

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 21 JULY 1909

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

WEDNESDAY, 21 JULY, 1909

The SPEAKER (Hon. J. T. Bell, *Dalby*) took the chair at half-past 3 o'clock.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

WANT OF CONFIDENCE MOTION—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. JONES (*Burnett*) said: When the adjournment of the House was moved last night by the Premier, he intimated to members on this side of the House especially that the debate should close this week.

The TREASURER: No; he only suggested it.

The PREMIER: I was not so presumptuous as that. I only asked permission.

Mr. JONES: The Premier asked members on this side to curtail their speeches or not to speak at all, as he was anxious to get on with the business of the country. It is rather amusing to hear the hon. gentleman talk about proceeding with the business of the country when we have such a vivid recollection of the Government programme that was introduced last session and there was no business in it; and the question to-day is whether there is any business in the programme that the Government have placed before us this session.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Well, let us get to it.

The TREASURER: Give us a chance, and we will very soon show you.

Mr. JONES: If the Premier was desirous of getting on with the business of the country, why did we have such a long recess? Members were informed the House would meet early this year.

The PREMIER: To give you time to complete your arrangements.

Mr. JONES: We had no arrangements to complete, if the Premier infers that we desired to make an arrangement with any other party. The hon. gentleman contributed a speech of three hours' duration to this debate, which speech is circulating throughout the State—

Mr. MURPHY: At the country's expense.

Mr. JONES: Yes, per medium of all the conservative Press. Our elective position in this House is just as high as that of the Premier. His other position is simply an appointed one; and, as one member representing over 6,000 electors, I intend to discuss questions in this House as they are introduced, irrespective of what the Premier may say. During this debate we have heard the story of the coalition several times. As a member of the Labour party, I am not very much concerned whether the party lately led by the hon. member for Townsville swallowed the party led by the Premier or *vice versa*. We have to deal with the Government as it is at present constituted. Suffice it to say that the coalition, in my opinion, is based on a bad foundation. There was a time only eighteen months ago when the party led by the hon. member for Townsville were willing to support the Labour party in office, without coalescing with them in any way, to defeat the present Premier.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: No.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: We never were.

Mr. JONES: That statement was made by many members of the party led by the hon. member for Townsville.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: It is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: There is no truth in it.

Mr. JONES: I was speaking only this morning to a gentleman who was a member of the party of the hon. member for Townsville at that time, and he distinctly told me that they were willing—so great was their hatred of the Premier and his party—to support the Labour party in office just simply to defeat the Premier.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Just the other way about.

Mr. JONES: I do not say for a moment that the party led by the hon. member for Townsville had any love or any affection for the Labour party; but the point I wish to make is that so great was their hatred of the Premier and his party that they were willing even to support the Labour party in office for the time being to defeat the Premier.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That is not correct.

Mr. JONES: Many of the members of the party led by the hon. member for Townsville who have spoken have taken credit for the democratic legislation passed by this House during the last three or four years. The truth is that they were sitting on this side of the House opposing that democratic legislation, and all the democratic legislation that has been passed under the Premiership of the present leader of the Government has been passed with the assistance of the Labour party.

Mr. MURPHY: The Secretary for Mines cannot deny that.

Mr. JONES: The Premier has repeatedly stated that the Labour party obey the instructions they receive from three men in the Trades Hall, at the *Worker* office. He adduces as proof of that assertion a letter that he wrote to the Parliamentary Labour Party. I do not purpose to read the whole of that letter, as I do not wish to detain the House at any great length, but I will just read a portion of it—

The Conservative party, discredited in the country, have found a last hope in the Legislative Council, and from that entrenchment continue to thwart the wishes and aspirations of the people of Queensland. The time has come when patience ceases to be a virtue, when we are forced to ask ourselves whether we are willing to permit the political prejudices of a few nominees to continue to override the wishes of the elected representatives of the people. This has become the most important question in Queensland politics, and on its satisfactory solution rests the hope of democratic progress in Queensland.

The hon. gentleman continued—

With this object in view, I suggest the following as the basis of an agreement between our respective parties:—

One of the clauses in that suggested basis of agreement reads as follows:—

That, in the event of an appeal to the country becoming necessary to attain the desired end, a joint committee be appointed to manage the election on the following basis:—

- (a) Neither party to contest any of the seats now held by any member of the other.
- (b) Where joint committee puts up a candidate both parties to support him.
- (c) Where joint committee is unable to put up a candidate for some particular seat, and cannot approve of any of the candidates standing, members of both parties to keep out of that contest as far as possible.

That letter was addressed to the hon. the leader

Mr. Jones.]

of the Parliamentary Labour party, Mr. Bowman, and in it the Premier desired the Parliamentary Labour party to agree to do certain things which they were powerless to do. The party replied courteously to the Premier, and submitted his letter to a joint meeting of the Parliamentary Labour party and the Central Political Executive. But that does not say that we have to go to three men at the *Worker* office for instructions before we can deal with any legislation in this Chamber. It is a well-known fact that Labour members in this Assembly are responsible to the electors they represent, and that when they present themselves for election it is for the electors to say whether they shall be candidates or not.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: Doesn't the hon. member mean the organisations, not the electors?

Mr. JONES: The Minister for Works knows that he is responsible to the electors of Kennedy. A number of electors must nominate him for a seat in this House before he can become a candidate, and it is the same with members on this side of the House. The only difference is that members on the other side of the House have to go to their electorates and seek a certain number of persons to nominate them, whereas we, who are better organised, wait until a number of electors recognise that we have the ability to represent them and are worthy of a seat in this Chamber.

THE SPEAKER: Order! I should like the hon. member to keep before him the precise question before the House, which is an amendment expressing want of confidence in the Government. That is the question he should discuss.

Mr. JONES: Yes, but the Premier has made a certain statement, and I am desirous that it should not go to the country unchallenged.

A LABOUR MEMBER: The Premier wandered all over the shop.

Mr. JONES: Members of the present Government and their supporters, Ministers particularly, have stated repeatedly, on the platform and through the Press, that the policy of the Government is land settlement, railway construction, and immigration. With those three subjects I purpose dealing briefly this evening. That has been the boasted policy of all past Governments—in fact, it is the natural policy of the State—a policy with which we all agree, despite the untruths of our opponents. We all know that land settlement is the most important factor in connection with the prosperity of the State. There are very many large areas of land, good agricultural land, distant many miles from a railway, and settlement cannot take place there without railway construction. Land settlement is the natural corollary of railway construction, and in my humble opinion, railways, especially in agricultural districts, should precede land settlement. No matter what Government is in power, they ought to make that a principle of their policy. In the earlier pioneering days of this State, many agriculturists desiring to settle on land had to go out many miles from a railway in order to get the land they required. I know settlers in the Burnett district who selected land 50 and 60 miles away from a railway terminus. How could you expect men who had to cart their produce so many miles to a railway to succeed on the land?

[*Mr. Jones.*

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Were they compelled to go 50 and 60 miles away?

Mr. JONES: Certainly they were compelled to go 50 and 60 miles away, because Government in the past had locked up the best agricultural lands within a reasonable distance of railway communication. I can quote one case in point. The railway was extended from Kilkivan into the Burnett district. The terminus of that railway is now Kingaroy. Before a selector could settle in that district he had to travel very nearly 50 miles through freehold property, which means that the Government had to build a railway for 50 miles through freehold property in order to develop Crown lands. That country contains the best land in the Burnett district, and it is not being put to its best use even at the present time. Where there ought to be many happy farmers' homes, there are only a few bullocks to the acre. There is such a demand for land in Queensland to-day that I think railway construction and land settlement should be simultaneous. The present Secretary for Railways, the Secretary for Public Lands, and the Speaker, who have all travelled over the Burnett lands, will, I think, bear me out when I say that district contains some of the finest agricultural land to be found in the State.

THE SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: In the southern part.

Mr. JONES: Yes; and there is no railway within many miles of that good agricultural land. The whole of that country would be selected if it were opened up by railways.

THE SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Let us get to work on them.

Mr. JONES: The Minister for Railways belongs to a party—the party led by the senior member for Townsville—which kept that district back for many years by extending the leases of pastoral lands.

Mr. HAMILTON: They are doing that everywhere.

Mr. RYLAND: And no restrictions as to prickly pear.

Mr. JONES: Yes; and, as I am reminded by the hon. member for Gympie, no restrictions are imposed in regard to prickly pear. The Secretary for Public Lands, in referring to the Upper Burnett lands a few days ago, stated that he had travelled through many miles of that country, and it was absolutely clean—that there was no prickly pear on it.

THE SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: There was no prickly pear on it.

Mr. JONES: They made a week's inspection of the Upper Burnett lands. I made a three weeks' inspection at the same time. I rode across country on horseback, and I had a previous knowledge of the district, and had a much better opportunity of viewing the lands than they, because they travelled on the soft cushion seat of a buggy. To see the country properly, you need to cross it on horseback.

THE SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I was in the saddle for many, many hours.

Mr. JONES: I do the hon. member an injustice. He did ride across country on horseback—to his sorrow, I believe.

THE SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Oh, no! I'm just as used to it as you are.

Mr. JONES: This is rather an important matter in regard to the Upper Burnett lands. Had the party gone a little further they

would have come into a large area of good agricultural country, which is infested with prickly pear, and is in such a state that it needs dealing with at once.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Where?

Mr. JONES: That is from Gayndah right up on the southern side of the Burnett River and right across to the Auburn and Boyne Rivers.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I was up through that country.

Mr. JONES: Up as far as Redbank Station there are about 100 miles of prickly pear infested country, and it is in such a state that unless it is dealt with immediately it will be absolutely useless for many years to come. In fact, I think it will be ruined altogether. The Minister for Railways interjected a short time ago, "Why don't you let us deal with it?" It should have been dealt with very many years ago. These leases have been extended to the pastoral lessees. It is good agricultural country, and, as I stated before, there are no restrictions in regard to the prickly pear, which is, after all, the worst form of land monopoly. One form of land monopoly has given way to another and worse form. We agree with these three very important questions—a vigorous land settlement policy, a vigorous railway policy, and immigration. I say I agree with the three—I am speaking for myself—but our methods differ greatly. It was stated last night by the hon. member for Warwick that the two parties who contested the last election—the party led by the hon. member for Townsville, and the party led by the Premier—that their policies were very nearly the same, and that therefore they were quite justified in coalescing. Were we to judge their policy by the titles of Bills introduced into this Chamber and the speeches of hon. members, our policy is the same also with regard to land settlement and railway construction. We, as a party, have never opposed land settlement. We have never opposed railway construction, except syndicate railways.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: You do not believe in freeholds.

Mr. MANN: Neither does the hon. gentleman.

Mr. JONES: I will deal with that matter directly. As regards the policy of past Governments in regard to railway construction, in 1899 there were 2,800 miles of railway open, and at the end of 1907 there were only 3,197 miles of railway open. That is in eight years an advance in railway construction, under the Philp Administration particularly, of only 397 miles—an average of 49 miles per year. Those are very small figures in a vast area of good agricultural land like we have in Queensland.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: That was not all under the Philp Administration. You are forgetting your dates.

Mr. JONES: The continuous Government at the end of 1907—

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: No.

Mr. JONES: I am not particularly dealing with the Philp Administration.

The TREASURER: Give us facts.

Mr. JONES: These are facts. No past Government has dealt with railway construction as the State of Queensland deserves—as it merits. The Morgan Government even did not do their duty in that direction, and I say no Government will do their duty in that

1909—x

direction unless it is a Labour Government, that will go in for a system of land settlement and land value taxation. Those figures prove that past Governments have not done their duty in regard to railway construction. They have encouraged land monopoly, and kept back railway construction to agricultural districts, which has retarded settlement. The system of land settlement for the past few years has not been successful. I never did agree with the system adopted by any previous Governments. As you, Sir, are aware, I have always honestly and openly been opposed to the land agency system and the group system. I am very pleased to see that the private land agency system has been discontinued. I do not agree with the hon. member for Fassfern, when he stated in this House a few days ago that under the private land agency system there was a very satisfactory feeling throughout the country.

Mr. MANN: No, he said there was bigger business.

Mr. JONES: I think you will find they have not been doing greater business, but if they were doing larger business the system led to corruption.

Mr. MANN: Eliminate the bad points.

Mr. JONES: In the Speech from the Throne it is pointed out—I am speaking from memory—that the system would lead to abuses.

The TREASURER: Could lead.

Mr. JONES: Could lead to abuses, and I say the abuses have been there for many years. I know of one instance where twenty-two persons representing themselves as intending selectors from New South Wales, came into the Burnett district. Their fares were paid from Brisbane to Gayndah, guides were provided for them, and trucks for their horses, and not one of those persons has selected land either in the Burnett district or in any other part of Queensland. They came just for a holiday. I had rather a sorry experience myself with one person who represented himself as an intending selector from New South Wales. He came to my house armed with a letter of introduction, and asked me to show him through the country. I had, as I said, a sorry experience with him, and the next I heard of him was that he was in gaol here in Brisbane for embezzlement.

The TREASURER: Nice company you keep.

Mr. JONES: No, I keep just as good company as the Treasurer. Perhaps I was taken down, as the Treasurer has probably been taken down in his time, and will be taken down again.

