from the fact—to his mind—the sole object at the bottom of bringing forward the motion to spend £50,000 on free immigration was to bring down wages. He made that statement believing it to be absolutely true.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Are you any better off than when you landed?

Mr. WOODS: He would like to point out to the hon. gentleman that he had never had the pleasure of being in the old country. He was speaking as an Australian. He would resent any man in England, or any member of the House of Commons, sending out agents to Australia and tell them what a beautiful place England was—"a land flowing with milk and honey"—and inducing them to leave their homes and go there.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You ought to welcome those people.

Mr. WOODS: He looked upon the matter in a pure, straightforward, honest Australian spirit.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and laughter.

Mr. WOODS: He wanted the people who came to Australia to be a credit to Australia.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. WOODS: He did not want the people to be brought to Australia to perish in the streets, or to commit suicide in some of the stables at hotels. Those immigrants who were brought out here a few months ago were deceived to come to Queensland by the misrepresentations of the Queensland Government. As soon as ever they landed they would be swarming—positively swarming. (Laughter.)

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: With what? (Loud and continued laughter.)

Mr. WOODS: If they were not swarming as soon as they got off the boat, in the dens they would be put into, and paid a mere pittance, they would very soon be swarming afterwards. (Laughter.) They had cases in point. Two, he thought, from the last ship that came out had committed suicide.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Why?

Mr. WOODS: The reason was not far to seek. Those poor unfortunate young women were torn away by misleading statements from their mothers' apron strings—(laughter)—and brought to Queensland, where they could get everything they wanted. What did they get? When they came to Queensland they had been almost starved, and got wages from 7s. to 10s. per week.

Hon. R. PHILIP: Tell the truth.

Mr. WOODS: The hon. gentleman knew it was absolutely true. Two cases within the past month.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: No.

Mr. WOODS: Two unfortunates who were deceived to come to Queensland by the glowing statements made by the representatives of the

*Mr. Woods.]*

Agent-General in London. It was very nearly time something was done. The only thing he was sorry for was that the leader of the Opposition, in moving his amendment, did not move to wipe it out altogether.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I think you are very selfish in not allowing these people to come here.

Mr. WOODS: He thought he had proved to the Committee—without keeping them very long—that there was no dearth of labour in Queensland. It was the contrary. He hoped the Minister would attempt to refute it. He thought the figures he had given from the various agricultural districts of Queensland proved beyond contradiction that there was plenty of agricultural labour in those districts.

Mr. KENNA (*Bowen*): In speaking, he would be speaking with the shadow of the guillotine hanging over him—something like the case of a condemned man in his cell who was going to be hanged at 8 o'clock in the morning. There had been a good deal of talk this evening, and he must say honestly, he had heard a great many economic fallacies given voice to. The first economic fallacy was referred to by the hon. member for Lockyer, and that was in quoting what the wages were in another country in mere figures, and comparing them with the wages in another country in mere figures. Those figures, any man with any intelligence must know, proved absolutely nothing. A shilling in one country might have a greater purchasing power than 10s. in another. Anyone who took the case of a man earning 5s. in that country and compared it with the case of a man earning 10s. in another country, was doing something that was economically absurd. There was no question about that. All comparisons of wages were practically worthless unless accompanied with something to show what the purchasing power of money in that country was. That was the position. The second economic fallacy was to bring official statistics of the number of people who were receiving relief and to argue from that that since there were so many people receiving relief in the country, there could not be a dearth of labour.

The TREASURER: It is no criterion whatever.

Mr. KENNA: It was no criterion whatever, because in every country in the world, however prosperous it might be, it had always been recognised that there was a certain number of unemployable persons—persons who were physically or mentally or otherwise incapable of strenuous labour or incapable of continuous labour.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Born tired.

Mr. KENNA: It wasn't their fault. Those people might be constitutionally so. It was their misfortune, undoubtedly. If they took a number of the unemployed in those towns they would find a very fair percentage of those unemployed were people to whom, if work were offered to them—just ordinary manual work—they would be physically incapable of doing it.

Mr. WOODS: That is in the cities.

Mr. KENNA: And in the outside places too. They must recognise that those people got tired of the cities and went out on the great roads and passed from place to place. He was not saying that was so in every class. He was speaking of those unemployable persons. If work were offered to them they would work for a few days, and then the roving, restless spirit came on and they had to march on. To take a number of statistics, even official statistics, of persons receiving relief and argue from that that work was scarce and that there was a dearth of employment was a pure economic fallacy.

[*Mr. Woods.*

The TREASURER: A large number of them are women and children.

Mr. KENNA: That was so. Those were the cases Mr. Brennan referred to. Mr. John Burns, speaking in the House of Commons, spoke on the unemployed question—he believed the expression “unemployable” was his: If the land were flowing with milk and honey to-morrow, if there was work for every man in the country, there would still be a substratum of men who were unemployable. If they wanted to be fair in dealing with those things, they must argue from a fair economic standpoint. Here was another economic fallacy: It was assumed that every able-bodied man who came to the country was a competitor in one branch of industry or another with those already there. That was only half a truth. That man was undeniably a competitor, but he was also a consumer. In time he became a producer, but he was a consumer all the time. The assumption was that, if there were 500 carpenters in Queensland, and they brought twenty more, there would be twenty more competitors with the carpenters already here, with the result that wages in the carpentering industry would go down. But those who argued in that way left out of consideration altogether the fact that those twenty additional carpenters were also consumers. They must have clothes—more work for the tailors; they must have food—more work for the butcher and the baker; they must have boots—more work for the bootmaker; they must have houses—more work for the carpenters. If the rest of the community had to find all those things for them, then they were unemployable, and should never have been brought here; but, supposing they were ordinary industrious men, who came here, either assisted or by their own means, then they added to the production of the country, and, by being producers, they became also consumers, and added to the general production of the country in the way of being additional consumers. They wanted to bring men to Queensland who would add to the sum total of production, and would also be consumers; and every desirable immigrant was at once a producer, adding to the wealth of the country, and a consumer, adding to the general wealth of the country by drawing upon its various commodities for consumption. He was not arguing for promiscuous immigration, for he had always been opposed to that, but just for a well-considered scheme of immigration, throwing open their doors to the proper class of people. The fourth economic fallacy was from the socialistic point of view. He was not justifying this, but he was pointing out what he knew to be the true socialistic ethics of the matter. From the socialist's point of view, all objection to immigration of any class, coloured or otherwise, was wrong. Let any socialist endeavour to refute that if he could. Marx never imposed any restriction with regard to colour or race. He asked all the exploited workmen of the world to come together, but a certain portion of the exploited workmen put up a ring fence round their country.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: What bearing has this on assisted immigration?

Mr. KENNA: It had a bearing on the whole question of immigration.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: Not on assisted immigration.

Mr. KENNA: It did not matter what kind of immigration it was. If a poor exploited workman of the old country thought he could improve his condition by coming to a more

socialistic country, the workmen of that country, from the true socialistic point of view, had no right whatever to say to him: "You shall not come here under any conditions." They would find that Japanese socialists, Chinese socialists, Hindoo socialists, and socialists representative of all countries, attended the various socialist congresses. They were regarded as belonging to the brotherhood of socialism, and they all met around the socialist table as equals. Socialism knew no race, and it knew no colour.

Mr. MANN: The instinct of self-preservation is stronger than the socialistic instinct.

Mr. KENNA: If the instinct of self-preservation was stronger than the socialistic instinct, then they could not be what they claimed. That sort of socialism was not socialism at all. It was trade unionism. The socialism that did not want any other workmen to come into a country to compete with those already there was trade unionism, and let them recognise it as trade unionism, and those who professed to be socialists should not regard it as anything else. He would quote from the account in the *Arena* of the last American Socialistic Congress, held at Chicago in the early part of this year, to show the view held by those who attended the congress upon the question of immigration—

The most interesting debate in a general way was upon the question of immigration, for therein appeared obvious, undeniable, the question of position. Does the Marxist call: "Working men of the world, unite!" mean that all working men should unite with each other without restriction as to country, race, or ideals? What position must the class-conscious socialist take in regard to the "yellow peril"? The Chinaman comes here as a labourer and is employed by a capitalist. Is he, then, common brother of the white man in the fight against capitalism, or is he, with his lower standard of living, an enemy?

"We are not living in the age of brotherhood," said one delegate. "We have got to save ourselves first, if we are to save the world later. If we stand for unrestricted immigration, we stand in opposition to the trade-unionists of this country, and we play into the hands of capital, who want cheap labour."

The speaker was applauded, but not so enthusiastically as was G. W. Woody, of California, the coloured delegate, whose voice had in it, it seemed to me, the note of enfranchised humanity. He spoke in behalf of unrestricted immigration.

"It would be," he said, "a curious state of affairs for the descendants of immigrants, or the immigrants from Europe themselves, to get control of the affairs of this country and then say to the Oriental immigrants that they should not come here. So far as making this a mere matter of race, I disagree decidedly with the idea of the committee. And, so far as reducing the standard of living is concerned, the standard of living will be reduced anyhow. You know as well as I do that either the labourer will be brought to the job or the job will be brought to the labourer. We will either have to produce things on American soil as cheap as they can be produced on foreign soil, or the production will be carried to the Orient. It seems to me that if we take any stand opposed to any sort of immigration, we are simply playing the old pettifogging trick of the Democrats and Republicans, and will gain nothing by it. To me, socialism is based, if anything, upon the brotherhood of man, and to take the stand that we take in opposition to any sort of immigration is opposed to the very spirit of the brotherhood of man.

There was tremendous applause after this speech. The galleries had to be called to order. It was the ethical stand, the stand on which socialism is strongest—that of comradeship and brotherhood of all the workers of the world.

He had never been an advocate of unrestricted immigration, but he thought we [8 p.m.] had no right to say to our swarming brothers in the old country, to swarming workers of the great cities of the old world, that they had no right to come here. Provided they were industrious and healthy,

they had a right to come. It seemed to him that the purchase of marble halls and the subsidising of steamship companies would not bring the right class of workmen here unless the conditions were good enough to warrant them in coming. We ought to endeavour to make the conditions good, and that was the very best advertisement that any country could have.

Mr. WHITE: That is true economics.

Mr. KENNA: When our conditions were sufficiently attractive, we would be justified in advertising and letting the world know what our conditions were, truthfully, and that they were sufficiently good to warrant workmen from all over the world coming here. One thing we must do was to make better provision for providing land for those who wished to go upon the land than what existed at present. The system of land settlement in Queensland wanted overhauling. The average man who came to Queensland—and he was speaking with an experience of seven years in his own electorate—had to wait eighteen months or two years before he could get possession. There were idle Crown lands which a man wanted to settle on, and the roundabout, involved process generally took about eighteen months to complete. In the meantime the man had eaten up a considerable portion of his capital, and worn his heart out in waiting, and in many cases goes away in disgust. Until we could bring that idle man and that idle piece of land together as expeditiously as possible, the process of inducing people to come to Queensland was not likely to succeed very far. There was any amount of land in Queensland within a reasonable distance of a railway, but what was lacking were roads. Here, again, our system of inducing people to come here to select land was utterly wrong. We built railways, and we did not take into consideration roads as feeders for these railways. We threw the responsibility upon the local authority, and they did that in a half-hearted way.

Mr. WHITE: It is a good system.

Mr. KENNA: It was a good system if it were properly carried out, but the test of a system was its success. He maintained that the road-making of the local authorities in Queensland had not been a success, and since the roads were great feeders of the railway, and great suppliers of traffic to the railway, and great openers-up of land, any system of land settlement that did not make better provision than existed at present for the provision of roads for the people settled in the neighbourhood of railways was at fault.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is what the public estate improvement fund does.

Mr. KENNA: That fund only touched the fringe of roads in Queensland. The best land in the world was not worth a fig unless we could get access to market, and we could not get access unless it was near a railway line or a good road. Take the Pacific Islands. They had the finest and richest soil in the world, but what was it worth?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: They have a great sea highway.

Mr. KENNA: But if the hon. gentleman went and grew pineapples, how would he get them to market? It was the same in Queensland. We might go into the rich Northern scrubs and fell the timber and grow sugarcane, but how were we going to get it to the mill? The land was lying rotting, and it would lie rotting until we could make some better provision for giving access to it by

*Mr. Kenna.]*

road or by railway. That was one of the reasons why there was such a big cry here for railways—because the roads were not formed. If we had better roads feeding our railways, there would be less demand for railways as a means of opening up new land. The onus of providing these roads was thrown upon the local authority; the local authority got only a small rate, and was willing to spend the rates obtained from any agricultural portion of its area upon that area, but we opened up big areas of scrub, cut them up in the Lands Office, surveyed them, and then flung the onus of providing access to them on the local authority; and the unfortunate farmer who took up land there in the hope that a beneficent local authority or kindly State would provide him with access to the market was generally left bogged. He had seen plenty of cases like that in his electorate. To effectually deal with this question of settling people upon the land we should give access either by road or railway to markets for the produce the settler grows. He intended to vote for this £50,000. He believed that a good deal of money spent upon immigration in the past had not been wisely or judiciously spent. He believed a large number of people were brought out whom the country would be better without, but at the same time he freely admitted that a large number of most deserving citizens were brought out: but advantage was taken of the freedom of getting out here by people who percolated through this State to other States. But the day for that sort of thing was past. The system of selecting immigrants was to be put on a much better basis, so that we should get industrious men, men with small capital, and healthy men, who would be producers as well as consumers, and who would, beyond all things, help to settle that great Northern country which lay at the gates of the Orient. That country we would sooner or later have to hold against the swarming millions of Asia, and the one safeguard which the people of Queensland and of Australia had was that that place should be closely settled by an industrious peasantry, who, when the time came to fight, would have something worth fighting for.