The TREASURER: Quite possible.

Mr. JONES: I am only giving that instance to show that the abuses and the corruption were there. This man travelled up on a pass from the Lands Office, and took me down for a £5 note.

The TREASURER: How can you avoid that?

Mr. JONES: They are avoiding it now by making intending selectors prove their *bona fides*, and adopting the old system that, if they select, their fares are re-

[4 p.m.] funded to them. That could have been done in the past. Now I do not think we have yet arrived at the solution of the difficulty with regard to land settlement. There is a great demand for land to-day, and that demand cannot be complied with. The Labour method of settling

Mr. Jones.]

people on the land is cheap land, and a just distribution of the land by limiting the area that shall be held by any one person. New Zealand has enacted that it is unlawful for any person to acquire an interest in any land beyond a total of 5,000 acres, but this limit applies only to third-class land. The limit for second-class land is 2,000 acres, and for first-class land 640 acres. Hence that country has committed itself to a closer settlement policy, and some of the other States of the Commonwealth have committed themselves to a closer settlement policy. The senior member for Toowoomba, in his speech the other night, advocated cheaper land, and there was an outbreak of laughter on the other side of the House, but he is not the only gentleman that advocated cheap land.

Mr. LENNON: We all advocate it.

Mr. JONES: The price of land in Queensland is too high, notwithstanding the fact, which I am well aware of, that people from the Southern States, who are driven out of their own States by an unjust system of land settlement and land monopoly, consider that land in Queensland is cheap.

Mr. KEOGH: And then you are going to put taxation on the top of that.

Mr. JONES: I will deal with land value taxation presently. If we are desirous of peopling the country and settling our lands, we must cheapen our lands so as to allow the people to get into the agricultural districts and utilise our lands to the best possible advantage. I would like to quote from the speech of the hon. member for Nundah on this subject the other night. He said—

In Queensland there are between 18,000,000 and 19,000,000 acres alienated, and a little over 500,000 acres under cultivation.

It does not follow that the land is not utilised unless it is under cultivation, I would remind the hon. member, because there is some land in Queensland that is not adapted for agriculture. It is dairying land, and it may be utilised although it is not under cultivation.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Although it is not under the plough.

Mr. JONES: Although it is not under the plough. We have areas of land in Queensland that is not adapted for agriculture, but if we are to give the people cheap land, I think we must alter the tenure. You, Sir, more than once, and in one speech I remember in this Chamber, said—and it is a very sound principle—that if Queensland were starting over again you would not be willing to sell one acre of land.

LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. JONES: So the Labour party is not the only party that subscribes to that doctrine—we are not the only party who believe that it is unwise for this State to sell our best lands, or to sell land at all. I represent a large agricultural district, and I have never shirked my duty with regard to land value taxation. You made that statement on more than one occasion, Sir, and I heartily agree with it. I think if it is wrong to sell one acre of land because a few acres have been sold, then it is equally as wrong to perpetuate the evil.

Mr. KEOGH: What are you going in for—leasehold for ninety years, or what?

Mr. JONES: An eminent barrister pointed out that there was very little difference between the tenure under the perpetual lease system and a freehold tenure. Any govern-

[Mr. Jones.

ment, it is well known, if they sell land, and allow a freehold tenure, reserve to themselves the right of taxation, and the tenure is equally as secure under the perpetual lease system as under freehold tenure. I am reminded by the hon. member for Herbert that the Mount Morgan Company have surrendered their freehold, and leased the areas. Some of the most valuable mines in Gympie and Charters Towers are held under leasehold tenure—not perpetual lease, but a lease for twenty-one years only. If people are industrious, and utilising the land to the best of their ability, no Government would be harsh enough to turn them off the land. I am opposed to freehold tenure, because it will lead, in the future, as it has led in the past, to land monopoly. We can never prevent land monopoly unless we alter the system of land tenure, or adopt the New Zealand plan, and where land is sold limit the area which one individual may hold. Now, there have been many suggestions in this Chamber regarding land settlement. I believe that landless people should have priority, but our system in the past has been to give priority and preference to those in other States, and people from oversea. The present Government are doing that. It is more difficult for a native-born Queenslander to get an area of land to-day than it is for a person from England or Germany. I am not opposed to German immigrants coming here getting the very best treatment. I think that we Queenslanders should hold out the hand of friendship and good fellowship to the people coming from across the seas, so long as they are white people; and we should give them equal opportunity with our own people when they do come here, but we should not give them preference at the expense of those natives who are the sons of the old pioneers of this State.

Mr. KEOGH: I am with you there. (Laughter.)

Mr. JONES: Then why are you sitting over there?

Mr. KEOGH: Because we are prepared to do that.

Mr. JONES: I do not want any misunderstanding of what I say. I think that the Germans who have come here as immigrants are industrious people, and I think they have done as much to settle our lands as any other class. But in all fairness to them—and I do not think they will expect any more from us—we should give them the same opportunity as we give to the people in this State. There are many systems of land tenure in this State. The hon. member for Warrego objected to the tender system for one.

Mr. COYNE: It is the worst system in the world.

Mr. JONES: The auction system is a little better, but not much better. All our systems of land tenure go to encourage the man who has got the money, and it leads to land speculation in a very large degree.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: Land boom.

Mr. JONES: Many people in Queensland take up land simply for land speculation. My suggestion is that the system of land tenure should be altered. The landless people should get the priority. An inquiry should be made into the applicants for land, and those who are *bona fide* wishing to be settlers and are desiring of putting the land to the best use would then have an opportunity of getting on the land. I have known men engaged in business in Melbourne—they are publicans—

selecting land in the Burnett district, and the local people would have been glad to have had an opportunity of taking up that land if they had been allowed to. One form of tenure which I would do away with altogether is the unconditional form of selection. (Hear, hear!) We have three duties to perform in connection with our system of land settlement. If we are going to give priority at all our first duty is to give priority to the landless people, and they should be the sons of our own people, who are already here. Our second duty should be towards the people coming from the other Australian States, and then our third duty should be to the people coming from oversea.

Mr. KEOGH: I believe that the present Minister is doing all that you wish now.

Mr. JONES: We know that the success of the country depends on a vigorous land settlement, and on a vigorous railway policy, and any Government would be wise to adopt the principle of railways to precede settlement.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Do you know what is proceeding in the Burnett district at the present time?

Mr. JONES: If the Minister had been in the Chamber a little while ago he would have heard what I said about the Burnett district.

Mr. KEOGH: You were very good on that.

Mr. JONES: The hon. gentleman would have heard me deal with my own district with regard to land settlement.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Is it not progressing satisfactorily in your district?

Mr. JONES: I am dealing with the whole State of Queensland just now, although I am only a district member.

Mr. COYNE: You are not parochial?

Mr. JONES: No. I know that there are some injustices in my own district, and I will mention one, so that the Minister can have an opportunity of contradicting it if he wishes. While I know the Minister is desirous of settling the Upper Burnett district by means of closer settlement—agricultural settlement and grazing selection—I ask him is it not true that he was applied to to have a certain area of land thrown open into certain areas for small grazing farms, and quite recently he leased the whole of this in one block of 60 square miles?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: What area is that you refer to? In what locality is it?

Mr. JONES: On Back Creek. The hon. member has been up there. I make the statement, and the hon. member can contradict if he wishes. The people up there wanted him to open it into small areas, but he leased it in one block of 60 square miles.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Without referring to the papers, I can give it a distinct denial. I have no recollection of it.

Mr. JONES: Probably it has not come under the Minister's notice. I make the statement and give the Minister an opportunity to deny if he wishes, and if my statement is not correct then I will be manly enough to withdraw it in the House. (Hear, hear!) I do not want to do an injustice to any hon. member. I am informed, however, that such is the case, and I believe it is true.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Where is Back Creek?

Mr. JONES: Between Eidsvold and Rawbelle.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I do not know it.

Mr. JONES: The man who applied for it in small areas was Sheridan, and it was leased in one lot to another person.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Probably it was given to him as an occupation license pending railway development.

Mr. JONES: I am not sure of that.

Mr. COYNE: There should not be any occupation licenses granted where people are willing to take up selections.

Mr. JONES: The remark of the Minister reminds me that the Lands Department are not doing a very wise thing just now. In the Upper Burnett they have many miles of good grazing land which is not revenue producing at the present time. It has been held back pending railway construction. It is not being used and the Government are not getting any revenue from it at all.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Is it under the control of the Lands Department?

Mr. JONES: Yes; it is under the control of the Lands Department.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Is it under occupation license?

Mr. JONES: No. If the hon. gentleman had gone further on his trip he would have seen it. He would have been able to hear of these injustices, and he would also have seen some prickly pear. If we have a proper land policy more people will come oversea to our shores. He who says that there are sufficient people in Australia at the present time is only fit for a certain institution and not this institution. We are not against immigrants coming here at all, but we are against the present method adopted by the Government. We want to make the conditions of life here much better so that we can increase our prosperity—our boasted prosperity—and then very many more people will come here.

Mr. KEOGH: What inducements are you holding out to them to come here?

Mr. MANN: Cheap land.

Mr. JONES: We want to hold out the inducement that our lands are available for them when they come here; that they can get cheap land here, and that there is work for them to do when they come.

Mr. KEOGH: Cannot they do that now?

Mr. JONES: Under such a system a steady flow of people would come and they could be encouraged if our primary and secondary industries were encouraged much more than they are to-day. Reference is made in the Speech from the Throne to the "judicious method of advertising in the old country—in England." Other members have quoted from extracts about the advertising in England and I do not want to read through the whole lot again. Young ladies are being induced to come out here because they are told that there are more "Jacks" than "Jills" here, that matrimony is a very simple thing here, that there are large squatters and landholders waiting to get married, and it is pointed out to them that they are merely units themselves in a country where marriage facilities are not so great.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You know that the males exceed the females in Queensland?

Mr. Jones.]

Mr. JONES: But when they come out here they find that all the best men are married. (Loud laughter.) I do not wish to offend the bachelors of the House, but we will probably introduce a bachelors' tax by and by.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: What about the young Australians?

Mr. JONES: There are a number of our young men who are not married.

Mr. KEOGH: But they ought to be. (Laughter.)

Mr. JONES: Yes, but the conditions do not allow them to get married. Work is too scarce; wages are too low; and they do not get a fair share of the product of their labour. The Agent-General, Sir Horace Tozer, contributes to a very large advertising medium at home, from which I intend to quote. It has a bearing on the district which I represent. He says—

"From the point of view of the immigrant, the possibilities of land selection in Queensland are particularly attractive." . . . The immigrant from this side knows exactly what he is going to get, and what is going to happen to him when he gets there. Then there is this to be remembered: Queensland has any amount of good land still unalienated which the Government are able to offer to new settlers. The extension of one branch railway inland from Gayndah opened up no less than 9,000,000 acres of agricultural land. This is all within the rain belt. Drought does not affect the coastal areas. . . . There is no season of the year in which the farmer may not work; there are all the conditions ensuring prosperity for the prudent agriculturist. . . . There is no climate to surpass that of Southern Queensland, and the conditions of life are as free and easy as possible.

Mr. GRAYSON: Is not that true?

Mr. KEOGH: Quite true.

Mr. JONES: It is not quite true that the railway is extended from Gayndah 90 miles, and that 9,000,000 acres of land have been made available for settlement. Part of it is true; it would be hard to write so many untruths to the square inch as this article by Sir Horace Tozer contains. If an intending selector goes to the Gayndah land agent, and asks if there are 9,000,000 acres of agricultural land available, he will wonder whether he is insane or not. I doubt whether there is 1,000 acres available and open for selection to-day.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: In the Burnett district there are 291,720 acres designed and being designed.

Mr. MANN: And it will be two years yet before it is ready.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: If the House permits, I can give the full list at once for the information of hon. members.

Mr. JONES: I gained a little of that information from the department this morning. It is not a question of what the Government are going to do. Now the Government are on their deathbed, they are making themselves busy furnishing this Chamber with a lot of figures we cannot prove—we do not know whether they are correct or not.

Mr. MULCAHY: Do you believe in death-bed repentance?

Mr. JONES: It would be unfair for me not to point out that there may be a typographical error here—"to" Gayndah instead of "from" Gayndah—and I should be sorry to take advantage of Sir Horace Tozer or anyone else on that which may be an error. I say, however, that area of land does not exist in the

Burnett district; for I believe the total area of the Burnett district is 8,500,000 acres. Sir Horace Tozer goes on to say—

It may be of interest to show how the new settler can go about his business. . . . The State farms give him his experience for next to nothing, and his little bit of capital will secure him all he requires in the way of land, labour, and stock.

Will the Secretary for Public Lands inform me how many acres are available for selection within a reasonable distance of the Biggenden State Farm or any other State farm, and whether a new selector could go to the State farm and gain the experience he would require to enable him to work his selection? It would take him two days to get to the State farm from the land now being designed.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You cannot have a State farm adjoining every selection.