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mackay*): During this debate a considerable discussion had been raised upon the number of applicants for relief. He should like to point out that this had very little bearing upon the question of the unemployed. There were many men so unfortunately constituted that within a very short time of handling large sums of money they were destitute. He had known cases where men had worked five or six months, and drawn big cheques, and then within a fortnight or a week had been destitute; but the fact of these men being in that position could hardly be taken as indicating that there was no employment. Again, there was another question that had been brought up. It had been stated that immigration would produce an amount of unemployment, and put men out of a job. He thought the reverse would be the case, if we got desirable men. There were districts in this State where three-fourths of the producers had come out as immigrants, or were the sons of immigrants. The hon. member for Woothakata said the money spent on immigration was absolutely wasted.

Mr. WOODS: I did not say that. I said I should like to know what we gained by it.

Mr. SWAYNE: In one sugar district alone we gained in one year nearly £500,000 worth of

[*Mr. Kenna.*

produce. Every farming representative in the House had alluded to the scarcity of labour in the agricultural districts. Having a practical knowledge of the sugar districts, he could say that in 1906 there was a scarcity of men to take off the crops.

Mr. WOODS: Where?

Mr. SWAYNE: In the Mackay district, for one. But the following year, 1907, there were plenty of cutters, and he believed that there were plenty of cutters this year. But in 1907 there was a scarcity of men to work the growing crops. Had that not been the case, there would have been more cane to cut this year, and consequently more employment for cane-cutters. On the question of the scarcity of labour he would not quote the testimony of farming representatives, who, he knew, would bear out his contention, but would adduce the evidence of officials. The following paragraph appeared in Dr. Maxwell's report on "The Bureau of Sugar Experiment Stations," for the year 1906-7:—

The director has frequently pointed out to farmers that continued ratooning over the second or third ratoon crop is, agriculturally speaking, bad practice; but the question of labour being at this time such a crucial and determining factor, he has decided to continue, for another crop at least, the ratooning of those varieties which still show a complete immunity from disease. As the director tersely expressed it to the writer—"The final question is not how to get the biggest crop, but the getting of a crop that pays the biggest, and possibly the only kind of crop which the farmer, under present labour conditions, is able to get at all." As a matter of fact, the director further stated: "High experimentation, and the best modern methods that are practised in other cane-growing countries, are gradually becoming impossible in Queensland, due to the want of labour power, at a paying cost, to carry such methods into practice."

A few weeks ago Mr. Tryon, the Government Entomologist, visited the Cairns district in connection with the grub pest, and in a paragraph report of his investigations, which appeared in the *Courier*, it was stated—

He mentions that some lands have been thrown out of cultivation, and the crop is also shorter by reason of decreased thoroughness of labour conditions to a great extent.

Mr. WOODS: It is all a question of wages.

Mr. SWAYNE: He would give the wages paid to men in his district, and leave it to hon. members to say whether agriculture could stand higher wages. Cutters in his district earned from 9s. to 17s. a day, and some chippers were asking from £1 15s. to £2 2s. a week in 1907. Now he would quote from the annual report of the Under Secretary for Agriculture—

The influx of experienced farmers and their families from the Southern States and elsewhere is having a marked effect upon the agronomy of the districts in which they have settled, and the gain to the farming community through their advent would be considerable. On the other hand, skilled and reliable farm labour has been scarce, and at periods, particularly during harvest time, practically unobtainable for general agriculture as separate from the sugar industry.

He thought those quotations were sufficient to show the state of the labour market as far as the agricultural districts were concerned. There was one feature of this debate which was very gratifying, and that was that, although many speakers treated the question from the narrow aspect of some particular industry, a few members treated it from a broad national aspect. He congratulated the junior member for South Brisbane on the speech he made, because that hon. member looked at the matter from a national standpoint, but voicing the views he did, he (Mr. Swayne) could not understand how the hon. member could sit where he did, because the

Opposition would not do what the hon. member considered was necessary if they were in a position to control the administration of the country. There was no member in the House, as far as he could gather, who was game enough to say that he was opposed to immigration. Even the party on the other side of the House said they were in favour of immigration, though, at the same time, they took action which would prevent immigration, if it was successful. They said they were in favour of immigration, but objected to State-aided immigration. Canada was only five days' sail from Great Britain, while Australia was five weeks' sail. Would men take a five weeks' journey instead of a five days' journey unless they were offered some inducement to do so? If we wanted immigration, the State must spend money on it; and he maintained that, with the additional production which was taking place in the State, money spent on immigration would be money well spent. Some of the nominated sugar labourers who came out last year were already on farms of their own. He knew men who came from Northern Europe not very long ago—men who were unable to speak our language, and they were now on the land employing labour. The more men of that sort we got the better it would be for the State as a whole. They had heard a good deal about improving the conditions of the workmen, but the very members who talked so much about that had opposed the passage of a Bill to provide for workers' dwellings—a measure that would have enabled the worker to become the owner, within two or three years, of the place in which he lived. A man with about £60—which any good shearer or sugar worker could save in a season—could become his own landlord under that Bill. Those members said they wanted to improve the condition of the workers, yet they did everything they could to prevent that being done. They did not want those men to become their own landlords, because directly a man became a freeholder he deserted from their ranks.

Mr. KERR: No.

Mr. SWAYNE: As a rule, when they became freeholders, they ceased to vote labour. With regard to the time that had been occupied by a motion for leave to introduce the Port Alma railway proposal, he might point out that only two members on the Government side spoke, while seven spoke on the Opposition side. On the question of the extra sitting day, ten members on the Opposition side and only three on the Government side spoke, and on the question of extra sitting hours eight Opposition members and three Government members spoke.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is now referring to a matter that has nothing to do with the question before the Committee.

Mr. SWAYNE: Regarding the question of indentured labour, it was a system which he did not think was a good one. When agreements were made by persons in different parts of the world, he did not think they were likely to be satisfactory; and he thought the proper thing to do was to bring the people out and leave them to make their own agreements. The Government were accused of allowing agreements to be made at wages of £1 a week; but what the employers really paid amounted to £1 4s. a week and rations. The broad national aspect of the question of immigration had been touched on more than once, and very ably; and the seriousness of the need for additional population was a matter that should not be lost sight of. In the *Times* of 8th September was an article expressing sympathy on general grounds with the policy of a white Australia, but declaring that the Empire could hold empty spaces for Australia only if Australia would do her utmost to utilise them.

It went on to say that the Empire, as the price of its support of a white policy, might fairly require a conscientious effort on the part of Australia to set aside the jealousies that now checked or hampered the stream of immigration, and dangerously retarded the peopling of the Australian continent. That put the whole case in a nutshell, and it must be apparent that the only way to retain possession of Australia was to encourage the immigration of European races.

Mr. KEOGH (*Rosewood*): In speaking the other evening on the Agent-General's vote he made reference to a statement made by an hon. gentleman—the leader of the Opposition, he thought—with regard to the amount of money given to people brought out under the auspices of the Chief Secretary. Umbrage was taken at the Chief Secretary for having brought those people into the State, and some members were under the impression that the pay—£1 a week and rations—was not sufficient for men of that class. He came out to Queensland some fifty years ago, and he had a good deal to do with the squatting element in Queensland, so far as [8.30 p.m.] being employed on the stations in the Western country was concerned.

He had no hesitation in asserting that the rations which were read out by the leader of the Opposition were far superior to those which they received in his (Mr. Keogh's) day. He did not say that the rations which they received at that time were not good and sufficient for the men who received them. They received 8 lb. of flour, 2 lb. of sugar,  $\frac{1}{4}$  lb. of tea, and 12 lb. of beef. The list read out by the leader of the Opposition was 12 lb. of bread or flour, 20 lb. of meat—

Mr. BOWMAN: I never referred to the rations at all.

Mr. KEOGH: Well, it was an hon. gentleman on the front Opposition bench, and the ration read out by that hon. gentleman was far better than they received in the olden days. He could look back with pride and pleasure to the men who came out under the old régime, such as the late Archbishop Quinn and others, who came out under Mr. Jordan. They were not spoonfed in those days, and yet the men who came out then were some of the best colonists in Queensland to-day. The land should be made ready for the people who were coming to Queensland now. In fact, it would be better if all the Land Acts were taken and burned so that they could commence *de novo*. He remembered the Land Act of 1868, when most of the old settlers took up their land.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Selection before survey.

Mr. KEOGH: Yes, they had selection before survey in those days, and there was no reason why they should not revert to that system again. He would not like to live in the old country again, because this was his adopted land now.

Mr. BOWMAN: How much longer are you going to live?

Mr. KEOGH: About ten or fifteen years. (Laughter.) There was one thing that he could look back with pride on in Australia, and that was that since he had been here no one could point the finger of scorn at him and say, "Keogh, you have not gone straight." He had always gone straight, and he would do so to the end. (Hear, hear!) Nothing would give him greater pleasure than to support the immigration vote, and he thought members of the Cabinet erred in not making the vote larger than it was. It should be £100,000. He agreed with the late Treasurer that, if they did not take time by the forelock, they would have the Northern Territory peopled by a class of men they did not want. It was far better to offer inducements to their own

*Mr. Keogh.*]

people in the old country, and as they had plenty of land it would be better for the State if it were taken up. He agreed with the President of the United States that they should fill up their empty spaces with white people. The Opposition seemed to think that there were sufficient people here already. He did not think so, and the more people they brought to Queensland the better. Although the Opposition might be prepared to run down Queensland, it was the finest country under the sun. Members of the Opposition lived in Queensland, and they could not live in another country under such prosperous conditions as they did in this grand State of Queensland to-day. (Hear, hear!) Queensland was the best State of the Commonwealth, and only wanted more population. Why should they frustrate the action of the Government, who were doing all they possibly could to further the interests of the State? The only way to make Queensland great and prosperous was to bring more white people here. They should get more people from the North of Europe—Danes and Germans—as those who had already come from those countries had made their mark here. He knew those men—a great number of them came into the State some years ago. The electorate which he had the honour to represent—Rosewood—had been peopled by some of the best colonists in this State—that was people of the Teutonic race. Those were the people who ought to be induced to come out here. They had proved themselves eminently fitted as colonists. There was an old saying—and he thought it was a true one—that the Germans, where they had colonies of their own, were not as good colonists as when they were under the British flag. He did not know why that was so, but it was probably because *we were more liberal*, and did not restrict their actions in any manner. They were always willing to give them a helping hand to get on. He made those remarks with the double intention of asking the Premier to bear in mind, when he was getting people to come out here from Europe, not to forget those people in the North of Europe. He believed in bringing out the women also, as he was always in favour of the ladies coming here—(laughter)—with their relatives and friends. The Premier was very emphatic in stating that the best class of women to bring to this State was certainly not from the populous centres, such as London, Liverpool, and Edinburgh, but from the country districts. He (Mr. Keogh) held that that was the proper class to get—good strong girls—who would turn out the best families they possibly could. (Laughter.) He trusted the Premier would not be sparing of the £50,000, if it was possible to bring out that class of people, and the sooner they were brought here the better it would be for the State. No country could go on prospering unless they had population, and unless they had the people to till the land. It had been said by some hon. members that when the immigrants landed here they did not know anything about ploughing and other work on the land. He thought one of the best things possible under the circumstances would be for the parties coming out here first of all—the newchums—to take work from the men who were already on the soil. From his long experience he had found that some of the immigrants, when they took up land, were not very far behind our own colonists, and got on quite as well. They might not drop into the seasons so well as our own colonists, but where they went in with the older colonists no doubt they would get good advice, and they were always prepared to accept it. The Premier, during the last session, stated he would be prepared to grant 160 acres to every immigrant that came to this State.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: They can get it for nothing.

[Mr. Keogh.]

Mr. KEOGH: If those inducements were held out to the people in England, Ireland, Scotland, and throughout Northern Europe, no doubt they would get people to come out here, and they would not come out as paupers, but would bring money with them as they did in New South Wales, Victoria, and the other States. Let them do all they possibly could to induce that class of settler to come out here. He would not debar any man with his wife and family coming out here, because every person who came to the country was worth a large amount of money to the State in labour and what they produced. He had heard it stated that some of the people who came out as farmers were not the class of people that was wanted, but in all his knowledge of the people who had come to this State as farmers, he had never known any of those men looking for rations or any assistance whatever; they simply went on to the soil and made a living. He trusted the vote would go through, and not only £50,000 but double that amount would be spent for such a good purpose as immigration.

The PREMIER: He would not detain the Committee very long, but he thought it was desirable to refer to a few matters before the debate was closed. He thought the very importance of the subject justified the debate that had taken place on it, not only because there was a strong difference of opinion in the House but because of the importance of the subject itself. He must say that, on the whole, the debate, considering the importance of the subject and the strong difference of opinion that existed, had been exceedingly moderate in tone.

Mr. BOWMAN: You do not think time has been wasted over it?

The PREMIER: No. It was true that good results might have been got in less time; but Parliament was really a rather cumbrous machine, and, on the whole, he thought the debate had been quite well worth the time spent on it.

Mr. BOWMAN: That is an admission.

The PREMIER: What struck him in connection with the debate was that most of the speeches from the Labour section of the Opposition, and one or two from the other section of the party opposite, did not support the amendment of the leader of the Opposition at all. Most of the speeches were really opposed to immigration altogether. The speakers did not say that they were opposed to immigration. On the contrary, they said that they were not opposed to immigration; but the arguments they put forward would not support the amendment of the leader of the Opposition—they would kill his amendment to vote £20,000 just as effectually as they would kill the voting of the £50,000 on the Estimates.

Mr. RYLAND: You take an extreme view of it. There is a happy medium.

The PREMIER: He was exceedingly glad of the debate for the reason that it showed quite clearly that there was growing up a consensus of opinion in Australia, and in Queensland, that it was their duty to bring in immigrants.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: It was a duty they could not get away from. Even the Labour party were recognising that. They had dropped out of their platform the plank which said that they were opposed to State-aided immigration.

Mr. HARDACRE: No.

The PREMIER: Well, it had either dropped out or it was there now.

Mr. HARDACRE: We have not dropped anything out. We have always held exactly what we hold to-day.

Mr. D. HUNTER: You will not find it in the platform now.

The PREMIER did not wish to say anything that would tempt reply, as there was not much time. The tone of the debate showed quite clearly that every sensible man in that Chamber had come to recognise that it was their duty to fill the great empty spaces, particularly in their Northern territory, with white men. Every man who believed in a white Australia recognised that it was their duty to do that for the sake of ensuring a white Australia, and that there was no other way by which they could ensure a white Australia than by filling the great empty Northern country with white men. They might disagree as to the details. They might disagree as to how to do it; but he was glad to see that it was now recognised that it was a duty they could not with safety neglect much longer. The hon. member for Leichhardt had said, by interjection, when the hon. member for Croydon was speaking, that it would take 100 years to fill this country. Probably it would take more than 100 years to fill it up adequately.

Mr. AIREY: That is no reason why we should not start now.

The PREMIER: As a matter of fact, that was exactly the reason that was pressing on them. He said two or three years ago that they had probably a generation ahead of them—twenty-five or thirty years—in which to make some provision for the protection of Northern Australia. If hon. members said they might do it in 100 years, would they do it all at once at the end of 100 years, or would the country lie idle there for 100 years? None of those things would happen. If they did not begin and do it now for themselves, or if those who came immediately after them did not do it, they would be very sorry for the neglect that they had been guilty of.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: A great national question like this was not a party question, or it should not be a party question. If any question should be considered apart from party or personal politics, it was this question. It was a question that ought to be so considered, not only for the safety of this great country but for the safety of their wives and children. Their very existence as a democratic white community depended upon it. The broad result of the debate was to show that the Parliament of Queensland was not opposed to immigration—that the Parliament of Queensland was beginning to recognise clearly their pressing duty in this matter. He did not think that a single member had risen throughout the course of the debate and had said that he was opposed to immigration, root and branch. All they had said was that they were opposed to indiscriminate immigration. Now, who was proposing indiscriminate immigration? Certainly not the Government. As the best authority he could get for the intentions of the Government he naturally turned to the *Worker*. (Laughter.)

Mr. RYLAND: I thought you said you did not read the *Worker*?

The PREMIER: He found in the *Worker* the immigration conditions as advertised by the Government. He wanted hon. members who had been hinting, without saying it, that the Government were advocating indiscriminate immigration, to listen.

Mr. RYLAND: So you are advocating indiscriminate immigration.

The PREMIER: He was afraid the junior member for Gympie did not read the *Worker*. (Laughter.) He regretted that the hon. member had followed his bad example in that respect, because, if the hon. member was a close student of the *Worker*, he would have known better. Here was the only kind of immigration that was going on in Queensland at the present time: First, "Assisted Immigrants"—Farmers in the old country who could show that they had some capital, could deposit a minimum amount of £50 with the Agent-General, which amount was paid to them when they got here; and they got a passage to Queensland for £5. The next form of immigration was "Nominated Immigrants"—which hon. members opposite quite approved of.

Mr. RYLAND: It is the least objectionable. (Government laughter.)

The PREMIER: They had reduced the rate for nominated immigrants to £4 for males and £2 for females. The next form of immigration was "Contract Immigrants"—where an employer who would agree to pay satisfactory wages and to give a year's employment could have an employee engaged in the old country if he paid down £5 for his passage money.

Mr. BOWMAN: Will you be able to tell us to-night how much has been lodged by the employers with the department, and how much has been paid back to them?

The PREMIER: No, he could not tell.

Mr. RYLAND: Over £600 has been spent.

The PREMIER: Over £600.

Mr. MULLAN: Your own officer says the indent system has been very unsatisfactory.

The PREMIER: That had nothing to do with the system; it had only to do with the men. He had his doubts whether many who had been brought out were unsatisfactory.

[9 p.m.] He did not doubt that there had been a number who were unsatisfactory. They could not bring 600 working men out without finding some were unsatisfactory. But he did not want to get away from the point. He had shown three ways in which people might be assisted from the old country to this country. First, the assisted immigrants who paid £5 for their own passage; the next, nominated immigrants, who might have the nomination money paid here; and contract immigrants, who got brought out if the employer paid £5 a head. In addition to these three ways, free passage was given to the wives and daughters of the immigrant, and to his sons under eighteen years of age, and to female domestic servants. Now, would hon. gentlemen opposite tell him what one of these they described as indiscriminate?

Mr. HARDACRE: The contract system is indiscriminate.

The PREMIER: Did the hon. member for Leichhardt mean to say that the contract system as carried out there was indiscriminate?

Mr. HARDACRE: All kinds of characters are brought in.

The PREMIER: The hon. member did not know the meaning of words. He might say that it was a bad system—he might say that we should not do that—but it was mere foolishness to call it indiscriminate. When the sugar-planters came to him they wanted him to bring in an indiscriminate number of labourers. They told him that 4,000 or 5,000 would be required, and they wanted him to bring in that number at once, without regard to labour conditions in the State. That would have been indiscriminate. But he told them that if they wanted one man, or wanted ten men, then they should engage to

Hon. W. Kidston.]

give that man a year's employment at certain wages, and pay part of his passage money. He thought that was discriminating a good deal, and they thought it was discriminating too much. They might object to the Government bringing immigrants under that condition, but it was mere foolishness to speak about such a system as an indiscriminate system. As a matter of fact, the Government had been exceedingly careful to try to avoid flooding the labour market; they had been deemed to have been careful in that respect. Far from being indiscriminate, his simple conviction was this: That instead of the 200 a month, or something like that, they were bringing out—because during the present year they would have brought out about 2,200 when the next steamer came in—next year they were projecting the bringing out of the same number according to their contract with the British India Company. They might get that number just because they could not handle a large number of settlers quickly enough, but 2,000 a year was altogether inadequate for the requirements of Queensland.

Mr. BOWMAN: You are not bringing out purely agriculturists, you know.

The PREMIER: Yes, they were. Perhaps he should rather say they were trying to bring them out.

LABOUR MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

The PREMIER: People got through the meshes.

Mr. RYLAND: I have been speaking to a great many mechanics.

The PREMIER: Just so. The condition of things in the old country was so bad in the iron trade that they could fill a ship in a day, and every day for a month, with people who would be glad to get away from that country. They had been trying to get only agricultural labourers, only those accustomed to country occupations, but every now and again this man and that man got through the mesh, and got his passage out here. It was difficult to prevent that. He thought it was desirable to prevent it as much as possible.

Mr. MANN: The immigration agents are allowed to choose.

The PREMIER: He knew that a number of men on the other side of the Chamber did not think it was a good thing to pay immigration agents by result—they should pay them a fixed wage, and then they would not care whether they got immigrants or not. It was a difficult matter to deal with; probably any system they adopted would have its own evils. Those were matters of detail that it was quite right to blame the Government for.

Mr. BOWMAN: Very important detail, too.

The PREMIER: Any errors of detail of that kind it was quite right to blame the Administration for, because it was their duty to try and avoid such errors of detail. All the same, his conviction was that the present size of the immigration stream to Queensland was altogether disproportionate to the capacities of Queensland—was altogether disproportionate to the urgent need there was for filling Northern Queensland with white men.

Mr. BOWMAN: Are they going to be selected in the same way as you said?

The PREMIER: It was a system that required a good deal of careful handling, but it was the best system we had. He wanted hon. gentlemen to know that they were going to try to overhaul our system of survey, to see whether they could not open up the land of Queensland at a much quicker rate than was now being done. He recognised how great difficulties there were in the way, but

[Hon. W. Kidston.

if these difficulties could be overcome, and the lands of Queensland could be opened up at a much quicker rate than was now being done, then the 200 a month, or the 2,000 a year they were proposing to bring in, would be altogether inadequate. As a matter of fact, he would be rejoiced to see, not 2,000 a year, but 20,000 a year coming to Queensland, if he could only see the way of settling them when they got here; because, if we multiplied our settlers at that rate, we could take the mechanics of all kinds along with such a flood of settlers. That was the kind of immigration that Queensland required, not a dribble, dribble of 200 a month. While he said that, he was just as desirous as any hon. member on the other side of the House to avoid indiscriminate immigration—to avoid flooding the labour market and making miserable, not only the people we brought here, but the people who were already here. That was a difficult job in a country like Queensland, with the irregular character of its industries, but that was what the Government were going to try to do—not to make the number of immigrants less, but to try to greatly multiply the number of immigrants, and it would be a good job for Queensland if the Government were able to do it. Two things had been said in the course of the debate by way of specific objection to the proposals of the Government. One was that the wages he quoted for the Western country were inadequate. General statements were made that higher wages were paid there than was shown by the report he got from Government inspectors out there. The member for Balonne, Mr. Land, did not take up that stand. He seemed to take up a much wider line, and he knew as much about the conditions in that part of the country as most members who had spoken. That hon. member took up this line: That judging from the wages paid there could not be any very great scarcity of labour out there, or the wages would have been higher.

Mr. BOWMAN: But he also told you something different—that in the first six months of the year there was very little employment for Western men.

The PREMIER: They all knew that.

Mr. BOWMAN: Yes; but you did not state it.

The PREMIER: No, he did not state it; but he had pointed out over and over again in the House how difficult the labour problem in Queensland was made by the fact that the Western country, the sugar country, and the farming country all wanted labour at the same period of the year, and that a large number of men were idle after that period; and he had tried to push on Government railways and other public works early in the year last year—and he would do the same this year—so as to equalise things as much as possible in the slack time of the year. No Government could very well do more than that. But to return to the figures in the list he had submitted, he invited specific contradictions of any of the figures in that list, because he wished to get at the truth of the matter, and so far as they had gone he had got only one actual contradiction, and that was from the hon. member for Wide Bay. Mr. Walker, who pointed out one case in his own district where the wages were stated to be 15s. a week when he knew them to be £1. He would have that statement verified.

Mr. KERR: The same thing occurs in the Barcoo District.

The PREMIER: Well, the papers had been here a couple of days now.

Mr. KERR: I marked the cases on the paper.

The PREMIER: Any figures marked on the paper would be verified. All he would say now was that certain pastoralists wanted men accustomed to stock from the old country.

Mr. KERR: Experts.

The PREMIER: Yes, experts—men accustomed to cattle and sheep in the old country, and he proposed to them that the wages of such men should be £1 a week, with board and lodging, for the first six months of the year for which they were engaged, and £1 5s. a week, with board and lodging, for the second six months. Those wages were very fair, judging from the figures which were supplied.

Mr. HAMILTON: You did not stipulate that with the first batch.

The PREMIER: He did exactly the same with the first batch as he was doing in the present instance. He acted on the information supplied to him.

Mr. KERR: The arrangement with the first batch was made before you got the information you now have.

The PREMIER: Yes; he only got that information the other day. Something had been said about the money spent in charitable relief. If anybody would look at the figures quoted by the hon. member for Woothakata, they would see what a small amount, comparatively speaking, was spent in charitable relief in those districts; and when it was remembered that widows were given charitable relief, it would be readily understood that those figures were no indication of the condition of the labour market. The best indication as to the general prosperity of the people of Queensland at the present time was the people's savings in the Government Savings Bank. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. WOODS: You denied just now that you told the member for Flinders that you would not take the word of the secretary of the Australian Workers' Union.

The PREMIER: He did not say he would not take his word. He said he did not ask him for information, and he had no intention of doing so.

Mr. PAYNE: You told me it would not be official.

The PREMIER: No more it would.

Mr. PAYNE: But you got information from the Pastoralists' Association.

The PREMIER: He did not seek for information from the Pastoralists' Association. He would not think of going to either the Pastoralists' Association or the secretary of the union for this information. He had no business, unless those figures were questioned, to go to either the secretary of the union or the Pastoralists' Association. But with regard to the general prosperity of the country, he would point out that the savings of the people of Queensland, as shown by the Government Savings Bank, increased last year by £373,000; and in the last seventeen months—from the 1st July, 1907, to the end of November last—they increased by £507,000.

Mr. MULLAN: Don't forget that since the bank smash nearly all the business men, commercial travellers, and others—

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Oh, oh! and laughter.

Mr. MULLAN: Have put money into the Government Savings Bank up to the full limit. (Government laughter.) I know what I am

talking about, and I say that has been done during the last fifteen years. (Government laughter.)

The PREMIER: It was quite unnecessary to take any notice of that interjection. It was a long time since the bank smash. That occurred in 1893, fifteen years ago, and had very little to do with the increase that had taken place in the deposits in the Government Savings Bank within the last seventeen months. He had occasion to speak about this matter earlier in the session, and he then showed that the savings of the people of Queensland practically amounted to this: that on an average every family in Queensland had £50 in the Government Savings Bank. If you told that to people in the old country they would hardly believe it. There were few countries in the world, if any, that could show such a result, and it did not look well for Queenslanders to be always calling out about the miserable conditions of the workers. There were few countries in the world, where, all things considered—climate, opportunities, and industrial conditions—the workers were better off than in Queensland. There were plenty of disadvantages here, industrial and otherwise; it was a comparatively new country, where people had to put up with many inconveniences, particularly those who went out into the bush; but everything considered, Queensland was not a bad country to come to, and most of the members in that Chamber were evidence of the fact. When he was in the old country he met some socialists—

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Did you take them out in the motor-car? (Laughter.)