Mr. JONES: There are too many of them now. He says further—

In addition to Crown lands there are many large private estates now being cut up and offered to the agriculturist and dairyman. Let us take the case of a would-be dairyman on one well-known estate only 50 miles from the metropolis. He is a young man with say, £3,000 to invest. He takes 500 acres at £6 per acre—£3,000. He deposits £30 on signing the agreement, and pays the same amount in annual instalments, with interest at 5 per cent. It costs him, for his house and labourers' quarters, £250; fencing and subdividing, £150; clearing 100 acres and preparing for cultivation, £200; horses, implements, and traps, £100; 150 cows at £6 per head, £900; two bulls at £20 each, £40; total, £1,790. From his 150 cows he has 100 always in milk, at the rate of 200 gallons per day, which means 6,000 gallons per month, at 4s. per gallon, or £112 per month, which means £1,350 a year. Count increase in stock at the rate of 13 per year, £100; deduct £100 for wages, and a sure income of £1,080 is the result.

The Agent-General costs the State £1,500 a year in salary besides the upkeep of his office, and he circulates this through a large advertising medium in Great Britain.

Mr. KEOGH: Who is the expert in this matter?

Mr. JONES: Sir Horace Tozer.

Mr. KEOGH: He knows nothing at all about it.

Mr. JONES: Judging by what he has written, he knows nothing about it. I am not here to represent the capitalist, but I say it is not fair even to a young man with a capital of £3,000 that he should be induced to come here by a report like this, in which he is practically told that all he has to do is to squat on the land and there is a sure income of £1,080 annually for him. Is this a judicious method of advertising? I am a native of the State and of the Burnett district, and I am not so unpatriotic as to decry my native State; but I say that in inducing people to come here we can well afford to tell the truth about this grand country of ours. (Hear, hear!) Its resources are great; it has vast potentialities; and the least we can do is to tell the truth. If we do that, and if the land is made available and the conditions of life are made better, we shall find that people will come here, and the country will be populated as it ought to be. But people are led astray by glowing accounts which are not true. Many of the people in the cities of England do not understand dairying. As the Premier said, many of them would not know one end of a cow from the other; and they will swallow these statements more readily than an Australian would. I say it is not right to induce them to come here to compete with others for work when there is not suffi-

[Mr. Jones.

cient work for them. In a small place like Degilbo, in my electorate, I saw no less than thirteen swagmen in one day; and it would take a lot to make me believe that the whole of them were unemployable or would not work. But what can they expect when they go to legislators in this Chamber who offer them 7s. 6d. a week—who sit on the opposite side of the House?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Does your party offer that?

MR. JONES: The hon. member for Cambooya admitted that he offered that.

THE TREASURER: No; he said the man offered to take 7s. 6d. a week.

MR. JONES: I am sorry if I am doing the hon. member an injustice. The statement was made in the Pittsworth paper and was read in this Chamber; and there is only one man's word against another after all. We know that wages are low in this State. We [4.30 p.m.] know that there are men carrying what is vulgarly known as the curse of Queensland in two saddle-straps on their backs. When thirteen big able-bodied men seeking work camp in a little place like Degilbo in one night, do you mean to tell me that there is sufficient work for the people who are already here?

MR. WHITE: There are some men making £5 a week on farms.

MR. WOODS: None from you.

MR. WHITE: They are not making it from you, any way.

MR. JONES: If we cheapen our land, and give assistance by widening the foundations of the Agricultural Bank, a great many of those people who are now seeking work—some of them married men—will settle on our lands and become primary producers. That is, if the middle men will not rob them. Is it fair to entice a lot of people here when the conditions are not as bright as people try to make out in this Chamber? When they land here, their first feeling is one of disappointment, and, when a man arrives in a new country and his first feeling is disappointment, that is a downward step. He does not place any reliance on any statement he may hear even from the people here. I have a letter in my hand from a man who came here as an immigrant three or four years ago, and who settled on land which was provided for him. I know the man well. He is a total abstainer, and is an industrious, hard-working man. He said—

I am quite sure that you will not be disappointed at the result of my labours. Any of the following would suit me, viz.:—Estate agency, insurance agent, commercial traveller, storekeeper, shopman, advertising agent, timekeeper, coachman, carter, ploughman, or tallying stores and loading, etc., etc. I am experienced in all these. I may say that, even if there is a job about the House as messenger or something like that, I would be glad to have it.

MR. KEOGH: He is a bit of a wonder, that man. (Laughter.)

MR. JONES: Yes, he is a good man. His handwriting will show that he is an educated man, and yet he is willing to take any position, high or low, and is ready either to wield the pick or the pen. When good men are seeking positions, and cannot get work, what is the use of enticing others to come here unless land is made available? The country is good enough; our natural resources are great; we have a country rich in agricultural possibilities and in mineral wealth; and, if we develop and encourage our primary and

secondary industries, we can then talk about bringing more people here. In the five years ending 1901 the Philp Government spent £130,057 on immigration. To prove that the money spent on State-aided immigration was not very successful, the population during the ten years ending in 1901 only increased by 42,726 persons, including the natural increase. The population in 1891 was 321,431, and in 1901 it was only 363,157. The result is not satisfactory, and it never will be until we encourage our primary and secondary industries. The hon. member for Clermont, in a very brilliant speech last night, devoted a great deal of time to the question of land taxation. I rather object to the term "land taxation." I like to apply the term "land value taxation"——

MR. LESINA: Hear, hear!

MR. JONES: Because it gives the impression that we on this side of the House, who advocate a land tax, are desirous of taxing acres, and not land values.

MR. WHITE: You are qualifying now.

MR. JONES: I am not qualifying at all. If the hon. member would only study our platform, and read up the speeches of different members on land taxation, he would know that we advocate land value taxation.

MR. COYNE: If he did that, he would not be on that side of the House.

MR. JONES: The hon. member for Cunningham stated that he was opposed to land value taxation because the people on the land are already heavily taxed.

MR. GRAYSON: So they are.

MR. JONES: Thus, by inference, the hon. member accused this party, or the people who advocate land value taxation——

MR. GRAYSON: No; I did not accuse your party.

MR. JONES: Of being advocates of an additional tax on the people who are engaged in the agricultural industry. That is not so. The hon. member for Cunningham made use of this argument, "I contend there is no class in Queensland more heavily taxed than the farmer."

MR. GRAYSON: That is quite true.

MR. JONES: He might well have added, "While the city landowner gets off scot-free."

MR. GRAYSON: The city landowner is heavily taxed, too.

MR. LESINA: No; but he will be if we get a chance.

MR. GRAYSON: I hope you will not get it yet.

MR. JONES: The junior member for Mackay stated——

If we cannot stop you from securing freehold, as soon as we can we will impose a land tax which will be equivalent to confiscation.

MR. GRAYSON: Quite right.

MR. WHITE: Hear, hear!

MR. JONES: The hon. member for Musgrave says "Hear, hear!" to that statement. I do not know how he accuses this party of confiscation. The hon. member for Clermont lent a little colour to that view, if I am right in my reading of the hon. member's speech as reported in the *Courier*—which I am rather sorry for.

MR. LESINA: No; that is opposed to land taxation.

Mr. Jones.]

Mr. JONES: The hon. member is reported to have said that he agreed with a land tax of 3d. in the £1. That was his basis.

Mr. GRAYSON: And up to 1s. in the £1.

Mr. JONES: And that we were desirous of introducing a land tax.

Mr. LESINA: About £500,000 a year.

Mr. JONES: The hon. member is reported as having said that we were desirous of introducing a land tax to get back the land from those who have already purchased it. If the hon. member had stated that a land tax was justified on the ground that it would prevent further land monopoly, or that it would break up the large estates that are held privately, I agree with him entirely.

Mr. MAXWELL: Why, there is a difference in the camp!

Mr. JONES: There is no difference of opinion. A land value tax is quite sound in principle. The hon. member for Clermont is not the only member of the Labour party who is courageous enough, either in this House or in the country, to advocate land value taxation.

Mr. MANN: He has no farmers in his electorate.

Mr. AIREY: There are some grazing farmers.

Mr. JONES: The hon. member for Cairns agrees with a land tax.

Mr. MANN: Yes, I agree with it now.

Mr. JONES: Well, say it straight out, so that *Hansard* may record it. (Laughter.)

Mr. MANN: I have never been afraid to announce that I am an advocate of it.

Mr. JONES: I have been returned on three different occasions for the Burnett, which is a rather important constituency—

Mr. COYNE: And yet there's more to follow.

Mr. JONES: I hope so. I have never ceased to advocate land value taxation. I was returned on the first occasion advocating an alteration in our land tenure, and advocating land value taxation; and the statement made by one hon. member by interjection when the hon. member for Clermont was speaking, "You go into the farming districts and see how they will accept land value taxation," does not make me afraid.

The SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member will keep before him the fact that it is the demerits of the Government that are now under consideration—an amendment expressing want of confidence in the Government.

Mr. JONES: Yes, Sir. I give the same reason for my references to the subject as the hon. member for Clermont gave last night for pursuing his argument in favour of land value taxation.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member should establish a connection between his remarks and the question before the House.

Mr. JONES: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I should like to see the Government replaced by a Government which will introduce land value taxation in its proper form. I am always willing to bow to your ruling, Sir, and hope I always shall be; but the hon. member for Mackay and the hon. member for Cunningham both discussed this question, though probably not as lengthily as I am doing, and I think I may be permitted to put before this Chamber, and possibly before my electors—

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Oh, oh! and laughter.

[*Mr. Jones*

Mr. JONES: My opinion with regard to land value taxation. The statement has been made that farmers do not approve of a tax on land values, but I contend that wherever land value taxation has been properly and rightly explained to farmers they have accepted it. I know they have accepted it very heartily in the Burnett district, and that they are eager that it should come. The proof of that statement is to be found in the fact that I got 75 per cent. of the farming vote in the Burnett district, notwithstanding that I advocated land value taxation. I hold that the principle is a sound and good one, and I am not going to alter my principles for the sake of a seat in this Chamber. I would rather go outside and advocate the principle of land value taxation as an ordinary citizen than retain my seat by giving up the principle.

Mr. MULLAN: Educate the people up to it.

Mr. JONES: The farmers of my electorate do not need very much education in regard to this matter. Again, I say this party do not suggest land value taxation as additional taxation. Our opponents tell the people in the country, whom they allude to as "the backbone of the country," that we want to tax the people off the land. The hon. member for Cunningham made that statement, but did not attempt to justify his opposition to land value taxation. Neither of the members I have mentioned, nor any other hon. member opposite, has given one solid reason why we should not introduce land value taxation. Land value taxation is certainly sound in principle as a revenue producing system of direct taxation. It will prevent land monopoly, and, above all, it will encourage the utilisation of land. One of the worst forms of selection—a form which the present Government agree with—is unconditional selection, under which men take up scrub land, do nothing with it, but wait for the industrious selector or the State to enhance the value of that land, and then reap the benefit of that enhancement in value. Many of those scrub selections are in consequence breeding grounds for all the pests and vermin of the State. I maintain that it is a sound principle that if the expenditure of public money enhances the value of land, some of that enhanced value should come back to the State. The hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba has been twitted with being associated—I do not know how far the association goes—with the party who advocate land value taxation. Let me call attention to the views of Mr. Tolmie, a former member for Drayton and Toowoomba, for whom every member of this House entertains a very high respect.

Mr. MANN: The Premier said he would not give a penny for his support.

Mr. JONES: Mr. Tolmie, speaking in this House in 1905, made use of these words, which will be found on page 621 of *Hansard* for that year—

The time must inevitably come when it will be necessary to introduce a land tax in Queensland. A land tax is amongst the revenue proposals of almost every country, and Queensland must inevitably come under the same conditions.

I am trying now to prove that members of this party are not the only men who approve of that form of direct taxation. Your predecessor, Sir, the late Mr. John Leahy, also expressed similar views, as will be found by referring to *Hansard* for 1905, page 422. He said—

There is no possible get away from the fact that in the near future there must be a land tax. It is no argument to say that the great bulk of our land is not sold. The same arguments were advanced in South

Australia and Victoria and New Zealand. Although in the last two colonies a greater proportion of the land is sold than in Queensland, the same principle applies, and we will have to consider a land tax in the near future. I certainly think such a tax should be imposed in such a manner that it will fall upon those who can bear it best.

There you have the opinion of two gentlemen who have never been members of the Labour party, but who agree with the principle of land value taxation, and have expressed their opinions in no uncertain manner in this Chamber; and I dare say there are members now sitting on the Government side of the House who recognise that land value taxation is inevitable. That great state-man of the old country who has passed away, the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, in a speech at West Calder, said—

In my opinion, if it is known to be for the welfare of the community at large, the Legislature is perfectly entitled to buy out the landed proprietors. . . . Those persons who possess large portions of the earth's space are not altogether in the same position as the possessors of mere personality. Personality does not impose limitations on the action and the industry of man and the well-being of the community as possession of land does, and, therefore, I freely own that compulsory expropriation is admissible, and even sound in principle.