The PREMIER: They were surprised at the attitude which socialists in Australia took up in opposing immigration—in opposing the coming to this country of other labourers, let them be black or white. They did not understand the race trouble as it was understood here. As a matter of fact, it was not socialism that objected to immigrants; it was trades unionism; it was the old guild system. It was socialism for the Government to bring in immigrants. It was State assistance to the individual, and it did not matter whether the individual was a worker or an employer, it was State co-operation all the same.

Mr. RYLAND: Are you the best sort of socialist?

The PREMIER: He was unable to say, like the Home Secretary said this evening, that he had much admiration for the ideals of the socialist. He had never been able to see the beauty of the millennium the socialists held out, and he did not think it would be a good state of society. He admitted that the idea of doing away with much of the social injustice that obtained under the competitive system was quite good, and nobody could help having some sympathy with it; but the whole system, with its limitation of individual effort, would not help the world in the end. All that was by the way. Might he suggest, as a result of this discussion, that the member for Fortitude Valley should withdraw his amendment.

Mr. WOODS: Sit down, and give him a chance.

The PREMIER: Let them all combine to try and send Queensland ahead—

Mr. BOWMAN: Combine with you, after what is going to happen at 10 o'clock! I would be sorry to combine with you.

The PREMIER: And make Queensland not only a better country for the individual men and women who lived here, but a country richer and stronger for defence and for holding its own.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

*Hon. W. Kidston.]*

Mr. KERR (*Barcoo*): Before the guillotine fell at 10 o'clock he wished to say they had seen to-day an evidence of the fair play members of the Opposition got from the other side. Four Ministers of the Crown had addressed the Chamber—the Premier had spoken twice at very great length—and had prevented members opposed to the Estimates from getting their views into *Hansard*. He wished to direct attention to the question of indented labour. The Government had made an arrangement with the Pastoralists' Association.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Were you not a colleague at the time?

Mr. KERR: He was; but he knew nothing about this matter until the Acting Chief Secretary brought it up. He then entered his protest, and called upon the officials of the department to give him an explanation as to how the rates of wages were fixed. Even ordinary station hands in the West got at least £1 5s. a week and their rations, and the Pastoralists' Association were using the Government and the money of the State by getting their employees assisted out here. The Premier acknowledged to-night that those men coming out were experts. If they had been common day labourers, going to work as ordinary hands, the £1 a week would be below the rate paid in the Central district. There were stations in his district indenting a fair number of men, and it was only fair to his constituents that he should name those stations. They had men being brought out here indented to the pastoral companies such as the Pastoral Agency Company, who owned War- [9.30 p.m.] breccan, such as the Fairbairn Brothers, who owned Barcardine Downs, Bimerah, and some stations on the Peak Downs, and many others. They were pastoral lessees who were getting labour indented by the Government, through the Chief Secretary, and the rate of wages was £1 a week and rations.

Mr. PAYNE: Starvation wages.

Mr. KERR: The hon. member for Mitchell, whose electorate was affected in the same way as his (Mr. Kerr's) electorate, knew very well that the men working on the stations all round there were paid £1 5s. a week. Yet the Chief Secretary laid upon the table a list of wages paid, and he gave the names of the stations paying those wages. He would deal with two stations which he knew something about. The first was Malvern Hills, which belonged to a Melbourne company, and the same company also owned Portland Downs. The rate of wages put down in the list for those places was £1 a week. Isis Downs was another station in that district closely adjoining, and the station wages put down for Isis Downs was £1 5s. a week. There was a difference of 5s. a week. Where did the officers get their information from?

Mr. D. HUNTER: The Ipswich workshops. (Laughter.)

Mr. NEVITT: The Warrego Pastoralists' Association.

Mr. KERR: They got their information from the Pastoralists' Association, because the paper bore the imprint of the Pastoralists' Association, where the information was supplied. Before the Pastoralists' Association were allowed to indent any of that labour the department ought to have been called upon to make a report as to what was the ruling rate of wages, and if that report had been submitted to the Minister in charge of the Labour Bureau at that time, he would have known that the reports which were placed on the table were not correct.

Mr. HAMILTON: This is a secret agreement.

[*Mr. Kerr.*]

Mr. KERR: An agreement was made, but immigration was carried on through the Chief Secretary's Department. Therefore the Labour Bureau had nothing to do with that agreement. The Premier acknowledged that the men engaged were experts.

Hon. R. PHILIP: What do you mean by "experts"?

Mr. KERR: Men who knew all about the breeding of sheep and how to deal with sheep, also men who knew all about cattle—men who had been trained all their lives as shepherds and stockmen. They also had a knowledge of dealing with stud sheep, which were the most valuable sheep on any station, as anybody knew. These men were being brought out, not as ordinary station hands, but they would take a position in charge of the stud sheep and in charge of the out station, and they would be in the position virtually of overseers. Then the wages that they were paid was not the wages that were paid to overseers. They were engaged for twelve months, and they could not leave their employment before that time. The hon. member for Carpentaria instanced the case of a man who had served his apprenticeship with him in a railway company in the old country, a man who afterwards came to the Ipswich workshops for employment.

Mr. NEVITT: No; Roma street.

Mr. KERR: This man was a member of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, and the ruling rate of wages of that society was 10s. a day, and he was paid only 9s. 6d. in the Roma-street workshops. Provision was made in the new classification which took effect from the 1st of July, 1908, and under that provision was made—

Mr. D. HUNTER: Read the scale.

Mr. KERR: If the hon. member for "Non-ever" would only keep quiet he would read it. He (Mr. Kerr) had been gagged all day, and he was now dealing with the point he wanted to raise, and the hon. gentleman could refer to it afterwards if he wished—

Mechanics, not including carpenters and tinsmiths, who had completed their apprenticeship in other than the workshops department might, on appointment to the staff, on proof of length of service as journeymen be paid according to the abovementioned scale, but not exceeding the rate for fifth grade service.

Hon. R. PHILIP: What is the scale?

Mr. KERR: He would read the Southern Division, where this man worked. The Central Division scale was sixpence more. The scale was: First year, 7s. per day; second year, 8s. per day; third year, 8s. 6d. per day; fourth year, 9s. per day; fifth year, 9s. 6d.; and after the fifth year 10s. per day. There was a provision made for mechanics not including carpenters and tinsmiths—and he had this provision put into the classification when he went through it with the officials of the department, because he saw the injustice to all men who were full mechanics coming in and having to go in to the work in the Ipswich workshops for a lower rate of pay than was being paid by, or demanded by, the society of which they were members. That was the provision that was made. The hon. member for Woollongabba raised the point about the men who served their apprenticeship in the workshops, and said they were only paid, after they had served their apprenticeship, at the rate of 7s. per day. That was the point he raised. Those regulations had been in force for years, and they were improved during the time he was head of the Railway Department. The hon. member for Woollongabba must know that. He (Mr. Kerr) said it, knowing a little more about the Ipswich workshops than the hon. member for Woollongabba.

Mr. D. HUNTER: I know too much about them for you.

Mr. KERR: You do not. All he had ever had to do with the Ipswich workshops had been fair and aboveboard.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Nine and sixpence for carpenters.

Mr. KERR: Yes; 9s. 6d. for carpenters. If the hon. member was there he did not suppose he (Mr. Hunter) would get 9s. 6d. He would have to get 9s. 6d. worth of work done first. (Laughter.)

Mr. D. HUNTER: I can do, and always have done, my work.

Mr. KERR: The position was this: As he had stated some time ago in the Assembly—he thought it was on the Address in Reply—if he had been there long enough he should certainly have had some alteration made in the Ipswich workshops, and he would have endeavoured to stop a good deal of the political influence that had been going on in those workshops for a number of years.

Hon. E. B. FORREST: Surely there can be nothing like that up there.

Mr. GRANT: Whom do you refer to?

Mr. KERR: There was no need to name any politician—they were all tarred with the same brush.

Mr. WHITE: I never asked for a position for anyone.

Mr. KERR: He admitted the hon. member had not. There was no need for him to do so, because he had a foundry of his own in Bundaberg. The men now in the Ipswich workshops, under the new regulations, were getting 6d. a day more than when he took charge of the Railway Department. He wanted to discuss the Railway Estimates on this occasion, but the Government did not want them discussed.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Give us a chance.

Mr. KERR: You did not give me a chance.

Mr. D. HUNTER: You won't give me a chance either.

Mr. KERR: The hon. member for No-never has been making—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must address other hon. members by the name of their constituency.

Mr. D. HUNTER: I don't mind.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! It is not what the hon. member likes. It is what the Standing Orders provide.

Mr. KERR: The hon. member made charges about the rate of wages paid in the Ipswich workshops. He had received a number of letters from the old country, which had arrived since he left the Railway Department. He received a letter the other day from a competent tradesman in the old country with two very good credentials, and he (Mr. Kerr) was struck with the difference in the hours worked, and also the pay in the old country. He appeared to be a thorough tradesman making application for a position, and what struck him (Mr. Kerr) very strongly—the hon. member for Wolloongabba and others might talk about the bad conditions that existed in the Ipswich workshops and other workshops under the control of the Railway Department—was the large number of men who made application to get into the Ipswich workshops.

Mr. HARDACRE: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member is dealing with the Ipswich workshops—has that anything to do with the motion before the Committee?

The CHAIRMAN: I understand the hon. member is connecting his remarks, having received some letters from the old country in regard to immigration.

Mr. KERR: He was not taking up the time of the Committee unnecessarily. The application was received from a man—he was not going to give his trade—and it just showed the number of men in the old country that were prepared to come out—first-class tradesmen with first-class credentials—who had been working at railway work and in carriage-building and other work like that—and the rate of pay he had been getting was £1 18s. per week, or 6s. 4d. per day. And not only did he only get £1 18s. per week, but he worked fifty-eight hours a week, which was ten hours more than was worked in the shops out here, where they only worked forty-eight hours per week. Fifty-eight hours a week for £1 18s., and he was prepared to come out here. And that was only one of a number of applications he had received from first-class tradesmen, who, owing to the depression that existed at the present time in the old country, were anxious to come out here. He (Mr. Kerr) addressed a public meeting two or three years ago on Charters Towers, and he advocated a policy—a policy which he believed in—seeing that the Commonwealth Government had taken coloured labour away from Queensland—he advocated that they should get into the Northern portion of the State white workers. He believed, as one who had lived in the North, and who knew something about the conditions there, and as one who believed the North was a splendid country—he believed that they should have immigration, so that there might be a white people settled in that portion of our State. He had advocated that policy so that that nation that was springing up in the East, with her teeming millions, should not be allowed to overrun the Northern portion of Queensland. Having advocated that policy, he could not support the amendment of the leader of the Opposition. He believed there was room in this State for a large number of people; but he believed they had a bad system of getting immigrants in the old country. It was recorded in *Hansard* that some years back he had pointed out that they could not expect to get agricultural labourers from the old country, when they were getting higher wages and lived under better conditions than were offered to the labourers who were being indentured by the Pastoralists' Association under the auspices of the Government. Labourers in the south of Scotland and the north of England were engaged for six and twelve months, and they were getting their £1 a week and upwards, with constant employment, in addition to "perks." Therefore, was it likely that they would come here? He should vote against the amendment.

Mr. BOWMAN: The Premier's admission, in reply to an interjection made by him (Mr. Bowman), that he did not think the time spent on the discussion of the vote had been wasted, was an unfortunate admission for the hon. gentleman to make in view of the action he proposed to take in another seven minutes.

LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOWMAN: They had been discussing the vote for over twelve hours, and they had

*Mr. Bowman.]*

also discussed the question of immigration for another two hours on the vote for the Agent-General.

The Premier entering the Chamber at this juncture, with several other hon. members,

Mr. LENNON: The Lord High Executioner!

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BOWMAN: The Premier, in his concluding remarks, expressed the hope that they would all work together, and that he would withdraw his amendment. It was not his intention to withdraw the amendment. He was going to divide the Committee on it. The hon. gentleman also referred to the three or four systems of immigration that were in existence, and the hon. member for Charters Towers interjected that even the Immigration Agent himself had stated in a report that the system of indenting labourers was unsatisfactory, and he (Mr. Bowman) proposed to read a paragraph from that officer's report for 1907—

Referring to the indentured labourers introduced, numbering 632, a large proportion of them appear to have been unsatisfactory as regards the work expected of them. On the other hand, as far as I could learn, many have taken up employment in other directions, and thus the State has probably benefited by their coming. In the case of those men who fitted their positions, some have since taken advantage of the nominated system by sending for their families.

That should be some guide to the hon. gentleman that the system which he was so anxious to perpetuate was a bad one. When replying to the various speeches, the hon. gentleman had not attempted to deal with the unemployed question as he (Mr. Bowman) would have liked him to do. The hon. gentleman purposely evaded that. When the hon. gentleman was speaking, he had interjected that the hon. member for Balonne had said that during the first six months of the year there were a number of men in Queensland who were unable to get employment. There were 6,000 or 7,000 men engaged in the pastoral industry who were thrown out of work when the shearing was over. What were those men going to do? The same applied to the men engaged in cane-cutting and in the wheat-harvesting on the Downs. Still, the hon. gentleman was prepared to bring out those indentured labourers on the lines laid down. The hon. gentleman had also made a point of Queensland being in a flourishing condition, because of the amount of money that was deposited in the Government Savings Bank. But the hon. gentleman did not tell them the number of depositors, nor did he tell them of the large sums that various friendly societies had in the bank, which helped materially to swell the average amount of deposits. The hon. gentleman wanted to imply that the amount in the bank represented the savings of the working men and women of Queensland.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and disorder.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Mr. Bowman.

Mr. BOWMAN: The Premier wanted the country to infer that the money in the bank was the savings of working men and women.

The TREASURER: So it is.

Mr. BOWMAN: Men in good positions had large deposits in the bank because they got good interest there. The hon. gentleman sneered in reference to the mention that was made about rations being obtained. He knew, as well as any hon. member, from the report of the Chief Inspector of Factories and Shops, that the condition of affairs that existed was not creditable to the State. The wages that were paid were an incentive to him and

other hon. members to pass amending legislation in the last session of Parliament in the form of a Factories and Shops Act and a Wages Boards Act.

The PREMIER: To improve the conditions.

Mr. BOWMAN: The conditions were not remedied, because the Wages Boards were not yet in existence, and Queensland to-day stood worse than any State in Australia.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: No!

Mr. BOWMAN: Yes, with regard to the conditions under which people were working.

At 10 o'clock the CHAIRMAN rose.

Mr. LENNON: "Angels and ministers of grace defend us!" (Uproar.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order! In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 136A, and with the Order of the House made on the 17th instant, I will now proceed to put the question. The question was—That there be granted to His Majesty, for the service of the year 1908-9, a sum not exceeding £53,530 for "Immigration," since which it has been proposed by way of amendment—(Mr. Bowman's amendment)—that the vote be reduced by £30,000. The question now is, that £23,530 only be granted.

Question put: and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 19.		
Mr. Adamson	Mr. McLachlan	
.. Barber	.. Mitchell	
.. Bowman	.. Muleahy	
.. Coyne	.. Mullan	
.. Hamilton	.. Nevitt	
.. Hardacre	.. Payne	
.. Hunter, J. M.	.. Ryland	
.. Huxham	.. Winstanley	
.. Land	.. Woods	
.. Lennon		
<i>Tellers: Mr. Huxham and Mr. Woods.</i>		

NOES, 45.		
Mr. Airey	Mr. Jenkinson	
.. Appel	.. Kenna	
.. Armstrong	.. Keogh	
.. Barnes, G. P.	.. Kerr	
.. Barnes, W. H.	.. Kidston	
.. Barton	.. Mackintosh	
.. Bell	.. Mann	
.. Brennan	.. Maxwell	
.. Campbell	.. Moore	
.. Cottell	.. Murphy	
.. Cowap	.. Paget	
.. Cribb	.. Petrie	
.. Deaham	.. Philp	
.. Douglas	.. Redwood	
.. Forrest	.. Roberts	
.. Fox	.. Somerset	
.. Grant	.. Stodart	
.. Grayson	.. Sumner	
.. Gunn	.. Swayne	
.. Hawthorn	.. Thorn	
.. Herbertson	.. Walker	
.. Hunter, D.	.. White	
.. Jackson		
<i>Tellers: Mr. Swayne and Mr. Cottell.</i>		

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Jones and Mr. Lesina.

Noes—Mr. Rankin and Mr. Haman.

Resolved in the negative.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is—That there be granted to His Majesty, for the service of the year 1908-9, a sum not exceeding £125,307, balance of the vote for the Chief Secretary's Department.

Mr. MURPHY rose to a point of order. His point of order was that the Chairman must put each department. The next vote was the Audit Office. They could not take the lot.

The CHAIRMAN: I would remind the hon. member that the Audit Department is passed.

[Mr. Bowman.

Mr. MURPHY: He meant Thursday Island.

The CHAIRMAN: I would just remind the hon. member that the procedure is quite in order. What was done to-night was done early in the year, and is also done in the British House of Commons in connection with the Army and Navy votes.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Question—That £125,307, balance of vote for Chief Secretary's Department, be granted—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 38.	
Mr. Appel	Mr. Herberston
.. Armstrong	.. Hunter, D.
.. Barnes, G. P.	.. Jackson
.. Barnes, W. H.	.. Keogh
.. Barton	.. Kidston
.. Bell	.. Mackintosh
.. Brennan	.. Maxwell
.. Campbell	.. Moore
.. Cottell	.. Paget
.. Cowap	.. Petrie
.. Cribb	.. Philp
.. Denham	.. Redwood
.. Douglas	.. Roberts
.. Forrest	.. Somerset
.. Fox	.. Stodart
.. Grant	.. Swayne
.. Grayson	.. Thorn
.. Gunn	.. Walker
.. Hawthorn	.. White

Tellers: Mr. D. Hunter and Mr. Moore.

NOES, 26.	
Mr. Adamson	Mr. Lennon
.. Airey	.. Mann
.. Barber	.. McLachlan
.. Bowman	.. Mitchell
.. Coyne	.. Mulcahy
.. Hamilton	.. Mullan
.. Hardacre	.. Murphy
.. Hunter, J. M.	.. Nevitt
.. Huxham	.. Payne
.. Jenkinson	.. Ryland
.. Kenna	.. Sumner
.. Kerr	.. Winstanley
.. Land	.. Woods

Tellers: Mr. Mann and Mr. Winstanley.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Rankin and Mr. Hanran.

Noes—Mr. Jones and Mr. Lesina.

Resolved in the affirmative.

#### HOME SECRETARY'S DEPARTMENT.

Question—That the sum of £603,524 be granted for the "Home Secretary's Department"—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 38.	
Mr. Appel	Mr. Herberston
.. Armstrong	.. Hunter, D.
.. Barnes, G. P.	.. Jackson
.. Barnes, W. H.	.. Keogh
.. Barton	.. Kidston
.. Bell	.. Mackintosh
.. Brennan	.. Maxwell
.. Campbell	.. Moore
.. Cottell	.. Paget
.. Cowap	.. Petrie
.. Cribb	.. Philp
.. Denham	.. Redwood
.. Douglas	.. Roberts
.. Forrest	.. Somerset
.. Fox	.. Stodart
.. Grant	.. Swayne
.. Grayson	.. Thorn
.. Gunn	.. Walker
.. Hawthorn	.. White

Tellers: Mr. Brennan and Mr. Cowap.

NOES, 26.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Lennon
.. Airey	.. McLachlan
.. Barber	.. Mann
.. Bowman	.. Mitchell
.. Coyne	.. Mulcahy
.. Hamilton	.. Mullan
.. Hardacre	.. Murphy
.. Hunter, J. M.	.. Nevitt
.. Huxham	.. Payne
.. Jenkinson	.. Ryland
.. Kenna	.. Sumner
.. Kerr	.. Winstanley
.. Land	.. Woods

Tellers: Mr. McLachlan and Mr. Payne.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Rankin and Mr. Hanran.

Noes—Mr. Jones and Mr. Lesina.

Resolved in the affirmative.

#### DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS.

Question—That £136,994 be granted for the "Department of Public Works"—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 38.	
Mr. Appel	Mr. Herberston
.. Armstrong	.. Hunter, D.
.. Barnes, G. P.	.. Jackson
.. Barnes, W. H.	.. Keogh
.. Barton	.. Kidston
.. Bell	.. Mackintosh
.. Brennan	.. Maxwell
.. Campbell	.. Moore
.. Cottell	.. Paget
.. Cowap	.. Petrie
.. Cribb	.. Philp
.. Denham	.. Redwood
.. Douglas	.. Roberts
.. Forrest	.. Somerset
.. Fox	.. Stodart
.. Grant	.. Swayne
.. Grayson	.. Thorn
.. Gunn	.. Walker
.. Hawthorn	.. White

Tellers: Mr. Grayson and Mr. Walker.

NOES, 27.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Mann
.. Airey	.. May
.. Barber	.. McLachlan
.. Bowman	.. Mitchell
.. Coyne	.. Mulcahy
.. Hamilton	.. Mullan
.. Hardacre	.. Murphy
.. Hunter, J. M.	.. Nevitt
.. Huxham	.. Payne
.. Jenkinson	.. Ryland
.. Kenna	.. Sumner
.. Kerr	.. Winstanley
.. Land	.. Woods
.. Lennon	.. Woods

Tellers: Mr. Hardacre and Mr. Mullan.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Rankin and Mr. Hanran.

Noes—Mr. Jones and Mr. Lesina.

Resolved in the affirmative.

[10.30 p.m.]

#### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

Question—That £70,981 be granted for the "Department of Justice"—put; and the Committee divided:—

In division,

Mr. MURPHY, proceeding to read an extract from a newspaper,

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must ask the hon. member to be silent.

Mr. PAYNE having risen to change his seat,

The CHAIRMAN: Order! It is impossible for the tellers to get the names if hon. members change their seats.

Several Opposition members interjecting that the tellers could not be gagged,

The PREMIER: This is disrespectful to the Chair.

After further interjections from the Opposition,

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must ask hon. members to remember that they are in Committee.

After a long pause,

The HOME SECRETARY: May I raise a point of order—

OPPOSITION MEMBERS (loudly): Order, order, order!

The HOME SECRETARY: I have a right to raise a point of order.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS (shouting): Order, order, order!

The HOME SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Order, order! and uproar.

The HOME SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, I wish to raise a point of order.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Order, order! and continuous uproar.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order! I must ask hon. members to allow the Home Secretary to proceed.

The HOME SECRETARY: I wish to make this point of order.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Order, order, order!

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order! I do not want to take extreme measures with hon. members, but I must be guided by the Standing Orders. The Home Secretary is quite in order.

The HOME SECRETARY: My point of order is this: That I wish to call attention to the fact that one of the tellers for the "Noes" is deliberately wasting time.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Order, order! and renewed uproar.

The CHAIRMAN (loudly): Order, order!

The HOME SECRETARY: I do not think such conduct on the part of the teller is in order. I also wish to state a more contemptible piece of tactics—

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Order, order! and further uproar.

The HOME SECRETARY: I have never seen that since I have been in the House.

The CHAIRMAN: I may tell the hon. member, I have no evidence that any of the tellers are deliberately refusing to do their duty. When I have evidence to that effect I will certainly take action.

Continued uproar.

Mr. LENNON (rising from his seat): I wish to state a point of order.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Order, order, order!

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

Mr. LENNON: Is the Home Secretary in order in insulting the tellers?

AYES, 36.

Mr. Appel	Mr. Hawthorn
" Armstrong	" Herbertson
" Barnes, G. P.	" Hunter, D.
" Barnes, W. H.	" Jackson
" Barton	" Keogh
" Bell	" Kidston
" Brennan	" Mackintosh
" Campbell	" Maxwell
" Cottell	" Moore
" Cowap	" Paget
" Cribb	" Petrie
" Denham	" Philip
" Douglas	" Redwood
" Forrest	" Roberts
" Fox	" Somerset
" Grant	" Stodart
" Grayson	" Swayne
" Gunn	" Thorn

Tellers: Mr. Douglas and Mr. Herbertson.

[Mr. Maughan.

NOES, 27.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Mann
" Airey	" May
" Barber	" McLachlan
" Bowman	" Mitchell
" Coyne	" Mulcahy
" Hamilton	" Mullan
" Hardacre	" Murphy
" Hunter, J. M.	" Nevitt
" Huxham	" Payne
" Jenkinson	" Ryland
" Kenna	" Sumner
" Kerr	" Winstanley
" Land	" Woods
" Lennon	

Tellers: Mr. Adamson and Mr. Land.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Rankin and Mr. Hanran.  
Noes—Mr. Jones and Mr. Lesina.

The CHAIRMAN: "Ayes," 36; "Noes," 27. Question resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. LENNON: I rise to a point of order—

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Order, order, order!

Mr. LENNON: Unlike many old experienced members of this House—

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

The PREMIER: Question, question!

At 10.48 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

THE TREASURER.

Question—That £159,730 be granted for "The Treasurer"—

Mr. LENNON: I want to know—

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Question, question! Order, order!

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

Mr. LENNON (amidst disorder): I ask is the Home Secretary, the pedagogue of this House, in order in insulting the tellers?

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

AYES, 36.

Mr. Appel	Mr. Hawthorn
" Armstrong	" Herbertson
" Barnes, G. P.	" Hunter, D.
" Barnes, W. H.	" Jackson
" Barton	" Keogh
" Bell	" Kidston
" Brennan	" Mackintosh
" Campbell	" Maxwell
" Cottell	" Moore
" Cowap	" Paget
" Cribb	" Petrie
" Denham	" Philip
" Douglas	" Redwood
" Forrest	" Roberts
" Fox	" Somerset
" Grant	" Stodart
" Grayson	" Swayne
" Gunn	" Thorn

Tellers: Mr. Grant and Mr. Gunn.

NOES, 27.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Mann
" Airey	" May
" Barber	" McLachlan
" Bowman	" Mitchell
" Coyne	" Mulcahy
" Hamilton	" Mullan
" Hardacre	" Murphy
" Hunter, J. M.	" Nevitt
" Huxham	" Payne
" Jenkinson	" Ryland
" Kenna	" Sumner
" Kerr	" Winstanley
" Land	" Woods
" Lennon	

Tellers: Mr. Coyne and Mr. Lennon.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Rankin and Mr. Hanran.

Noes—Mr. Jones and Mr. Lesina.

Resolved in the affirmative.

## DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC LANDS.

Question—That £161,901 be granted for the "Department of Public Lands"—put; and the Committee divided—

In division,

Mr. LENNON said he rose to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order.

Mr. LENNON: Yes, in connection with the action of the Home Secretary. He had asked whether the hon. gentleman was in order in insulting the tellers. He would like to have the Chairman's ruling. (After a pause) He asked for experience—Was that proper conduct in that Committee?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! As long as I am Chairman, I will endeavour to do my duty. I have already replied to the Home Secretary, and I think hon. members will agree with me that I could not reply in any other way.