The present Secretary for Public Works at one time advocated a land tax. Does he advocate it now? I should like the hon. gentleman to declare himself on this matter. The Labour party do not advocate land value taxation as an additional tax. We wish to encourage the agriculturist and all those who are engaged in our primary industries, and we have an exemption of £300. That exemption has been fixed by the party, not because they think it is not right to tax landowners, but simply because they desire to encourage the struggling farmers and those engaged in primary industries. The Federal Labour party introduced land taxation with a very high exemption. That proposal, however, I shall not deal with on the present occasion. At the time of the last election the Sydney *Bulletin* published a very able article, in which they dealt very effectively with the proposed Federal land tax. The opponents of that tax were trying to prove that a man in Queensland with 400 acres of land, valued at £400, would be taxed under that proposal to the extent of £30 a year, and the *Bulletin* showed very clearly the fallacy of that statement. I say again, we do not advocate land value taxation as additional taxation. We are paying land taxes now in the shape of rates to shire councils, but with a land tax settlers will have better roads and more bridges. Some members have complained of the withdrawal of endowment to local authorities. If we had land value taxation, we could treat the local authorities more liberally than we can do at the present time, and they would also be compensated by getting more railways and better roads and bridges.

Mr. THORN: Who is going to pay for the railways?

Mr. JONES: The whole of the landowners and taxpayers, because the city owner of a 16-perch allotment, which is very valuable, with his rackrenting, should pay more than the person in the country who has 360 acres, which he is utilising for production of food. Under the exemption, the man who has a small holding and who is engaged in the farming industry would not be taxed. If the system favoured by the Labour party were adopted, it would be a very fortunate man indeed who would have land valued so high that he would be burdened with the imposition of a land tax. Although hon. members

opposite do not agree with this, they are not slow to accept a great deal of State socialism—they want State railways to carry their produce.

Mr. GRAYSON: They pay for the carriage of their produce.

Mr. JONES: When any legislation in this Chamber, which we term socialistic, benefits Downs constituencies and Downs representatives, they are not slow to accept it. If there is an agitation for a State store or granary, it is from the Downs people.

Mr. GRAYSON: They pay for it—they pay interest on the cost.

Mr. JONES: Then, when it is proposed to establish a State battery or a State metallurgical office for the benefit of the miners, they are the very first to jump up in this Chamber and oppose assistance being given to miners.

Mr. GRAYSON: I have never opposed assistance to miners.

Mr. JONES: I have a little table here which shows the wages paid and the fares charged under a corporation and those under private companies. This is in one city of Traws, Darwin. They are as follows:—

WAGES.

Drivers—3s., corporation; 32s., private company.
Conductors—28s. 8d., corporation; 18s. to 21s., private company.
Inspectors—25s., corporation; 25s. to 27s., private company.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: What has that to do with the question?

Mr. JONES: This shows the benefits of State socialism—

Hours—72, corporation; 105, private company.
Fares—2½d., corporation; 3d., private company.

COMPARISON.

Wages—Where the company pays £100, the corporation pays £166.
Fares—Where the company charges £100, the corporation charges £85.

That proves the wisdom of this party in opposing the Government at the time they did, and that is how I wish to connect the matter with the no-confidence motion—that this party opposed the party led by the Premier when he introduced what we believed, and what I firmly believe to-day, to be syndicate railways.

Mr. COYNE: There is no question about it.

Mr. JONES: The Premier said he could go no further with the Labour party—that we had left him, and that he did not leave us. That statement, which shows that where the trams are municipalised they can pay higher wages and charge less to the passengers in the way of fares, proves that it is a wise thing for this State to still keep control of the railways, and allow no more railways to be built under the system of private enterprise. The hon. member for Warwick, in dealing with the prickly pear question, gave a great deal of credit to Senator McColl for his report. This is a very important subject, as you know, Sir. I remember you travelling in one district—and I am one of those who commend you for doing so—travelling in one district where you saw one solitary bunch of prickly pear. Some hon. members, who do not know what the effects of pear growth in that district were, may laugh about it—you jumped off your horse, gathered a few sticks of wood and set alight to the pear, recognising the danger to that district if that one bunch were allowed to grow and spread all over the district, which it very quickly would have done. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. Jones.]

I remember in the town of Gayndah, where I was born, I could jump over the highest prickly pear bush there when I was a lad, but now you would need a balloon to get over it.

Mr. KENNA: A man in America has been living on prickly pear.

Mr. KEOGH: Your speech in Gayndah was the most disgraceful ever made in Queensland.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. COYNE: I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. member for Rosewood in order in charging the hon. member for Burnett with making a disgraceful speech?

The SPEAKER: The hon. member is certainly not in order, and I should like to say that the hon. member's knowledge of parliamentary procedure must point out to him that he is quite out of order in continually interjecting when another hon. member is speaking.

Mr. JONES: I was dealing with the prickly pear question, and this is an opportune time, because the Government recognise that this has become a national question. I do not believe, with Senator McColl, that it will become a blessing. A gentleman speaking on the Downs the other day stated that there was only between 3 per cent. and 5 per cent. of fibre in the prickly pear, and therefore it could not be profitably used in the manufacture of paper, and those who have had any experience in using prickly pear as a fodder for stock have not had a very happy experience. The hon. member for Warwick eulogised the Agricultural Department for getting certain reports by Senator McColl from America. If we are to believe it—and I have never yet seen it controverted—a letter appeared in the *Courier* dated 19th June, in regard to prickly pear, signed by Mr. A. T. Clerk. You will see there that that gentleman, two and a-half years ago, supplied the then Minister for Lands, Hon. D. F. Denham, with the very information that Senator McColl has collected from America.

Mr. KENNA: Do you mean to say you believe in the *Courier*?

Mr. JONES: I am not making any statement about the *Courier* at all. I am not dealing with the policy of the paper—I am dealing with a letter which appeared in the open column, and I am going to read it to this Chamber, although it may take five minutes. It reads as follows:—

Sir,—In your issue of Saturday the 19th I noticed a sub-leader as well as reading matter copied from Senator McColl's report to the Queensland Agricultural Department, on the subject of prickly pear. Now, sir, in all common justice to myself I have been for the last eight years making a study of pear and its probable usages, and since 1905 have been endeavouring to find out if the same can be turned to some usage purposes. Having a son residing in America I have been getting the most exhaustive reports of all and every experiment made by the United States Department of Agriculture Bureau of Animal and Plant Industry, B. T. Galloway (Chief of Bureau of Plant Industry), A. D. Melvin (Chief of Bureau of Animal Industry), W. J. Spillman (Agriculturist in Charge of Farm Management Investigations), Mr. Alexander Sinclair, of San Antonio, Mr. William Sinclair, and Mr. T. A. Coleman. These exhaustive reports I have been getting right up to 1908. No officer in this State has taken the same interest in the matter as I have done or come to the same trouble to get all the information possible from the other side of the world. The present Minister for Lands (Hon. D. F. Denham) some two and a-half months ago asked me for the reports, and still has them. But to-day, sir, we are startled by a most glowing account and report in all the newspapers of the wonderful uses to which pear can be put, the infor-

mation being gathered expressly for the Agricultural Department by Senator McColl. I wish to point out that the greater and most important part of the report is contained in the reports I have been getting from 1905 to 1908, and had the Queensland Agricultural Department done its duty to the State in such an important matter as this it would have been in possession of the same documents as I have. Perhaps it does possess them, but has not sufficient interest in the matter to peruse them. As soon as I get the reports from the Minister for Lands I will place them in your hands, as they may be of some interest. In them you will see photos, of the very two cows Senator McColl speaks of as well as store bullocks being fed and fattened on chopped pear, the pear being sugred and catt feeding on it, pear being chopped up for use, photos, of the simple machinery, pear being planted for food purposes, and photos of the fruit being sold in the streets. I think there were in all some twenty-six photos, taken. It is a pity Senator McColl did not try to induce some of the wealthy Americans to come over to Queensland and clear off the land that which is to-day Queensland's greatest curse and blot.—I am, sir, etc.

That proves that the hon. member for Warwick was not quite correct in his statement last night, when he gave all the credit to Senator McColl for furnishing the department with these reports, when the Minister for Lands was supplied with the [5 p.m.] same reports two and a-half years ago. I would repeat, while dealing

with the pear question, that it is a very important one; much of our land is going to ruin, and I hope that whatever Government is in power will take some steps to eradicate that pest. I do not believe it is a blessing, or that it will be turned into use; but, if it ever does turn out to be a blessing, I think there will be a good many plants left in Queensland from which they can grow fodder. There is one very important matter I wish to deal with regarding prickly pear and the administration of the Lands Department. The Lands Department have issued notices of forfeiture to those who have selected under agricultural selection, giving them sixty days' notice to clear the pear. It has the effect, in case of applicants for concessions for wire netting in another branch of the department, and applicants for assistance from the Agricultural Bank, after the loans have been approved and they have paid the inspection fee of £3 and the fee for registration of mortgage—that their orders which were supplied to them by the Agricultural Bank have been dishonoured, not through the fault or the bad administration of the Agricultural Bank, but because the Lands Department have issued notices of forfeiture to these holders who happen to have a few prickly pear bushes growing on the land. I think they should encourage men who have taken up prickly pear selections.

Mr. THORN: Let them stop on there and not clear it?

Mr. JONES: No; but the man who has taken up 320 acres does not take it up to allow it to be overrun with prickly pear. Many of the selectors must clear the prickly pear in their leisure time, many of them clear it at night, if they secure other work; but they will not be able to do so, because the Lands Department harass the people on the land.

The TREASURER: That is a condition on which they took it up.

Mr. JONES: That is a regulation which has been enacted since, which I am referring to. They get a notice that, if in sixty days they do not clear it, they forfeit their holding.

Mr. MANN: The Treasurer does not know.

Mr. JONES: A man does not take up a small area of land to allow it to become

[Mr. Jones.

infested with prickly pear. This interferes with another department: I know of one case where a loan has been granted, and the mortgage been ready for registration, and the Agricultural Bank has had to dishonour the order because of this notice of forfeiture. They say that they cannot register a mortgage on a selection which is liable to forfeiture. Whose fault is it that it is pear infested? The past Government, led by the hon. member for Townsville, leased all this land, and now the agriculturist who is endeavouring to put that land to the best use is being burdened with the mistakes of a previous Administration, which allowed the leaseholders to monopolise good agricultural land until it became infested with prickly pear. I believe there was a deputation the other day on the same question, asking the Lands Department to show more leniency towards those who have taken up the prickly pear selections. The Lands Department have very many reserves which are badly infested with prickly pear to-day. Surely we, in our wisdom, could adopt some system of allowing that land to be put to use, with the proviso that the prickly pear must be taken off it. While the Lands Department are harassing the small farmer with regard to prickly pear conditions they are keeping reserves of their own thickly infested.

Mr. THORN: They are not harassing them at all; they are helping them all they require.

Mr. JONES: I would suggest to this Chamber—and I think no one, Sir, knows the evil of prickly pear more than yourself—that the Lands Department, in connection with prickly pear country, and especially that big area in the Upper Burnett district, should run a railway through it. You used the same argument when the Mount Debatable Estate was before this House for repurchase, and I agreed with you at the time. It was that the estate should be repurchased and put under close settlement, because it was becoming badly infested with prickly pear. One of the best things we can do is to run a railway in the Upper Burnett district, and allow selectors to take up that land on a long lease—say, for twenty-one years, with no rental at all, but with a restriction that they clear it of prickly pear.

Mr. THORN: Is not that just what the Government are doing?

Mr. JONES: The present Government are charging more for prickly pear land than Governments in the past days have charged for clean land. We want cheap land, and I do not think we are likely to get it from the party sitting opposite, especially from the party which is now dominated largely by the hon. member for Townsville.

Mr. KENNA: What about getting the land free on perpetual lease?

Mr. JONES: Yes, that is a clause in one of the Land Acts, but it has only been in operation in one particular part of the Dalby electorate. The senior member for Ipswich announced a policy in this Chamber last week—a policy which has been advocated for years by this party. The senior member for Toowoomba is not the only one who has advocated cheap land. If we are to judge the leaders of the different parties by their speeches, it cannot be said that there is very much difference in the policy, as they appear on paper, of the three parties in the House.

Mr. KENNA: That is in the paper policy?

Mr. JONES: Yes. The policy introduced by the Government to-day is a democratic policy, if we are to judge it by its title; but our experience has been, in the case of the Old-age Pensions Bill and the Mining or Private Property Bill, that it was only a policy which looks well on paper; that there is no business in it, but only snares and delusions when we come to consider it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Did you not support them for a long time after?

Mr. JONES: The policy announced by the senior member for Ipswich is simply a copy of a part of the Labour platform. That is the policy which we have been advocating for years.

Mr. KEOGH: Why not support the present Administration then? (Laughter.)

Mr. KENNA: It wants support badly.

Mr. BLAIR: It is on its last legs.

Mr. JONES: The Labour party have sound principles and high ideals. Our policy is formulated in the best possible manner, and the people of Queensland would be wise to adopt a straight-out Labour policy; and I think, if they get the opportunity, and an election eventuates out of the present crisis, they will do so. Our policy is not a one-man policy, but is formulated in the broadest possible manner. We will not allow one man to dominate us. We know that members opposite have to accept the policy of the Premier.

Mr. MANN: No; the *Courier*.