AYES, 36.

Mr. Appel	Mr. Hawthorn
" Armstrong	" Herbertson
" Barnes, G. P.	" Hunter, D.
" Barnes, W. H.	" Jackson
" Barton	" Keogh
" Bell	" Kidston
" Brennan	" Mackintosh
" Campbell	" Maxwell
" Cottell	" Moore
" Cowap	" Paget
" Cribb	" Petrie
" Denham	" Philp
" Douglas	" Redwood
" Forrest	" Roberts
" Fox	" Somerset
" Grant	" Stodart
" Grayson	" Swayne
" Gunn	" Thorn

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

NOES, 27.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Mann
" Airey	" May
" Barber	" McLachlan
" Bowman	" Mitchell
" Coyne	" Mulcahy
" Hamilton	" Mullan
" Hardacre	" Murphy
" Hunter, J. M.	" Nevitt
" Huxham	" Payne
" Jenkinson	" Ryland
" Kenna	" Sumner
" Kerr	" Winstanley
" Land	" Woods
" Lennon	

Tellers: Mr. Barber and Mr. May.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Rankin and Mr. Hanran.

Noes—Mr. Jones and Mr. Lesina.

Resolved in the affirmative.

[11 p.m.]

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND STOCK.

Question—That £43,816 be granted for the "Department of Agriculture and Stock"—put; and the Committee divided—

In division,

On the tellers being called by the CHAIRMAN,

Mr. KENNA said that, with the permission of the Chairman, and considering the reflections cast upon a previous teller, he would like to decline the honour.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The CHAIRMAN: I call upon the hon. member to take his place when he is called.

Mr. KENNA: He did so under strong compulsion.

1908—3 E

Mr. MURPHY: He does so under the gag.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

AYES, 36.

Mr. Appel	Mr. Hawthorn
" Armstrong	" Herbertson
" Barnes, G. P.	" Hunter, D.
" Barnes, W. H.	" Jackson
" Barton	" Keogh
" Bell	" Kidston
" Brennan	" Mackintosh
" Campbell	" Maxwell
" Cottell	" Moore
" Cowap	" Paget
" Cribb	" Petrie
" Denham	" Philp
" Douglas	" Redwood
" Forrest	" Roberts
" Fox	" Somerset
" Grant	" Stodart
" Grayson	" Swayne
" Gunn	" Thorn

Tellers: Mr. Keogh and Mr. Petrie.

NOES, 27.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Mann
" Airey	" May
" Barber	" McLachlan
" Bowman	" Mitchell
" Coyne	" Mulcahy
" Hamilton	" Mullan
" Hardacre	" Murphy
" Hunter, J. M.	" Nevitt
" Huxham	" Payne
" Jenkinson	" Ryland
" Kenna	" Sumner
" Kerr	" Winstanley
" Land	" Woods
" Lennon	

Tellers: Mr. Jenkinson and Mr. Kenna.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Rankin and Mr. Hanran.

Noes—Mr. Jones and Mr. Lesina.

Resolved in the affirmative.

## DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

Question—That the sum of £377,424 be granted for the "Department of Public Instruction"—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 36.

Mr. Appel	Mr. Hawthorn
" Armstrong	" Herbertson
" Barnes, G. P.	" Hunter, D.
" Barnes, W. H.	" Jackson
" Barton	" Keogh
" Bell	" Kidston
" Brennan	" Mackintosh
" Campbell	" Maxwell
" Cottell	" Moore
" Cowap	" Paget
" Cribb	" Petrie
" Denham	" Philp
" Douglas	" Redwood
" Forrest	" Roberts
" Fox	" Somerset
" Grant	" Stodart
" Grayson	" Swayne
" Gunn	" Thorn

Tellers: Mr. Redwood and Mr. Roberts.

NOES, 27.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Mann
" Airey	" May
" Barber	" McLachlan
" Bowman	" Mitchell
" Coyne	" Mulcahy
" Hamilton	" Mullan
" Hardacre	" Murphy
" Hunter, J. M.	" Nevitt
" Huxham	" Payne
" Jenkinson	" Ryland
" Kenna	" Sumner
" Kerr	" Winstanley
" Land	" Woods
" Lennon	

Tellers: Mr. Ryland and Mr. Sumner.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Rankin and Mr. Hanran.

Noes—Mr. Jones and Mr. Lesina.

Resolved in the affirmative.

## DEPARTMENT OF MINES.

Question—That £51,715 be granted for the "Department of Mines"—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 36.	
Mr. Appel	Mr. Hawthorn
.. Armstrong	.. Herbertson
.. Barnes, G. P.	.. Hunter, D.
.. Barnes, W. H.	.. Jackson
.. Barton	.. Keogh
.. Bell	.. Kidston
.. Brennan	.. Mackintosh
.. Campbell	.. Maxwell
.. Cottell	.. Moore
.. Cowap	.. Paget
.. Cribb	.. Petrie
.. Denham	.. Philp
.. Douglas	.. Redwood
.. Forrest	.. Roberts
.. Fox	.. Somerset
.. Grant	.. Stodart
.. Grayson	.. Swayne
.. Gunn	.. Thorn

Tellers: Mr. Barton and Mr. Jackson.

NOES, 27.	
Mr. Adamson	Mr. Mann
.. Airey	.. May
.. Barber	.. McLachlan
.. Bowman	.. Mitchell
.. Coyne	.. Mulcahy
.. Hamilton	.. Mullan
.. Hardacre	.. Murphy
.. Hunter, J. M.	.. Nevitt
.. Huxham	.. Payne
.. Jenkinson	.. Ryland
.. Kenna	.. Sumner
.. Kerr	.. Winstanley
.. Land	.. Woods
.. Lemon	

Tellers: Mr. Murphy and Mr. Winstanley.

## PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Rankin and Mr. Hanran.

Noes—Mr. Jones and Mr. Lesina.

Resolved in the affirmative.

[11.30 p.m.]

## RAILWAYS.

Question—That £1,154,000 be granted for "Railways"—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 36.	
Mr. Appel	Mr. Hawthorn
.. Armstrong	.. Herbertson
.. Barnes, G. P.	.. Hunter, D.
.. Barnes, W. H.	.. Jackson
.. Barton	.. Keogh
.. Bell	.. Kidston
.. Brennan	.. Mackintosh
.. Campbell	.. Maxwell
.. Cottell	.. Moore
.. Cowap	.. Paget
.. Cribb	.. Petrie
.. Denham	.. Philp
.. Douglas	.. Redwood
.. Forrest	.. Roberts
.. Fox	.. Somerset
.. Grant	.. Stodart
.. Grayson	.. Swayne
.. Gunn	.. Thorn

Tellers: Mr. D. Hunter and Mr. Somerset.

NOES, 27.	
Mr. Adamson	Mr. Mann
.. Airey	.. May
.. Barber	.. McLachlan
.. Bowman	.. Mitchell
.. Coyne	.. Mulcahy
.. Hamilton	.. Mullan
.. Hardacre	.. Murphy
.. Hunter, J. M.	.. Nevitt
.. Huxham	.. Payne
.. Jenkinson	.. Ryland
.. Kenna	.. Sumner
.. Kerr	.. Winstanley
.. Land	.. Woods
.. Lennon	

Tellers: Mr. McLachlan and Mr. Nevitt.

## PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Rankin and Mr. Hanran.

Noes—Mr. Jones and Mr. Lesina.

In division,

Mr. MULCAHY: I wish to draw attention to the deliberate waste of time by the tellers for the "Ayes." It is a stonewall. (Opposition laughter.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

After a pause,

Opposition members interjecting, "Woolloongabba," "No—Never," "Hurry up."

Mr. LENNON: It is a terrible waste of time.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! "Ayes," 36; "Noes," 27.

Resolved in the affirmative.

## TRUST AND SPECIAL FUNDS.

Question—That £286,891 be granted for "Trust and Special Funds"—Chief Secretary, Home Secretary, Treasurer, Public Lands, Agriculture and Stock—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 36.	
Mr. Appel	Mr. Hawthorn
.. Armstrong	.. Herbertson
.. Barnes, G. P.	.. Hunter, D.
.. Barnes, W. H.	.. Jackson
.. Barton	.. Keogh
.. Bell	.. Kidston
.. Brennan	.. Mackintosh
.. Campbell	.. Maxwell
.. Cottell	.. Moore
.. Cowap	.. Paget
.. Cribb	.. Petrie
.. Denham	.. Philp
.. Douglas	.. Redwood
.. Forrest	.. Roberts
.. Fox	.. Somerset
.. Grant	.. Stodart
.. Grayson	.. Swayne
.. Gunn	.. Thorn

Tellers: Mr. Cottell and Mr. Thorn.

## NOES, 27.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Mann
.. Airey	.. May
.. Barber	.. McLachlan
.. Bowman	.. Mitchell
.. Coyne	.. Mulcahy
.. Hamilton	.. Mullan
.. Hardacre	.. Murphy
.. Hunter, J. M.	.. Nevitt
.. Huxham	.. Payne
.. Jenkinson	.. Ryland
.. Kenna	.. Sumner
.. Kerr	.. Winstanley
.. Land	.. Woods
.. Lennon	

Tellers: Mr. Hardacre and Mr. J. M. Hunter.

## PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Rankin and Mr. Hanran.

Noes—Mr. Jones and Mr. Lesina.

Resolved in the affirmative.

## LOAN FUND ACCOUNT.

Question—That £1,596,051 be granted from the "Loan Fund Account"—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 34.	
Mr. Appel	Mr. Hawthorn
.. Armstrong	.. Herbertson
.. Barnes, W. H.	.. Hunter, D.
.. Barton	.. Keogh
.. Bell	.. Kidston
.. Brennan	.. Mackintosh
.. Campbell	.. Maxwell
.. Cottell	.. Moore
.. Cowap	.. Paget
.. Cribb	.. Petrie
.. Denham	.. Philp
.. Douglas	.. Redwood
.. Forrest	.. Roberts
.. Fox	.. Somerset
.. Grant	.. Stodart
.. Grayson	.. Swayne
.. Gunn	.. Thorn

Tellers: Mr. Douglas and Mr. Swayne.

## NOES, 25.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. May
„ Airey	„ McLachlan
„ Barber	„ Mitchell
„ Bowman	„ Mulcahy
„ Coyne	„ Mullan
„ Hamilton	„ Murphy
„ Hardacre	„ Nevitt
„ Hunter, J. M.	„ Payne
„ Huxham	„ Ryland
„ Kerr	„ Sumner
„ Land	„ Winstanley
„ Lennon	„ Woods
„ Mann	

Tellers : Mr. Huxham and Mr. Woods.

## PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. G. P. Barnes, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Rankin, and Mr. Hanran.

Noes—Mr. Jenkinson, Mr. Kenna, Mr. Jones, and Mr. Lesina.

Resolved in the affirmative.

[12 p.m.]

## SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1907-1908.

Question—That £180,352 10s. 8d. be granted on account of the “Supplementary Estimates 1907-1908”—put; and the Committee divided :—

## AYES, 34.

Mr. Appel	Mr. Hawthorn
„ Armstrong	„ Herbertson
„ Barnes, W. H.	„ Hunter, D.
„ Barton	„ Keogh
„ Bell	„ Kidston
„ Brennan	„ Mackintosh
„ Campbell	„ Maxwell
„ Cottell	„ Moore
„ Cowap	„ Paget
„ Cribb	„ Petrie
„ Denham	„ Philp
„ Douglas	„ Redwood
„ Forrest	„ Roberts
„ Fox	„ Somerset
„ Grant	„ Stodart
„ Grayson	„ Swayne
„ Gunn	„ Thorn

Tellers : Mr. Cribb and Mr. Grant.

## NOES, 25.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. May
„ Airey	„ McLachlan
„ Barber	„ Mitchell
„ Bowman	„ Mulcahy
„ Coyne	„ Mullan
„ Hamilton	„ Murphy
„ Hardacre	„ Nevitt
„ Hunter, J. M.	„ Payne
„ Huxham	„ Ryland
„ Kerr	„ Sumner
„ Land	„ Winstanley
„ Lennon	„ Woods
„ Mann	

Tellers : Mr. McLachlan and Mr. Nevitt.

## PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. G. P. Barnes, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Rankin, and Mr. Hanran.

Noes—Mr. Jenkinson, Mr. Kenna, Mr. Jones, and Mr. Lesina.

Resolved in the affirmative.

## SUPPLEMENTARY TRUST FUNDS ESTIMATES.

Question—That £18,611 3s. 3d. be granted for “Supplementary Trust Funds Estimates, 1907-1908”—put; and the Committee divided :—

In division,

Mr. MANN rose to a point of order. The Chairman had not stated whether this vote was for His Majesty or for William Kidston.

The CHAIRMAN : Order !

## AYES, 34.

Mr. Appel	Mr. Hawthorn
„ Armstrong	„ Herbertson
„ Barnes, W. H.	„ Hunter, D.
„ Barton	„ Keogh
„ Bell	„ Kidston
„ Brennan	„ Mackintosh
„ Campbell	„ Maxwell
„ Cottell	„ Moore
„ Cowap	„ Paget
„ Cribb	„ Petrie
„ Denham	„ Philp
„ Douglas	„ Redwood
„ Forrest	„ Roberts
„ Fox	„ Somerset
„ Grant	„ Stodart
„ Grayson	„ Swayne
„ Gunn	„ Thorn

Tellers : Mr. Barton and Mr. Cribb.