Mr. JONES: I am making the speech, thank you. (Laughter.) The members opposite have to accept the policy of one man, but the policy which the Labour party ask the people of Queensland to accept is formulated in the broadest possible manner at a properly constituted convention. We do not bow to the leader of our party. We all have the greatest respect for our leader, Mr. Bowman; he knows that, but we do not bow to our leader or the chairman of our party. The hon. member for Barcoo knows that was so when he was the leader of the party. We do not follow men; we follow principles. Personally, I have nothing but the greatest admiration for the leader of our party, but still I say that we are here to follow principles and not men. If we had followed any man—if the party had followed any leader—we would now be sitting on the other side of the House following the leader of the Government. We follow only the policy which was formulated in the broadest possible way that we could get it. No member who has spoken yet has alluded to the timber industry. I do not know if the Government are doing their duty with regard to that industry, which I consider is a great industry. We want to pay more attention to reforestation. Although Queensland is so much larger than Victoria, yet in Victoria they have three times the area reserved for timber that we have in Queensland. (Hear, hear!) The Minister for Lands, speaking in reply to a deputation, said that he would not allow timber to be sold without competition. There was a regulation which in the past allowed timber to be sold without competition, but I quite agree with the present Minister that that should not be so. The fact remains that we must pay some attention to our timber industry. If we are not careful, that industry will in the future receive a great blow, and a number of men will be injured by it. I understand that they can land Manchurian pine, and pine from Siberia, in Melbourne much cheaper than we

Mr. Jones.]

can land pine from Kingaroy at the mills in Brisbane. They can bring it over thousands of miles at less cost than it takes us to bring it a few miles.

Mr. KENNA: It is brought over in tramp steamers.

Mr. JONES: The timber-getter should receive more consideration than he does. He lives a hard life; he makes his own roads—in many cases he has to make all his own roads through the scrubs—he follows a dangerous occupation, and yet we charge him right up to the hilt. In cutting timber the mills always allow under 6 inches, but the Railway Department charges right up to the very inch. A reasonable request to ask is that the timber-getters only be asked to pay the railage on the timber that they are paid for by the mill.

Mr. GRAYSON: The wages are higher in Queensland than in Siberia.

Mr. JONES: That is so, and probably the small wages paid in the other countries has something to do with it, and probably it is the fault of the tariff. The Railway Department gets a large revenue and does not give the timber-getter any concession whatever, or very little concession. I think they might reduce the fares and freights and encourage that industry a little more than they have done; and the Government should pay some attention to our forests. There is one question I want to deal with, and that is the mining industry. I was drawn off the track by members interjecting, otherwise I intended to confine my remarks to one hour. The mining industry is an important one, and it does not receive the assistance it deserves. It is the second industry in Queensland, and, in times of drought, hon. members know that it has stood by this State. (Hear, hear!) We will probably get a drought again, but what encouragement do the *bonâ fide* miners get from this Government?

Mr. MULCAHY: None at all.

Mr. LESINA: They are starving Gympie.

Mr. JONES: We had deputation after deputation when we were helping the Premier to pass democratic legislation, and we had promises that certain sums would be placed on the Estimates, but how much did we get? We had, as Minister for Mines, the hon. member for Albert, who is now Home Secretary, and he scarcely knew a shaft from a winze. (Labour laughter.)

Hon. R. PHILP: How much did the previous Minister know?

Mr. JONES: He knew more than that.

Hon. R. PHILP: I do not think so.

Mr. JONES: I do not think that the previous Minister for Mines, the senior member for Ipswich, did attend to his duty in that matter; but probably he was outvoted in the Cabinet by our bad system of Cabinet government. A body of men meet in secret, and they say that they will deal with the mining industry.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Doesn't your party meet in secret?

Mr. LESINA: No.

Mr. JONES: All parties meet in secret; but the only difference is that we have minutes taken of our meetings, but the Government does not have any minutes taken at their meetings.

The TREASURER: How do you know?

Mr. JONES: We have official records made at our meetings, which we are not ashamed

[Mr. Jones.

to publish in the whole of the Press of the country; but the hon. gentlemen do not keep any minutes of their caucus meetings.

Mr. MULLAN: It does not matter much, because we have heard all their caucus secrets.

Mr. JONES: The Home Secretary is in his place now. I say that when he was Minister for Mines he did not do his duty as the head of that department. The first speech he made in this House he said he was a State socialist, and it will be found in the records of *Hansard*.

The HOME SECRETARY: Does he deny that?

Mr. JONES: Yes; he denied it down at Beenleigh. Speaking at Beenleigh, he said, "We must put all our energies and revive our forces," or words like that, "to fight the Socialist party." And yet he says he is a State socialist.

The HOME SECRETARY: State socialism and socialism are two different things absolutely. (Labour laughter.)

Mr. JONES: We have yet to learn that. The hon. gentleman is not well learned on the subject. Now we have a change in the Ministry and we have the hon. member for Kennedy as Minister for Mines. Now, we remember the hon. gentleman, when he was a private member, advocated State batteries for this State.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member is quite wrong there.

Mr. JONES: Did you never advocate State batteries?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: No.

Mr. RYLAND: Only a State battery of his own. (Labour laughter.)

Mr. JONES: I think I have a recollection of the hon. member advocating it.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: You are quite wrong.

Mr. BARBER: He moved an amendment on it once.

Mr. JONES: The Home Secretary was a State socialist, but he would not give us a State battery. Is that not a form of State socialism? (Opposition laughter.) The leader of the Independent Opposition, when the Mount Perry people applied to the Government, was Minister for Mines. They applied for a State battery in a field where there is a quantity of metal.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: The Cabinet was against him.

Mr. JONES: The Mount Perry applicants guaranteed a certain quantity of stone, and interest on the cost of the construction of the battery, which was £1,500; and the application was refused. Why do not these State socialists, when they get into the Cabinet, try to be true to their principles, and give miners or farmers a little of that State socialism which they advocated as private members? I am pleased that the late Minister for Mines has been removed from that department. Personally, I have the greatest respect for him; but I think he was out of place as Minister for Mines—I do not think he knew sufficient about the industry. I have here a circular showing where a company applied to the Minister for a grant, and the Minister refused the grant. They wanted a Government geologist sent to report on their mine; and their motive in applying for the grant was that they might get the services of the geologist. The geologist was sent to report either in favour or against a grant being made; and the company expected him to give a report to

guide them as to the future working of the mine. That is how our finances are being used—in the interests of companies, not *bonâ fide* miners. The Minister told the deputation that they would get further exemption if they applied. Now, I would ask whether the Minister can grant exemption over the head of the warden—whether he can override the Mining Act? Under the Act a month's notice has to be given, and a court has to be held; and objections, if any, have to be heard. The Minister for Mines said it would be all right—he would give the exemption when it came before him. Are we going to have that sort of administration in the Mines Department? I say that the sooner a Government which administers its department in that way is put out of office the better.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Will the hon. member give the name of the company?

Mr. JONES: Yes; I am a member of the company myself. It is the Mount Shamrock Mines, Limited. I opposed, and will, if opportunity offers, go to the next court to oppose, the exemption. If they are not going to work it, they should throw it up, and let *bonâ fide* miners work it.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Does the hon. member say the Minister overrode the warden?

Mr. JONES: He promised he would grant exemption.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: But did he do it?

Mr. JONES: He is out of office. The hon. member for Kennedy will do it, I suppose. There is a lot of political influence at work, and a lot of the shareholders are in this and the other Chamber. I was one of the original shareholders, and what I have in it I had to work very hard for. We supported the Mining Machinery Advances Act. Has that been of any use to the miner and prospector? I believe only two advances have been made so far—one of £1,000 and the other of £1,450—at the instance of the hon. member for Charters Towers, Mr. Winstanley. Is that the proper way to assist this great industry? We asked the Premier to place £50,000 on the Estimates for the purpose of assisting the industry, and he asked for suggestions in connection with the matter. The mining members made certain suggestions, but he did not adopt any one of them. In my opinion we should establish State batteries and State metallurgical works. A miner here has no place to treat his ore; he is at the mercy of the Southern works and the works oversea carried on by private enterprise. The department does not even assay his ore, so that he will know its value before it leaves the State. I am not going to take up the time of the House on the mining industry at any great length, because I have dealt with the subject on more than one occasion. I am longing to see the industry better assisted than it has been in the past, and I think a Government could be formed even out of this Chamber that would do it. Here is another instance of the administration of the Mines Department. I have known one application for a grant being made, and the applicant stated that he had a payable reef; and the assistance asked for was refused on the ground that they did not require it, as the reef was payable. The other day there was an application from Cania, and it was refused because the reef was not payable. Is not that quibbling? No

miner can see a pick's point in front of him, and whenever they have *bonâ fide* applications they should assist the industry. It would have the effect of opening up and developing new fields, and the benefit to the State in the shape of revenue would be very great. The present political situation is due, in my opinion, to the present system of government by Cabinet. Our present system encourages intrigue and corruption, and also maladministration. These lightning changes in the Cabinet—while I am desirous of seeing another change—are not conducive to good administration. Ministers go to an electorate and promise a railway or some other concession to the district; then they come here and through the treachery probably of one man they are put out of office or sent to other departments, and people have to go to the same trouble of deputationising and banqueting another Minister and exacting from him the same promise.

Several members interjecting,

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. JONES: As I said before, these lightning changes are not conducive to good administration. Another thing, there is too much personality indulged in. I [5.30 p.m.] have tried not to be personal; but I think too few members recognise the responsibility that we have taken on our shoulders. I think, generally speaking, that most men, no matter to what party we belong, and though our methods may differ, are actuated by the desire to serve their country. I hope that is the feeling. I know that is what prompted me to come into this Chamber to represent the very important electorate of the Burnett. With respect to the political harmony that should prevail in this Chamber—not to say that members are unfriendly when they meet outside—there have been charges of intrigue; and men have been charged with going about the street with portfolios in their pockets.

Mr. RYLAND: The hon. member for Townsville.

Mr. JONES: Charges have also been made about promises of railways being made. The present Government have approved of the construction of a railway in the Burnett district—a railway which has been agitated for for years and years, and which was promised by the hon. member for Townsville, when he was leader of the Government. We have been told that the hon. member is responsible for the railway going to Nanango. Now, I take a little credit myself for that railway. I have persistently advocated the linking up of the line from Kingaroy to Blackbutt and on to the Darling Downs, thus building up a centre in the Lower Burnett—a district rich in agricultural land and timber—which will be equal to the city of Toowoomba if that linking up is only done.

Mr. GRAYSON: It must be done.

Mr. JONES: The people of the district need not be afraid of a betterment tax, or of the tax under the Railways Act of 1906—which is a form of land taxation, I might remind hon. members, they have supported in the past. I have persistently advocated railway construction in that district. What I say to the Government is this: There have been charges of bribery in the way of railway promises. For the present Secretary for Railways I have the greatest regard. I think he is one of the most approachable gentlemen who have ever occupied a seat on the front Treasury bench, although I do not agree with him politically; and I can honestly say that I have never been

Mr. Jones.]

approached and asked for a vote, or for any support, in return for the railway that has been tabled from Kingaroy to Nanango. I have always held the opinion that railways should be constructed purely on the merits of the respective districts, and that experts should decide the route. I do not think that a member of Parliament should say that a railway should go across Sandy Creek or Billy-goat Gully, overriding the opinion of the engineers and surveyors, who are paid for the purpose of deciding as to the best route. All we can reasonably be expected to do is to point out in this Chamber that we represent large agricultural areas which are deserving of railway construction, and leave the decision as to the route to the experts. The late lamented Mr. J. D. Campbell, when Secretary for Railways, expressed himself in that way, and I believe the present Secretary for Public Lands did the same. I never was approached with regard to the railway; but I will say that I have never known another Government which introduced a railway policy at the beginning of a session. That is usually left to the end of the session. I believe it is unprecedented in the history of Queensland for railways to be brought in at the opening of a session.

Mr. MANN: And the railways passed last session are not started yet.

Mr. JONES: One is put in an awkward position of having to vote against a Government that on the same day introduces a railway proposal in his district. That was my position the other day, and I unhesitatingly voted against the Government. Am I to be accused now of voting against that railway? I understand all railways are submitted on their merits, based on the broad ground of expert opinion, and are non-party.

Mr. GRANT: That is not what is said by members on your side, is it?

Mr. JONES: Neither the Minister nor any member has approached me in regard to my support for that railway. Hon. members always know where to find me, and they surely do not expect me—and if the people of my district expect me to sacrifice my principles for a railway, although they are desirable, and I am pleased to advocate the extensions, they are very much mistaken. I think we have very much higher motives even than railway construction in coming into this Chamber. Now, all these charges have been made against the present Government, and to restore political harmony we need to alter the system of government altogether and have elective Ministries. The hon. member for Bowen has made a speech dealing with this question, and I do not want to repeat his remarks. It has been ably dealt with. In this Chamber a private member does not have the power of initiative that he should have. If we introduce a Bill on private members' day, it is talked out. If we introduce any measure on any other day, the Government say, "The member for So-and-so is taking the business of the country out of our hands, and we will not allow him to do so." The power of initiative is confined simply to the Cabinet, who sit in secret conclave and formulate their policy, and we are told to take it or leave it. Now, I think we should elect the Ministers in this Chamber on the Swiss system; and if we adopted the Swiss system, Ministers would not be allowed to carry on any private business. In Switzerland they are not allowed to engage in large businesses.

Mr. RYLAND: The butter industry.

[*Mr. Jones*

Mr. JONES: Without casting any reflection at all upon members of the Ministry, we have two members of the Ministry who are the two greatest middlemen in Queensland.

Mr. RYLAND: Hear, hear! Barnes Brothers.

Mr. JONES: Is it not only human nature to expect that they will shape legislation in their own direction? I remember when the Dairy Bill was passed—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I thought we had no say in that at all.

Mr. JONES: I am dealing with the system of government. I am only taking this as an illustration, and not by way of disrespect to any hon. gentleman. The present Secretary for Public Lands introduced the Dairy Bill, and it was stipulated in the Bill that a poor little dairy inspector getting £120 a year should not own one share in a dairy factory. He could hardly own a cow or a share in a cow, and yet the Minister who introduced and was to administer the measure can be the largest shareholder in the factories of Queensland. Where is the consistency in that?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The Act was well administered, too.

Mr. JONES: I think there should be a certain amount of honesty in politics. When a Bill is introduced, the fate of the Government should not hinge on the passage of that Bill. The Government may introduce five or six measures. The first introduced may be a twopenny-half-penny, unimportant little thing which is not acceptable to hon. members, while the other five may all be of great importance and acceptable to the House. When the unimportant measure is introduced, if the Premier thinks that it is not acceptable to the majority of hon. members, he immediately says, "The fate of the Government hinges on this measure. I regard it as a party measure, and I am going to dissolve Parliament or resign if it is not carried." That is our present system of Government. In Switzerland, if a measure is defeated, it is put aside—thrown into the waste-paper basket—and Ministers go on with the next item on their programme. That is as it should be. The fate of the Government there does not hang upon one particular measure, and the people have greater powers. Under the system of referendum, if a Bill is passed, it does not immediately become law. It receives ninety days' grace, and if within that time a certain percentage of the people object to it, it is held in abeyance until the next general election, when a referendum is taken on it, and the people can say "Yes" or "No" with regard to the measure. There political harmony reigns, and the same thing would obtain here if we adopted the system of elective ministries. The hon. member for Warwick stated last night that we are a party who want to level down, that our process is a levelling down process, and that we want to drag every one down into the gutter. I deny that. Our process is a lifting up process. There is not very much wrong with the production of the world to-day. The fault lies in the uneven distribution of the wealth. We do not advocate absolute equality. That cannot be brought about. We are not all born equal; we are not born with the same physical strength or mental capacity, and we, as socialists—and I have never denied that I subscribe to the doctrine of socialism—desire to benefit all the people by the widening of the functions of the State, as the Home Secretary expressed it when he entered this Chamber—a statement which this party "Hear, heard," at

the same time asking him to come over and sit in the corner with us. Now the hon. gentleman would give the people in the country the impression that a socialist is a person to be dreaded—a person who is going about the country to take the land from the people. How can we take the land? What would we do with the land? We desire nothing of the kind; we believe that the whole of the people should own the land, and that it should be put to its best use. The proper use of the land is a thing at which we aim, because the holding of land in large areas and its non-utilisation lies at the root of our social and industrial evils. When you get that question settled you will bring about State socialism. I think it was the Countess of Warwick who said that she was never a Christian until she became a socialist, and the "Encyclopædia Britannica," in its definition of socialism, says socialism is identical with Christianity. The Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, who cannot be accused of being a socialist, gave a very good definition of socialism when he said it was government of the people by the people for the people, the co-operation of all to secure to every man his just rights. He said the poor law and every kindly act of legislation by which the community sought to discharge its obligations to the poor and needy was socialism.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Are there no other quotations you can give besides that?

Mr. JONES: Yes, I can give more quotations. King Edward said, "We are all socialists nowadays."

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the hon. member will show the connection between his present remarks and the question before the House.

Mr. JONES: Yes. I am just concluding my remarks on this subject. The Secretary for Public Instruction has asked for more quotations, and I might just refer to the speech made by Lord Chelmsford on the eve of his departure from Queensland. Lord Chelmsford in that speech used these words—

Queensland should start at the root of things—start with the eternal principles of justice, equality, and freedom.

Is not that the doctrine of socialism? My own knowledge of the subject is that all writers on socialism, ancient and modern, have based their doctrine upon those three principles of "justice, equality, and freedom." There is a definition by Lord Chelmsford for the hon. gentleman. The Secretary for Public Lands or some other Minister stated on one occasion that the Labour party, or the Socialist party, would take children from their parents and put them in a State nursery, and he said to mothers, "How would you like your children to be taken away from you? How would you like it if Mr. Jones, the socialist, came to you, and said, 'I want your child to go and work in a hat factory or a meatworks?'"

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Who said that?

Mr. JONES: One of the Ministers. I cannot say which one just now, as I have lost the extract, but anyhow the report appeared in the *Courier*. The speaker further suggested that the child would be taken from his mother in Brisbane, and perhaps sent to Townsville. In the same report reference is

made to the marriage tie, which, it was said, socialists would loosen. All these statements are more bogeys put up to frighten people away from the true doctrine of socialism. We do not advocate a levelling-down process, as was stated by the hon. member for Warwick, but a lifting up process—a process which will secure to the worker a better share of the product of his labour than he receives at present. We are not likely to bring that about in a day or two, but I think it is only reasonable to ask hon. members to assist us to bring about a better distribution of the wealth of the world than is made at present, so as to give the labourer more for his labour than he is receiving. I have here an extract from a report of the British Board of Trade, which shows the percentage that the workers of the world receive from the earnings in the most important industries. In the beer trade the workers receive £7 out of every £100 earned, and a somewhat similar distribution takes place in other industries or trades, the percentage received by the worker being highest in the mining industry. In Great Britain 93 per cent. of the population owns 7 per cent. of the wealth of the country, and 7 per cent. own 93 per cent. of the wealth. In the United States of America the unfair distribution of wealth is even greater. Therefore, is it not a noble thing, is it not a noble ideal, to aim at securing a fuller return to the worker—the wealth producer—for his labour? I think it is. It is only right that we should get assistance from hon. members opposite and other members in this Chamber to bring about a more equal distribution of the wealth of the world to-day, and a better share for the wealth producer. There is no levelling-down process in that. With the very few rich on the one hand and the very many poor on the other, there is something radically wrong; and when we take the responsibilities of office on our shoulder—when we come here to legislate and frame laws in a young country, we ought to be guided by the mistakes of the older countries of the world. We ought to aim at righting very many of the wrongs, and they can only be righted by taking the policy that is advocated by this party—taking it plank by plank. They are taking it now. If the hon. member for Townsville and the party led by him had stuck to their own policy of unequal franchise, and long leases, and the poll tax—had they stood by them, they would have been relegated to political oblivion long ago. They are only existing to-day by stealing—I use the word politically—by taking and passing the most popular planks of the Labour platform, which the people are clamouring for, and they leave us in a minority, still advocating the unpopular planks of the platform. The verses that I wish to read are for the benefit of the hon. member for Warwick, and are as follow:—

Suppose you gained a dollar yesterday,
Or gained a score,
Or made your fortune by some clever play
A million more,
And made life harder for your fellow men
What then?

Suppose your plans for profit all succeed,
And you are worth,
According to the reckonings of greed,
Say, half the earth,
But of the worth of service have no ken,
What then?

Suppose you give a little of the wealth
You cannot use,
And steal its double by some artful stealth,
Or legal ruse,
And men are fooled to give you chance again,
What then?

Mr. Jones.]

Suppose that by and by the people wake,
 And take their own,
 Nor ask for just a nibble at the cake,
 Nor for a bone,
 And will not longer hide in hole and den,
 What then?
 Suppose the fellows you have sneered aside
 As fools and cranks,
 The world's to-morrow with their counsels guide,
 And win world thanks,
 And truth flows freely from to-morrow's pen,
 What then?
 Aye, and suppose there is a realm above,
 Where Right is throned,
 And men are weighed in balance of love,
 Nor crime condoned
 Because 'twas wrought among the "upper ten,"
 What then?

I justify my action in supporting the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition because I believe that the two parties that have coalesced and formed the Government do not possess the confidence of the country, and are not a true reflex of the will of the people as expressed at the last general election, and for the reason that I believe a better Government can be formed from this side of the House if the present Ministry is defeated—a Government that will give the people just as many railways and more democratic legislation. If an election should eventuate, I believe that the majority of the electors will elect a better Government than is at present in office.

LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. G. Jackson, *Kennedy*): I heard hon. members yesterday interject that they wanted a Minister to speak.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: So I hope what I have to say they will take notice of, mark well, and inwardly digest. The hon. member who has just sat down, on the whole, made a very moderate speech. I do not think he gave expression to quite so extreme sentiments as some hon. members who have preceded him, although I do not agree with all he uttered.

Mr. BOWMAN: He is more moderate than you.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Hon. members have raised the question of elective Ministries. They seem to think if they could only get elective Ministries then they would solve the problem of all our political troubles.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I would point out to hon. members, if they are in favour of Ministers being elected by the majority, which means elected by the majority of the House, the chances are the very same Ministers would be chosen as are now chosen by the Premier.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No hope; and other interjections.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: There are so many interjections being made, that I cannot catch them, but I think that would be the result. If, on the other hand, they propose to elect Ministers by caucus, the same as the Federal Ministers were elected—

LABOUR MEMBERS: That is not true.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Do hon. members contradict the statement that the Federal Ministers were elected by caucus?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Yes, yes!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I can assure hon. members that it was given to me, on the very best authority, that the Federal Ministers were chosen by Federal caucus. If hon. members propose to adopt that method, I

[*Hon G. Jackson.*

see some little difficulty ahead when we are dismissed from the position we occupy, because I take it they will stand by their platform. Hon. members declare that they never deviate from their platform, but I will show that they have done so before I sit down. As one of the planks of their platform is elective Ministries, I take it for granted that they will call all hon. members sitting on that side of the House together to choose a Ministry from amongst those numbers. The hon. member for Clermont endorses what I am saying. They know very well they cannot form a Ministry by themselves. They will therefore call the members of the Independent Opposition into their caucus and choose a Ministry. The Labour party do not possess a majority, otherwise they would elect a Ministry themselves. I would ask the members of the Independent Opposition how would they like that position of affairs—whether they are prepared to follow a Ministry elected by the Labour caucus?

Mr. WOODS: We will get you to draft a resolution.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I have done that on previous occasions, and have very often saved them a good many difficulties. I am quite prepared to do that again if they will requisition it. I would point out to those hon. members who are advocating an elective Ministry, and who take the Swiss federation as an illustration of the advantages of elective Ministries, that it is not a fair comparison to quote one particular country in the civilised world where they have elective Ministries. The Swiss confederation is altogether different to the system of responsible government that we have and as known all over the world, in America, in Canada, in Australia, and in the old country.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Their Constitution is similar to the Federal Constitution.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Anybody who knows anything about the Swiss Constitution knows it is entirely different to ours, and, although the experiment may be successful there, it is no argument that it will be successful under our Constitution.

Mr. LESINA: It depends on the genius of the people.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I admit that the genius of the people has to do with the matter. We know that some of the South American Republics, where they have similar Governments to our own, cannot work them the same as the British people do, and you could give those countries in South America the most perfect conditions, and owing to a defect in the genius they have in themselves for self-government, they make failures of them. I would just remind hon. members that Mr. Kingston, Premier of South Australia, some years ago proposed to introduce into the South Australian Constitution the principle of elective Ministries. But, after giving it more consideration, he decided that it was not a desirable thing to do.

[7 p.m.] Now, I have in my hand a copy of this evening's Brisbane *Telegraph*, in which I notice that Mr. Fisher, the leader of the Federal Labour party, makes reference in a speech of yesterday to this question. Whilst Mr. Fisher was speaking, Mr. Fowler interjected, "Let Parliament elect its Ministries." Mr. Fisher said—

If that comes about we shall have a greater state of abuse than we have yet had.

Now, there is a condemnation from the lips of the late Prime Minister, the leader of the Federal Labour party. I am assuming that he is correctly reported, and I have no doubt he is.

The PREMIER: How shocking that would be.

Mr. BOWMAN: Not much worse than it has been.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: What I want to know is this: How can they reconcile the principle of elective Ministries by caucus, or by the House, with one of the planks of the Labour platform which states that a Labour Government must have a majority of portfolios? The members of the Labour party, as is well known, cannot take office in any Government unless they have a majority of portfolios in that Government.

Mr. BOWMAN: A very wise thing, after past experience.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: If the hon. member admits that it is a very good thing that there should be no coalition unless they have the upper hand, as they assume they will have if they have a majority of portfolios, that is all right; but I ask the hon. gentleman how he can reconcile it with the principle of elective Ministries. Now, leaving that question, and coming to some remarks made by the hon. member for Burnett in connection with mining. The hon. member complained that mining got no encouragement from the present Government.

Mr. MULCAHY: Quite true.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The answer to that is that the Kidston Government, latterly, have spent more in mining—

Mr. MULCAHY: Ordered by the Labour party.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: During the last twelve months.

Mr. MULCAHY: The Labour party made them do it. (Laughter.)

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The Labour party always makes the Government do nothing that happens to be good; but if it is anything that is bad the Labour party have nothing to do with it.