## NOES, 25.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. May
„ Airey	„ McLachlan
„ Barber	„ Mitchell
„ Bowman	„ Mulcahy
„ Coyne	„ Mullan
„ Hamilton	„ Murphy
„ Hardacre	„ Nevitt
„ Hunter, J. M.	„ Payne
„ Huxham	„ Ryland
„ Kerr	„ Sumner
„ Land	„ Winstanley
„ Lennon	„ Woods
„ Mann	

Tellers : Mr. Huxham and Mr. Murphy.

## PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. G. P. Barnes, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Rankin, and Mr. Hanran.

Noes—Mr. Jenkinson, Mr. Kenna, Mr. Jones, and Mr. Lesina.

Resolved in the affirmative.

## SUPPLEMENTARY LOAN ESTIMATES, No. 2, 1907-1908.

Question—That the sum of £79,384 3s. 8d. be granted for “Supplementary Loan Estimates, No. 2, 1907-1908”—put; and the Committee divided :—

## AYES, 34.

Mr. Appel	Mr. Hawthorn
„ Armstrong	„ Herbertson
„ Barnes, W. H.	„ Hunter, D.
„ Barton	„ Keogh
„ Bell	„ Kidston
„ Brennan	„ Mackintosh
„ Campbell	„ Maxwell
„ Cottell	„ Moore
„ Cowap	„ Paget
„ Cribb	„ Petrie
„ Denham	„ Philp
„ Douglas	„ Redwood
„ Forrest	„ Roberts
„ Fox	„ Somerset
„ Grant	„ Stodart
„ Grayson	„ Swayne
„ Gunn	„ Thorn

Tellers : Mr. Redwood and Mr. Roberts.

## NOES, 25.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. May
„ Airey	„ McLachlan
„ Barber	„ Mitchell
„ Bowman	„ Mulcahy
„ Coyne	„ Mullan
„ Hamilton	„ Murphy
„ Hardacre	„ Nevitt
„ Hunter, J. M.	„ Payne
„ Huxham	„ Ryland
„ Kerr	„ Sumner
„ Land	„ Winstanley
„ Lennon	„ Woods
„ Mann	

Tellers : Mr. Barber and Mr. McLachlan.

## PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. G. P. Barnes, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Rankin, and Mr. Hanran.

Noes—Mr. Jenkinson, Mr. Kenna, Mr. Jones, and Mr. Lesina.

Resolved in the affirmative.

## SUPPLEMENTARY LOAN ESTIMATES, 1908-1909.

Question—That £40,000 be granted for “Supplementary Loan Estimates, 1908-1909”—stated.

Mr. AIREY asked whether these Loan Estimates were included in the motion for the application of the Standing Order?

The CHAIRMAN: These Estimates are included in the motion for the application of Standing Order 136A.

Mr. MANN said he would challenge the Chairman's ruling.

The CHAIRMAN: I gave no ruling. I merely answered a question put to me by the hon. member for South Brisbane.

Mr. MANN said they could debate the Chairman's ruling. They were served this trick last session.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the hon. gentleman be seated?

Question put; and the Committee divided:—

## AYES, 34.

Mr. Appel	Mr. Hawthorn
„ Armstrong	„ Herbertson
„ Barnes, W. H.	„ Hunter, D.
„ Barton	„ Keogh
„ Bell	„ Kidston
„ Brennan	„ Mackintosh
„ Campbell	„ Maxwell
„ Cottell	„ Moore
„ Cowap	„ Paget
„ Cribb	„ Petrie
„ Denham	„ Philp
„ Douglas	„ Redwood
„ Forrest	„ Roberts
„ Fox	„ Somerset
„ Grant	„ Stodart
„ Grayson	„ Swayne
„ Gunn	„ Thorn

Tellers: Mr. Grayson and Mr. Thorn.

## NOES, 25.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. May
„ Airey	„ McLachlan
„ Barber	„ Mitchell
„ Bowman	„ Mulcahy
„ Coyne	„ Mullian
„ Hamilton	„ Murphy
„ Hardacre	„ Nevitt
„ Hunter, J. M.	„ Payne
„ Huxham	„ Ryland
„ Kerr	„ Sumner
„ Land	„ Winstanley
„ Lennon	„ Woods
„ Mann	

Tellers: Mr. Winstanley and Mr. Woods.

## PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. G. P. Barnes, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Rankin, and Mr. Hanran.

Noes—Mr. Jenkinson, Mr. Kenna, Mr. Jones, and Mr. Lesina.

Resolved in the affirmative.

[12 30 a.m.]

The House resumed. The CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee had come to certain resolutions.

The SPEAKER: The question is—That the resolutions be received.

Messrs. HARDACRE and MANN rose together.

Mr. HARDACRE: Mr. Speaker, can I speak—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Question—That the resolutions be received—put; and the House divided:—

## AYES, 34.

Mr. Appel	Mr. Hawthorn
„ Armstrong	„ Herbertson
„ Barnes, W. H.	„ Hunter, D.
„ Barton	„ Keogh
„ Bell	„ Kidston
„ Brennan	„ Mackintosh
„ Campbell	„ Maxwell
„ Cottell	„ Moore
„ Cowap	„ Paget
„ Cribb	„ Petrie
„ Denham	„ Philp
„ Douglas	„ Redwood
„ Forrest	„ Roberts
„ Fox	„ Somerset
„ Grant	„ Stodart
„ Grayson	„ Swayne
„ Gunn	„ Thorn

Tellers: Mr. Cowap and Mr. Grant.

## NOES, 25.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. May
„ Airey	„ McLachlan
„ Barber	„ Mitchell
„ Bowman	„ Mulcahy
„ Coyne	„ Mullian
„ Hamilton	„ Murphy
„ Hardacre	„ Nevitt
„ Hunter, J. M.	„ Payne
„ Huxham	„ Ryland
„ Kerr	„ Sumner
„ Land	„ Winstanley
„ Lennon	„ Woods
„ Mann	

Tellers: Mr. Lennon and Mr. Sumner.

## PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. G. P. Barnes, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Rankin, and Mr. Hanran.

Noes—Mr. Jenkinson, Mr. Kenna, Mr. Jones, and Mr. Lesina.

Resolved in the affirmative.

## RECEPTION OF RESOLUTIONS.

The CLERK read resolutions from the Committee of Supply covering the Departments of Executive and Legislative, Chief Secretary, Home Secretary, Works, Justice, Treasurer, Lands, Agriculture and Stock, Public Instruction, Mines, Railways, expenditure from trust and special funds and from loan fund account, Supplementary Estimates for the year 1907-8, Supplementary Loan Estimates for 1907-8, Supplementary Trust Funds Estimates for the year 1907-8, Supplementary Loan Estimates No. 2 for the year 1907-8, and Supplementary Loan Estimates for the year 1908-9.

Question—That the resolutions be received—put; and the House divided:—

## AYES, 34.

Mr. Appel	Mr. Hawthorn
„ Armstrong	„ Herbertson
„ Barnes, W. H.	„ Hunter, D.
„ Barton	„ Keogh
„ Bell	„ Kidston
„ Brennan	„ Mackintosh
„ Campbell	„ Maxwell
„ Cottell	„ Moore
„ Cowap	„ Paget
„ Cribb	„ Petrie
„ Denham	„ Philp
„ Douglas	„ Redwood
„ Forrest	„ Roberts
„ Fox	„ Somerset
„ Grant	„ Stodart
„ Grayson	„ Swayne
„ Gunn	„ Thorn

Tellers: Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Stodart.

	NOES, 25.	
Mr. Adamson		Mr. May
" Airey		" McLachlan
" Barber		" Mitchell
" Bowman		" Mulcahy
" Coyne		" Mullan
" Hamilton		" Murphy
" Hardacre		" Nevitt
" Hunter, J. M.		" Payne
" Huxham		" Ryland
" Kerr		" Sumner
" Land		" Winstanley
" Lennon		" Woods
" Mann		

Tellers: Mr. Barber and Mr. McLachlan.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. G. P. Barnes, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Rankin, and Mr. Hanran.

Noes—Mr. Jenkinson, Mr. Kenna, Mr. Jones, and Mr. Lesina.

Resolved in the affirmative.

WAYS AND MEANS.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

The TREASURER moved—That the Speaker do now leave the chair, and the House resolve itself into a Committee of Ways and Means.

Question put; and the House divided:—

	AYES, 34.	
Mr. Appel		Mr. Hawthorn
" Armstrong		" Herbertson
" Barnes, W. H.		" Hunter, D.
" Barton		" Keogh
" Bell		" Kidston
" Brennan		" Mackintosh
" Campbell		" Maxwell
" Cottell		" Moore
" Cowap		" Paget
" Cribb		" Petrie
" Denham		" Philp
" Douglas		" Redwood
" Forrest		" Roberts
" Fox		" Somerset
" Grant		" Stodart
" Grayson		" Swayne
" Gunn		" Thorn

Tellers: Mr. D. Hunter and Mr. Redwood.

	NOES, 25.	
Mr. Adamson		Mr. May
" Airey		" McLachlan
" Barber		" Mitchell
" Bowman		" Mulcahy
" Coyne		" Mullan
" Hamilton		" Murphy
" Hardacre		" Nevitt
" Hunter, J. M.		" Payne
" Huxham		" Ryland
" Kerr		" Sumner
" Land		" Winstanley
" Lennon		" Woods
" Mann		

Tellers: Mr. Huxham and Mr. Mulcahy.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. G. P. Barnes, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Rankin, and Mr. Hanran.

Noes—Mr. Jenkinson, Mr. Kenna, Mr. Jones, and Mr. Lesina.

Resolved in the affirmative.

COMMITTEE.

The TREASURER moved that the following sums be granted for the year 1908-9:—£1,579,180 from the consolidated revenue fund, £146,890 6s. 9d. from trust and special funds, £1,136,051 from the loan fund account; and the following supplementary sums for the year 1907-8—£180,352 10s. 8d. from the consolidated revenue fund, £18,611 3s. 3d. from trust and special funds, and £79,384 3s. 8d. from the loan fund account.

[1 a.m.]

Question put; and the Committee divided:—

	AYES, 34.	
Mr. Appel		Mr. Hawthorn
" Armstrong		" Herbertson
" Barnes, W. H.		" Hunter, D.
" Barton		" Keogh
" Bell		" Kidston
" Brennan		" Mackintosh
" Campbell		" Maxwell
" Cottell		" Moore
" Cowap		" Paget
" Cribb		" Petrie
" Denham		" Philp
" Douglas		" Redwood
" Forrest		" Roberts
" Fox		" Somerset
" Grant		" Stodart
" Grayson		" Swayne
" Gunn		" Thorn

Tellers: Mr. Cottell and Mr. Grant.

NOES, 25.

Mr. Adamson		Mr. May
" Airey		" McLachlan
" Barber		" Mitchell
" Bowman		" Mulcahy
" Coyne		" Mullan
" Hamilton		" Murphy
" Hardacre		" Nevitt
" Hunter, J. M.		" Payne
" Huxham		" Ryland
" Kerr		" Sumner
" Land		" Winstanley
" Lennon		" Woods
" Mann		

Tellers: Mr. Hardacre and Mr. McLachlan.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. G. P. Barnes, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Rankin, and Mr. Hanran.

Noes—Mr. Jenkinson, Mr. Kenna, Mr. Jones, and Mr. Lesina.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The TREASURER moved—That the Chairman do now leave the chair, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Question put; and the Committee divided:—

	AYES, 34.	
Mr. Appel		Mr. Hawthorn
" Armstrong		" Herbertson
" Barnes, W. H.		" Hunter, D.
" Barton		" Keogh
" Bell		" Kidston
" Brennan		" Mackintosh
" Campbell		" Maxwell
" Cottell		" Moore
" Cowap		" Paget
" Cribb		" Petrie
" Denham		" Philp
" Douglas		" Redwood
" Forrest		" Roberts
" Fox		" Somerset
" Grant		" Stodart
" Grayson		" Swayne
" Gunn		" Thorn

Tellers: Mr. Moore and Mr. Swayne.

NOES, 25.

Mr. Adamson		Mr. May
" Airey		" McLachlan
" Barber		" Mitchell
" Bowman		" Mulcahy
" Coyne		" Mullan
" Hamilton		" Murphy
" Hardacre		" Nevitt
" Hunter, J. M.		" Payne
" Huxham		" Ryland
" Kerr		" Sumner
" Land		" Winstanley
" Lennon		" Woods
" Mann		

Tellers: Mr. Barber and Mr. Nevitt.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. G. P. Barnes, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Rankin, and Mr. Hanran.

Noes—Mr. Jenkinson, Mr. Kenna, Mr. Jones, and Mr. Lesina.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The House resumed. The CHAIRMAN reported progress, and asked leave to sit again.

The TREASURER: I move that the Committee have leave to sit again on Monday next.

Question put; and the "Noes" called "Divide."

After the division bell had been rung,

The SPEAKER said: The question is that the Committee have leave to sit again on Monday next. As many as are of that opinion say "Aye"; to the contrary, "No."

There being no response of either "Aye" or "No."

The SPEAKER said: I have put the question twice, and there being no response the second time, there is no division.

#### LOAN PROPOSALS, 1908-1909.

The TREASURER presented the loan proposals for the year 1908-9, and moved that the paper be printed and referred to Committee of Ways and Means.

Question put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 34.

Mr. Appel	Mr. Hawthorn
" Armstrong	" Herbertson
" Barnes, W. H.	" Hunter, D.
" Barton	" Keogh
" Bell	" Kidston
" Brennan	" Mackintosh
" Campbell	" Maxwell
" Cottell	" Moore
" Cowap	" Paget
" Cribb	" Petrie
" Denham	" Philp
" Douglas	" Redwood
" Forrest	" Roberts
" Fox	" Somerset
" Grant	" Stodart
" Grayson	" Swayne
" Gunn	" Thorn

Tellers: Mr. Herbertson and Mr. Moore.