The TREASURER: They cannot help it.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: They cannot help it. The hon. member for Burnett insinuated that the Premier had made a promise of £50,000 for mining.

Mr. WOODS: Is not that true?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: No; if the hon. member for Woothakata admits what the hon. member for Burnett said is true, he is quite wrong.

Mr. WOODS: Don't you believe it is true?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: No. The Premier said to a deputation, of which I was one, that if he could see his way to spend the money profitably he would not hesitate to place a sum of £50,000 on the Estimates. Although I was just as anxious as the hon. member who is interjecting that a larger sum should be placed on the Estimates, still it is only fair to say that the Premier made no distinct promise of that particular sum of money.

Mr. WOODS: Was £50,000 placed on the Estimates?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: It was not. I do not mind an interjection if it is relevant; but it is impossible for me to answer a series of questions which the hon. member seems prepared to submit to me. He has come to the table with pencil and note-paper, and apparently wants to deal with me as a lawyer deals with a witness in the witness-box. I am not going to shirk anything; but it is impossible for a member, within a reasonable time, to make any sort of speech, and reply to all these interjections. The hon. member for Burnett admitted himself

that the mining members were not united when they came before the Minister for Mines or the Premier to make a request—that some wanted State batteries, others smelting works.

Mr. MULCAHY: Now you are making a deliberate misstatement.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member charges me with making a deliberate misstatement. I don't know whether he is quite in order, but, at any rate, I will let it pass. (Hear, hear!) What I am saying is correct, that some of the mining members at that deputation wanted one thing, and some another. I know that the hon. member for Cook was particularly strong on the question of State batteries. I myself favoured smelting works, though I am not sure whether I mentioned it at the deputation, but I have advocated State smelting works in this House. Either the last year or the year before I made a speech and advocated State smelting works, but I have no recollection of ever advocating State batteries. I have been on a deputation, some of the members of which may have asked for State batteries, but I myself never asked the Government to make advances for State batteries. The Mining Department had a report two or three years ago from one of their officials in connection with the desirability of establishing State batteries in my own district and the district surrounding Charters Towers, and that report was very adverse. Now, in connection with State smelting works, I might also point out to hon. members present that, at my instigation, the Mining Department, about twelve months ago—although I do not say hon. members opposite may not have suggested it, I know the hon. member for Burnett was a hearty advocate of State smelting works—got their chief inspector to make a report on the desirability of establishing a State smelting works. That report I have not yet seen, although I am Minister for Mines; I understand that it is being printed, but I have not had an opportunity of seeing it yet, so that I cannot say whether the chief inspector is in favour of establishing a State smelting works or not. Now, we all know that as regards the applications for advances out of the deep sinking fund, the usual procedure is to get a report, and if the report is favourable, and there is money available, usually an advance is made. Hon. members must recognise that, seeing there are so many mining fields in Queensland—mining fields are scattered over the immense areas of Queensland, and the mining industry is an important industry—but they can see that it would take a very large sum of money indeed to go round all the mining districts of Queensland. It is impossible to grant every application. My own district, I contend, had been neglected as regards advances by the Mines Department.

Mr. WOODS: Now they have got a chance.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I can assure the hon. member that, since I have occupied this position, I have not advanced a single penny for my own electorate—to any man who appealed from my own district.

Mr. MULCAHY: You have not had an opportunity yet.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Well, I have been here two or three weeks; probably if I had been disposed I should have been able to do it at the present time.

Mr. MULCAHY: No money available.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: At present I am going on the principle that no advances ought to be made until we know where we are. I do not say there is any danger of this

Hon. G. Jackson.]

Government being defeated. (Opposition laughter.) Until we know the result of this no-confidence motion, I think the Minister should stay his hand. As the hon. member for Croydon made reference to Croydon, I think that Croydon did get special treatment; at any rate, I believe it had more money for deep sinking than other places.

Mr. MURPHY: The Premier promised us £10,000, and he owes us £5,000 yet. (Hear, hear!)

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The Ravenswood district has not had a great deal in the past. Twelve months ago, when their application came in, there were a number of other applications coming along. Ravenswood was given a little out of the deep-sinking fund last year, but before that they practically got nothing. I would like to deal with another matter, to which reference was made by the hon. member for Burnett, and that is with reference to mining exemptions. I did not quite catch what the hon. member said, and I am sorry he is not in the Chamber now, but I understood him to make a charge against my predecessor—the present Home Secretary—that he had promised a deputation to grant an exemption to a mine and would override the warden. Hon. members probably know in regard to claim exemptions that that matter is under the control of the wardens, but when it is a case of an exemption for a mining lease it comes to Brisbane to the Mines Department to be dealt with. The late Minister for Mines assures me that he never told a deputation anything of the sort, and he never interfered with the warden in the matter of claim exemptions. The hon. member for Burnett also said that it was customary for the Mines Department to get reports, not for the purpose of considering whether a particular mine should get a grant out of the deep-sinking fund, but in order that the company might get a favourable report from the Mines Department, so that, I presume, they could use that report for flotation purposes. My predecessor tells me that on one occasion the Mount Shamrock mine—I am not sure if that is the mine that the hon. member for Burnett referred to—

Mr. BOWMAN: Yes.

Mr. MULCAHY: That is the mine he mentioned.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: My predecessor tells me that the Mount Shamrock people came to him and asked the department to send a geologist to the mine to report on it. They had not made any application for an advance out of the deep sinking fund, and the Minister absolutely refused to grant the request to let the Government Geologist report on the mine for that particular purpose. So that I think the hon. member must be incorrect, or he must have got wrong information, in connection with what he is saying. Now, in dealing with mining matters, I might refer to some of the criticisms made by one or two members last week. The hon. member for Herbert, Mr. Lennon, had some complaints in connection with mining matters in his district. The hon. member complained that certain mineral leases in his district had been granted exemption and the miners could not get into the leases on account of them being locked up.

Mr. WOODS: Quite true.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member says "quite true." I have made inquiries at the department in connection with that matter, and I am informed that there is only one lease under exemption.

Mr. WOODS: There are others, and you know it.

[Hon. G. Jackson.

Mr. LENNON: What about the dredging areas?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I will deal with the dredging areas, but that is another matter altogether. The dredging areas are claims, and the warden has jurisdiction over all claims. I would just point this out: that the warden of that district granted exemptions to those dredging areas, but the Mines Department has not granted any exemptions at all. Does the hon. member want the Minister to override the warden in that matter?

The PREMIER: Would he like the warden to be interfered with?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I was just asking the hon. member that. Does he wish me to interfere with the jurisdiction of the warden in that matter?

Mr. LENNON: If the warden won't act fairly to the people, I think you should.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I think it would lead to a great deal of criticism, and possibly abuse, if you interfered with the warden in the carrying out of his duties in that matter. But before these exemptions were granted the department sent up a geologist to make a report on the country, and see whether it was advisable that these exemptions to the dredging areas should be granted—to the injury possibly of the alluvial miner. Mr. Cameron was the geologist who was sent up, and he furnished a report to the department pointing out that a great deal of that country was not suitable for the working miner. The ground was too poor or too deep in a majority of cases. It was desirable that the dredging areas should be granted. This was done. So the hon. member will see that he has really no complaint against the Mines Department in that connection.

Mr. LENNON: That district has maintained 200 miners for five years. No company has ever been successful on it, and it is essentially a working man's district.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member may see Mr. Cameron's report if he wishes.

Mr. LENNON: I have seen it.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: If the hon. member has seen it, then he knows that the department acted in accordance with that officer's report. Mr. Cameron has no special interest in it one way or the other. I can inform hon. members that whilst I am Minister for Mines the interests of the alluvial miner and the reef miner will all be well considered by me.

Mr. MAUGHAN: And the coal miner?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: But, whilst doing that, I am not going to discourage the investor or the speculator. The investor is the working miner's best friend and the prospector's best friend, and I shall make it my business to encourage to the greatest extent the possible introduction of capital in our mining fields. (Hear, hear!) The senior member for Charters Towers, Mr. Winstanley, and the junior member for Charters Towers, Mr. Mulvan, both had a grievance against the department. The senior member for Charters Towers complained that £500 had been advanced by the Mines Department to a particular mine in the eastern portion of the field, although, when other applications for assistance out of the deep sinking fund had been made, they were told by the Mines Department that there was no money available, or that the vote was exhausted. Just let me explain for a moment or two how this may have happened. When I got back from England twelve months ago, I found that the

vote was pretty well exhausted—that there was only £2,000 or £3,000 left. The hon. member for Ipswich, Mr. Blair, was then Minister for Mines, and he had been distributing the money fairly freely. Possibly he may have thought that there would be more money on the Estimates.

Mr. MULCAHY: The Premier promised it to us.

Mr. MURPHY: As a matter of fact, £50,000 was placed on the Estimates.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The Premier gave no distinct promise at all.

Mr. BLAIR: Yes he did; and the Treasurer as well.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I knew that a number of applications had come in from my own district, and I undertook to see the Minister as soon as I could, pointing out that my own district of Ravenswood had got very little money. I said I thought that Ravenswood should get some money. The reports had not then come in from the Charters Towers or Ravenswood mines.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: Charters Towers was in long before that.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: They were not before the Minister. I was informed that they were not before the Minister, and I went to the Mines Department to inquire.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: That is not correct.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I found that the Minister had set apart a certain sum of money in connection with applications from my electorate—that was, supposing the reports were favourable. There was only about £3,000 left when I went to the department—that was in September last, on my return from England—and I can imagine that when the matter went before my predecessor he was referring to the amount there was in the fund when he said there was no money for those mines. But the hon. member wants to know how it was that this grant was made afterwards in connection with the eastern portion of Charters Towers. I believe there was a small sum of money left after other grants had been made, and it was out of this small sum that the £500 was granted. I imagine that the applications from Charters Towers must have amounted to many thousands of pounds. About that time some very important discoveries were made in the Brilliant Freeholds, and the effect of those discoveries was to stimulate a great deal of prospecting in some other mines. I remember when I was on the Towers with the Premier the deputation in connection with the deep-sinking fund admitted that there was not the justification for making advances to those mines on account of the discoveries they had made in the deep ground. Then there was that application for £500 to develop mines in the eastern part of Charters Towers, and the Government were able to make the advance. That is the explanation, as far as I understand it.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Very ingenious! Very thin!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I am afraid no explanation would be satisfactory to the hon. member for Gympie. The hon. member for Charters Towers, Mr. Winstanley, also ventilated a grievance in connection with what is a mines regulation matter—ventilation, sanitation, and so on. All these matters are dealt with in the Bill, which I am only too anxious to introduce if an opportunity is given. The hon. member's colleague, Mr. Mullan, also dealt with some mining matters. He referred to the

1909—r

question of tributers. I have a great deal of sympathy with tributers. On account of the depression in gold mining on Charters Towers it has been found necessary by a great many men to take to tributing, which is rather unfortunate, because in the great majority of cases they do not earn anything like what they were receiving in wages. The hon. gentleman's contention was that tributers should be protected—that they should have a certain amount of sustenance money; and he quoted Western Australia and Victoria in support of his contention. The hon. gentleman's statement is correct as far as Western Australia is concerned. There is a section in the Mining Act of 1904 which provides that no tribute is payable unless they have earned £2 per man per week after paying expenses. How that is working I have no information; but it all depends on the agreement. I don't think it matters much whether you put this into an Act or a regulation, if the owners are not prepared to make an agreement with the tributers.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: You can compel them to work their mines.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Exemption can be refused, of course, if they do not make out a case. The provision the hon. member mentioned in the Victorian Act has been repealed. I have here an extract from the Mining Act of 1897 in regard to sustenance money. That was repealed by the Act of 1904, so that evidently it was not found to work very well; but they substituted this section—

The cost of all prospecting work, such as main drives levels, cross-cuts, or shaft-sinking, which the tributers agree to do under their tribute agreement, and which, in the opinion of the Inspector of Mines, will be of permanent advantage to the mine, shall be borne in equal proportions by the owner of the mine and the tributers; and in the event of default the tributers shall (whatever may be the amount thereof) be entitled to sue the owner of the mine for his proportion of the cost before the warden. Such cost if not stated in the tribute agreement shall be fixed by mutual agreement, or, in the event of disagreement, by the warden, whose decision as to the amount of such cost and of such proportion shall be final and conclusive, and without appeal.

That might be a very desirable provision to make when amending our mining laws. I am not prepared to say at present, but evidently the sustenance provision was not found to be advantageous in Victoria. Then the hon. member complained about the percentage paid. The provision dealing with the percentage was also repealed by the Act of 1904; but there is a provision in the Victorian Act to this effect—

The percentage or proportion to which the owner and the tributer are respectively entitled under any tribute agreement shall be calculated upon the gross value of the gold or minerals obtained under such agreement.

So hon. members will see that the provisions with regard to sustenance and percentage in the Act of 1897 have both been repealed.

Mr. MULLAN: Do you think it was a good thing to repeal them?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: As I have already pointed out, I think it is a matter of agreement between owner and tributer. However, if I get the opportunity to deal with these matters I shall be very much inclined to give consideration to what the hon. member has brought forward. The matters I have been dealing with are questions that could be very much better dealt with on the Estimates.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: If you get the chance. We are getting in early to avoid the rush.