NOES, 25.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. May
" Airey	" McLachlan
" Barber	" Mitchell
" Bowman	" Mulcahy
" Coyne	" Mullan
" Hamilton	" Murphy
" Hardacre	" Nevitt
" Hunter, J. M.	" Payne
" Huxham	" Ryland
" Kerr	" Samner
" Land	" Winstanley
" Lennon	" Woods
" Mann	

Tellers: Mr. Hardacre and Mr. Payne.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. C. P. Barnes, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Rankin, and Mr. Hanran.

Noes—Mr. Jenkinson, Mr. Kenna, Mr. Jones, and Mr. Lesina.

Resolved in the affirmative.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER: I move that this House do now adjourn. The first business on Monday will be the resumption of Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. WOODS rose to give notice of a question.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a question before the House. The hon. member cannot give notice of a question when the business of the day is over, except with the permission of the House. He cannot do so unless the Chief Secretary withdraws his motion.

Mr. McLACHLAN: If I may be allowed, I would like to give notice of a question.

The PREMIER: I beg to withdraw the motion. (Hear, hear!)

[1.30 a.m.]

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

[Hon. A. G. C. Hawthorn.]

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS.

Mr. LAND: Mr. Speaker,—During the taking of a division to-night I was one of the tellers.

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the hon. gentleman wish to make a personal explanation?

Mr. LAND: Yes. I was one of the tellers. The Home Secretary accused the tellers of being guilty of wilful delay.

The SPEAKER: Order, order! Unless it is something that concerns the hon. member himself he cannot make an explanation.

Mr. LAND: It does concern myself, as I was one of the tellers. I wish to explain that during the time the count was being taken two of the members shifted in their seats, and when my colleague counted the names and I counted the numbers, I found that there were twenty-seven names, but only twenty-six were ticked off. Consequently we had to go right through the whole count again. Therefore, I say there was no wilful delay, and I think that the Home Secretary should withdraw his remarks.

Mr. MAY: And apologise.

Mr. ADAMSON: Mr. Speaker,—I also wish to make a personal explanation. I was one of the tellers with Mr. Land, and there was no intention of delaying the Committee.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Oh, oh! and loud laughter.

Mr. ADAMSON: I say, as emphatically as I can, that there was no intentional delay.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ADAMSON: What Mr. Land says is perfectly correct. We went through the different numbers and counted that side and then counted this, and when we came to count them again we found that there was a discrepancy, as there were twenty-seven members and only twenty-six were ticked off, and we had to go all through again. I have another explanation to make. This evening I involuntarily moved from my place. I wish to say that I challenge any member to say that while I have been in this Chamber I have been disorderly.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MAXWELL: Sit down.

The SPEAKER: I have allowed the hon. members to proceed with the permission of the House. But the House knows, and the hon. members know, that the House knows nothing of what takes place in Committee. The proper place to deal with it is in Committee.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER: I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BOWMAN, who was received with Opposition cheers, said: Before the House adjourned he wanted to make a very strong protest against the action of the Premier, on behalf of the electors he represented and the party sitting behind him. (Hear, hear!) The action of the Premier to-night was one which was altogether unfair and unjust to thousands of electors throughout the State, whose representatives would not have an opportunity of discussing many of the grievances they wished to have brought up in the House. The action of the Premier was one that would brand him as a politician—

The PREMIER: Is this in order?

Mr. BOWMAN : What had it got to do with the Premier ?

The SPEAKER : Order ! The hon. gentleman cannot discuss the general policy of the Premier on a motion for adjournment.

Mr. BOWMAN : All he could say, in conclusion, was that the action of the Premier—

The PREMIER : This is not the time to say it.

Mr. BOWMAN : He would not ask the Premier when to say it.

Mr. AIREY : It had been the custom that a little allowance should be made on occasions of this kind. They had had a most unprecedented proceeding this evening which would not be forgotten for a number of years. He thought the country should know—

The PREMIER : Is this discussion to be allowed ?

Mr. MURPHY : The Speaker will decide.

The SPEAKER : The hon. member cannot discuss matters of a controversial nature under cover of this motion, unless, of course, he gets the permission of the House. (Hear, hear ! ) Is it the wish of the House that the hon. member be allowed to proceed ?

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS : No.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS : Yes.

The SPEAKER : Order !

Mr. AIREY : Seeing that he spoke with the courtesy of the House, he would commence by saying that it was a fitting thing to end the session—

The PREMIER : Order !

Mr. AIREY : It was a fitting way to end the session, which began with a scandalous betrayal of public confidence—

The PREMIER : Order !

Mr. HAMILTON : You are not the Speaker.

The PREMIER : I will not have it.

Opposition jeering, hooting, and laughter, and cries of "Gagger."

The SPEAKER : Order, order !

Mr. BOWMAN (to the Premier) : You Judas.

The SPEAKER : Order, order ! If hon. members will not obey me when I call for order I shall have to enforce the Standing Orders. The hon. member for Brisbane South, so far as I could see, was giving reasons why we should not adjourn. But the concluding portion of his remarks were distinctly out of order.

Mr. AIREY : He was merely going to say that it was a fitting thing that a session which began in the way this one did should end with such a scandalous proceeding.

The SPEAKER : Order ! The hon. member must only give reasons why the House should not adjourn.

Mr. AIREY : He hoped the House would not adjourn at present for this reason : that seeing the way the business was misconducted—

The SPEAKER : Order ! The hon. member is not in order in saying the business of this House has been misconducted. I ask the hon. member to withdraw that.

Mr. AIREY : He was not talking about the misconduct of the House ; he was talking of the misconduct on the part of the Government.

The SPEAKER : Order ! That is out of order. I desire to give hon. members every reasonable facility to show why the House should not adjourn, and I hope hon. members will assist me by keeping within the bounds of the Standing Orders. I would ask the hon. member to withdraw that statement.

Mr. AIREY : He withdrew it, but he wished to point out the proceedings of the Government might possibly have been justified at the end of a long active session, and they had been met by obstruction in the course of their business. This session had not been long, and it had not been characterised by obstruction to business, but it had been characterised by a deliberate abandonment of all public business. Under those circumstances the action of the Premier in doing what he had done was simply scandalous.

Question again stated.

Mr. MANN objected to the adjournment because it was not safe for hon. members to go outside the Chamber. He was afraid, in the present heat and temper of hon. members on the Government side, they might lay violent hands on hon. members.

The SPEAKER : Order, order ! The hon. member must know he is treating the House in a frivolous manner.

Mr. MANN : The Speaker had not been in the Chamber all the evening. There had been threats hurled across the floor. He was speaking in all seriousness, and in the present heated state it was not advisable to adjourn. It would be better to wait till morning, when hon. members would be able to go home in a more decorous fashion.

The SPEAKER : Order, order ! The question before the House is the adjournment, and the hon. member must treat it in a serious manner. I tell him that I will not allow debate of this kind. If he continues to pursue that attitude I will have to take action.

Mr. MANN : He was speaking in all seriousness.

The SPEAKER : Order, order ! The hon. member is not. I won't allow it.

Mr. MANN : He must admit that the evening he had felt pretty warm. Many charges had been hurled across the Chamber, and hon. members had been threatened with personal violence. He thought it would be very inadvisable to adjourn while hon. members were in such a heated state. There had been very strained relations the whole evening, and it was only through the utmost tact on the part of the Chairman that the proceedings had gone on as well as they had.

The SPEAKER : Order, order ! I trust the hon. member will not proceed on those lines. So far as I am aware, nothing unusual has occurred this evening, and I must insist on serious debate. The matter is irrelevant to the motion before the House, and hon. members must know that they need have no fear of personal violence.

Mr. MANN : Possibly the House would adjourn in a state of harmony if the Home Secretary would be courteous enough to apologise to hon. members.

*Mr. Mann.]*

The SPEAKER: Order, order! I am not concerned about personal quarrels between members.

Mr. MANN: It was only a fair thing for the hon. member to apologise.

Mr. HARDACRE was in favour of the House adjourning for one very important reason. They had just passed, in about four hours, nearly £5,000,000 of public money without the representatives of the people being allowed to discuss those items, and the public outside should have an opportunity to really understand what had been done. A full opportunity should be given for public meetings in the country so that the public might express their opinion.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. HARDACRE: What had been done was practically to abolish representative government.

Mr. KERR contended that there were good reasons why they should not adjourn. The business of the country had been pushed through under the gag and the guillotine, and several matters had to be passed—he drew attention to them on the Address in Reply. He drew attention to certain transactions of the Government with regard to the resumption of a certain piece of land on the river, and in connection with which one hon. member in the House was interested. One hon. member was financially interested in that land, and hon. members had had no opportunity of discussing the question of the purchase of that land.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is out of order. There is no motion before the House under which he can discuss that matter.

Mr. KERR said that he had had no opportunity of bringing the matter up, as they had been gagged. It was one of the greatest scandals that had ever been perpetrated in Queensland.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must know that this procedure on a motion of this kind is entirely out of order.

Mr. KERR said that he would take occasion to bring the matter up on the Appropriation Bill.

Mr. MITCHELL said that he intended to offer reasons why the House should not adjourn. They had a great deal of business to do before the session closed.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have just pointed out to the hon. member for Barcoo that, if the House sits here for twenty-four hours, it is impossible to do any more work just now, as there is no more work on the notice-paper.

Mr. MITCHELL regretted that there was no more business on the paper, because it was desirable to undertake as much business as possible, as their time was so limited. The Government were guilty of neglect in not having some business on the notice-paper.

The SPEAKER: Order! Such a reflection on the Government at this stage is entirely out of order. The hon. member must see that what he is saying is not relevant to the question before the House.

Mr. MITCHELL: There were times when they were called upon to make a stand. He lodged his protest against the adjournment of the House under the circumstances. The manner in which the work of the session had been done did not meet with the acceptance of the House, and it was desirable that they should not adjourn for some considerable time.

[Mr. Mann.

Mr. LENNON rose for the purpose of giving reasons why the House should not adjourn. The Speaker had referred in most felicitous terms to the manner in which the business of the session had been conducted. He said that so far the business had been conducted most amicably, and he (Mr. Lennon) was sure that opinion would find a hearty response in the breast of every hon. member.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member must not put words into the mouth of the Speaker. I did not say what the hon. member has just attributed to me. I said that, on the whole, the relations of hon. members had been amicable.

Mr. LENNON: Perhaps he was overstating the case, but he believed that was what the Speaker meant, although he did not express it in the same words. One reason why the House should not adjourn was that they had been promised a Trade Disputes Bill, an amendment of the Local Authorities Act, and a variety of other Bills. It was only a travesty on representative government, and an insult to the people, that they should swallow the whole thing now, and go about their business without doing anything. They should have an opportunity of criticising the measures mentioned in the Governor's Speech. He thought that they should present a humble petition to His Majesty, and ask him to take away representative government, and let them return to the status of a Crown colony. He said that advisedly after the treatment to which they had been subjected that evening.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member is now referring to something which occurred in Committee. The Speaker and the House are ignorant of all the matters the hon. member is referring to, whether they took place or not. The House has no knowledge of what occurred in Committee unless the Committee present a report to the House.

Mr. LENNON: It was as well that the House had no knowledge of what transpired in Committee, because it was not fit for publication.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LENNON: He sincerely hoped that he would never again have such an experience. He entered his emphatic protest against the scandalous treatment which hon. members had received.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RYLAND protested against the House adjourning at the present time. The leader of the Government wanted to push through an Appropriation Bill with the object of getting all the money he required. He thought he was justified in assuming that there would be no more business done, although they were told at the commencement of the session that there was a lot of important business to do. They did not know when the House would meet again.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is not in order in discussing the question in the manner in which he is doing. He knows that the House will meet on Monday. He is discussing a question which might properly be referred to on the Appropriation Bill.

Mr. RYLAND: Considering what had been done in the House during the last two or three days, representative government had become a farce.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RYLAND: The representatives of the people here were robbed of their rights, and the people outside were insulted.

[2 a.m.]

Question—That this House do now adjourn—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 34.

Mr. Appel	Mr. Hawthorn
„ Armstrong	„ Herbertson
„ Barnes, W. H.	„ Hunter, D.
„ Barton	„ Keogh
„ Bell	„ Kidston
„ Brennan	„ Mackintosh
„ Campbell	„ Maxwell
„ Cottell	„ Moore
„ Cowap	„ Paget
„ Cribb	„ Petrie
„ Deuham	„ Philp
„ Douglas	„ Redwood
„ Forrest	„ Roberts
„ Fox	„ Somerset
„ Grant	„ Stodart
„ Grayson	„ Swayne
„ Gunn	„ Thorn

*Tellers*: Mr. Grayson and Mr. Gunn.

NOES, 23.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. McLachlan
„ Airey	„ Mitchell
„ Barber	„ Mulcahy
„ Bowman	„ Mullan
„ Hamilton	„ Murphy
„ Hunter, J. M.	„ Nevitt
„ Huxham	„ Payne
„ Kerr	„ Ryland
„ Land	„ Sumner
„ Lennon	„ Winstanley
„ Mann	„ Woods
„ May	

*Tellers*: Mr. Mulcahy and Mr. Ryland.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. G. P. Barnes, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Rankin, and Mr. Hanran.

Noes—Mr. Jenkinson, Mr. Kenna, Mr. Jones, and Mr. Estlin.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The House adjourned at eight minutes past 2 o'clock a.m.