Hon. G. Jackson.]

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I expected that reply. Hon. members say there is no opportunity to discuss the administration of the Government.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Not for two years.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: If that is so, would not one have expected to have had some hair-raising disclosures made during this debate? But what grievances have hon. members brought forward in connection with any Government department? I have dealt with one or two questions in connection with mining; but they are not serious questions of administration. After two years, during which they say they have had no opportunity of discussing the administration of the Government, what have they brought forward during the last three weeks, while they have been discussing the Government and its administration? Let me now take the other department over which I have control—the Works Department.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Have you finished the mining matters?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I cannot talk all night about mining; but I have dealt with the points raised by hon. members so far as I have taken a note of them. I have not read the speeches, but I have sat in the Chamber most of the time, and have made a note now and again of matters brought forward. I will now take the Department of Works. After three weeks' debate there has been only one small matter brought forward by way of fault-finding with this department. It was the hon. member for Charters Towers, Mr. Winstanley, who raised this grievance. The hon. member [7.30 p.m.] complained that the Works Department, after calling for tenders for the erection of police barracks at Charters Towers, restricting tenderers to the supply of Brisbane-made bricks, went back on that at the instigation of the senior member for Townsville, and called for fresh tenders under which it was permissible to supply either Brisbane or Townsville bricks. I think that was the hon. member's complaint.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: That was not my point at all.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Then I have not understood the hon. member at all. He complained of the interference of the hon. member for Townsville. When the department proposed to restrict the supply of bricks to bricks made in Brisbane, by way of showing the dominance of the hon. member for Townsville in the Cabinet, the hon. member complained that, at the instigation of the hon. member, fresh tenders were called for, permitting alternative tenders to be sent in for Brisbane or Townsville bricks. Now, the hon. member for Townsville was quite justified in a matter concerning his constituency in asking for alternative tenders, permitting of the supply of Townsville bricks. It is not a new matter in connection with tenders in the department to provide that the bricks supplied shall be Brisbane made. The same thing happened a little while ago in Gympie, and there was an outcry from Gympie when it was proposed that only Brisbane bricks should be used. The same thing has happened in other provincial towns, because it has been found by the department that, unless bricks are machine-made, they are not as good in quality, and very often in some of the provincial towns they do not take the same care in mixing the clay. The hon. member for Townsville sent a telegram, or a letter, to the department asking that the matter should be reconsidered. There is no serious offence there. If the hon. member

had gone to my predecessor and said to him, "You must give the contract to a certain Northern firm, which proposes to provide Townsville bricks," that would certainly, in my opinion, have been unfair interference; but that was not the case at all. That is the only grievance that has been so far raised in connection with the Works Department. Let me now come back again to the hon. member for Burnett. In the course of his speech this afternoon the hon. member dealt very largely with the question of land taxation, and the substitution of the leasehold principle for the freehold. The hon. member pointed out that, if we established the leasehold principle in connection with agricultural and town lands, it would be the same as we have in connection with the mining fields.

Mr. MURPHY: There are freeholds on mining fields.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member is quite right. There are some freeholds on mining fields, and, as a matter of fact, if minerals were reserved in the freeholds—as we propose to do if we are given an opportunity of getting on with the Mining or Private Property Bill—then there would be really no reason why we should not have freeholds on the mining fields.

Mr. MURPHY: The homestead leases are practically freeholds.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I thank the hon. member for mentioning the matter. There is, of course, a difference between miners' homestead leases and mining leases for mining operations. The miner's homestead lease is practically a perpetual lease, and a perpetual lease is exactly the same as a freehold.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: The one pays rent and the other does not.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: One does not pay rent after a certain time—that is where the hon. member is wrong.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: After thirty years.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Well, after thirty years it practically becomes a freehold. Does the hon. member want to have some Mining Act passed under which the homestead lessees on Charters Towers shall be made to pay rent for all time? Does the hon. member advocate that? The hon. member does not reply! (Laughter.)

Mr. AIREY: "In vain is the net spread in the sight of the bird."

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Does the hon. member propose that the homestead lessees should be compelled to pay the same rent to the Government after the thirty years are expired? The hon. member for Burnett seems to have a terrible don on the freehold system. We had a speech yesterday from the hon. member for Clermont in which he also denounced the freehold tenure.

Mr. MURPHY: Formerly you did not like freeholds—when you signed the platform.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member is quite wrong. There was nothing in the platform I signed with regard to freeholds, as I will show by and by. The members of the Labour party have a plank in their platform now, "No more freeholds." They want to have a land tax, and they propose to go a great deal further. They affirm that there is what they call an "unearned increment" in connection with land, and they say that the State should get that unearned increment. Well, if there is such a thing as an unearned increment—if they

can prove that there is such a thing—I suppo there is, in many cases, also a decrement.

Mr. MURPHY: You are becoming quite conservatised. (Laughter.)

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The views I am now expressing I have often expressed before, and it would be much better if hon. members, instead of interjecting, would quote from any of my speeches to show that I ever said anything different to what I am saying now.

Mr. MANN: You have always been a conservative radical.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I do not know what that means. When I belonged to the Labour party I was just as good a democrat—and I am now—as any hon. member opposite—that is, as far as anything reasonable and practicable is concerned. I was saying a moment ago that, if it is fair that the State should get an unearned increment—if there is such a thing—it is also fair that, where land has depreciated in value, the owner of such land should receive some compensation. Last year I became an executor and also a beneficiary in a small estate, and I have in my hands a number of deeds of freehold land which I should be very happy to hand to any hon. member and make him a present of.

Mr. MURPHY: I am afraid they cannot be much good, George, or you would not give them away. (Laughter.)

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member says, I understand, that I would not give away the deeds of good land. Well, some of this land, so far as quality is concerned, is good. Some of it consists of town allotments. I would be most happy to hand the deeds to any hon. member on the other side if he will pay the rates on them. As a matter of fact, I am not asking for the transmission of the deeds. Here is the deed of 28 perches—that is, a town allotment. I may say all the land is within a few miles of the Queensland coast. The next is the deed of one rood—a town allotment. The next is another rood—another town allotment. This is for a one-fourth undivided share in 55 acres. Hon. members might jump at that. Here is another for one-fourth undivided share in 32 acres. This is one rood—a town allotment. Here is one for 28 perches—a town allotment.

Mr. BARBER: Why, you are quite a boodler. (Laughter.)

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The last is for a 10-acre block. I think the hon. member for Clermont last night, when pointing out that the Labour party were willing to respond to any political party who would make them the best offer, said, "Any offer?" Now, I ask hon. members is there any offer?

Mr. MURPHY: Why not sell them to the Government?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Here are the titles, and they can have them for nothing if they will pay the rates on the lands.

Mr. MURPHY: We know they are not worth the rates or you would not offer them. Why not make a present of them to the *Worker* newspaper. (Laughter.)

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: My argument is that if the State is going to take the unearned increment in the value of land, then it should compensate the purchasers of land who have lost by their investment. The lands to which I have referred were bought at a Crown lands sale twenty or twenty-five years ago, and I contend that it is only fair if people buy land,

and there is no unearned increment and they lose money by the transaction, the State ought to compensate them for that loss if it takes its share of the unearned increment. Hon. members opposite may talk as much as they like about the leasehold system, but I know that if they were going to take up a selection they would prefer a freehold tenure any time and every time. I do not say anything about town allotments. It may be desirable that the State should reserve the freehold in town allotments, but that is a matter which I do not propose to discuss on the present occasion. I remember stating many years ago in this House that it is absolutely necessary that the freehold of agricultural lands should be given to selectors. It is patent to everybody that if we are to compete with other countries, like Canada and the neighbouring Australian States, we shall not attract settlers to Queensland unless we are prepared to give them the fee-simple of their land. That is the principal reason why we cannot afford to adopt the leasehold system. Now let me make one or two references to the speech delivered by the hon. member for Clermont last evening. I am not going to deal very extensively with his speech. I purpose referring to one or two points only. The hon. member stated that the Labour party, or the Socialist party, as they should be called now, had nothing to expect from a middle-class Parliament or a middle-class Government. The hon. member for Cook, I remember, stated that a Conservative Government often gave reforms, but the hon. member for Clermont argues that nothing can be expected from a middle-class party. Let me ask the hon. member for Clermont, and hon. members opposite, who gave reforms in England? Who gave an extension of the franchise? Not the Labour party, because there was no Labour party in existence at that time. Who gave old-age pensions in England about twelve months ago? Not the Labour party. The Labour party had not influence enough to get old-age pensions in England. When hon. members opposite say that they can never get reforms from the Liberal party, let us come to Australia, and consider who drafted the broad democratic Federal Constitution. How many Labour members were there at the Federal Conventions in Sydney, Melbourne, and Adelaide when that democratic Constitution was framed?

Mr. MULCAHY: What about Kingston?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Kingston was not a Labour member, and the hon. member knows that. I do not think there was a single Labour delegate at any of those conventions, unless it was Mr. Trenwith, and I am not quite sure about him; but I think he was the only Labour delegate at those conventions which drafted the Federal Constitution, under which we have one adult one vote. I mention that as an answer to the hon. member for Clermont's statement that no reforms can be expected from the Liberal party. I have said that I have listened to the speeches which have been made during this want of confidence debate, and I must say that the criticisms have been weak, and the excuses weaker. The Premier was charged with having made an electioneering speech. Just fancy the audacity of the Premier in making an electioneering speech! Hon. members on the other side, of course, never make electioneering speeches—hardly ever, anyway.

Mr. BOWMAN: They can't say that about you.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I think hon. members opposite are determined that whether a dissolution will come about or not they will make speeches of an electioneering character—speeches which are addressed to their

constituents. There has been plenty of abuse and plenty of poetry flung at the Premier during this debate. We had some more poetry flung at this side to-night. Hon. members on the other side appear to be determined that if they cannot kill us with their criticisms they will kill us with their poetry, and they have even quoted the Premier's poetry. (Opposition laughter.)

THE PREMIER: If they can stand that, they can stand anything.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: If they had confined themselves to the Premier's poetry it would not have been so bad. I do not know that I have any right to deal with any personal matters, except those which concern myself, but it is desirable, I think, that I should say something with regard to my own position. There have been one or two references made to me by two or three members, but no serious criticisms. It may be as well, perhaps, that I should explain my own position. I have already mentioned that I went for a trip to the old country just before the Government submitted what were called by hon. members opposite "syndicate railways," but which I would call Government co-operative railways—(Opposition laughter)—which is much the better term for those railways which were introduced at the end of last session. I went away to England just before that trouble started, and I got back to Queensland after the coalition had been fixed up, so that I did not in any active way participate in the measures taken for bringing about that coalition. I am not going to talk about what happened in caucus, because I know nothing about it. Some personal references have been made to me by the leader of the Labour party, Mr. Bowman; by the hon. member for Brisbane South, Mr. Airey; and by the hon. member for Bowen, Mr. Kenna. The leader of the Opposition said I had got my reward for honest service to the man who has gone back on Labour. The hon. member for Charters Towers, Mr. Mullan, made a desperate effort the other night to show that the Premier had gone back on socialism. I shall deal with that statement later on, as I do not want to interrupt my argument by dealing with it just now. The leader of the Labour party said I had got my reward for honest service to the man who had gone back on Labour. Is it not about time that members belonging to the Socialist party dropped this cry of renegade and traitor? Have we not heard quite enough of that? I will show before I have finished my speech that there is nothing of the renegade or traitor about the Premier or myself. (Labour laughter.) Hon. members may laugh. They won't laugh when I have finished with them. We have been branded as renegades to Labour. Now they are trying to brand us as renegades to liberalism. The Premier has got his faults, I suppose, like any other man. The leader of the Labour party has his faults. Even I have got my faults. After all, this talk that is indulged in about the Chief Secretary being an autocrat, a despot—about him making the Ministers do this and do that—it is all idle talk. I have known the Chief Secretary a great many years—

MR. BOWMAN: You have danced to his tune pretty often.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member, by the time I have finished, will see that I have not danced to his tune. As a matter of fact, in 1905, when the Labour party held that convention to which I was a delegate, when they proposed to introduce the socialistic objective, I was one of the first men to ask the Premier and the hon. member for Brisbane South, Mr. Airey, who was then a Minister—

[Hon. G. Jackson.

two members of the Labour party and Ministers in the Morgan Government—instead of dancing to the Premier's tune, I asked the Premier to come to that convention and do his best by argument to stop that Labour convention from introducing and adopting that socialistic objective. The Chief Secretary has his faults like anybody else, but I must say I never knew a man more willing to listen to the counsel and advice of his friends than the present Premier of Queensland. I do not say he listened to the advice of his enemies.

MR. BOWMAN: You never knew a man that threatened the party more than he did.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: I never knew the Chief Secretary, when he was a member of the Labour party, to threaten that party. (Opposition laughter.) What I will prove, or try to prove, before I close my speech to-night is this: I will show that the ex-Labour members have been true to Labour and to democracy. I will show that the Socialist party, which is the present Opposition, is responsible for the division in the Labour party, and that they are responsible for the coalition that has taken place. Of course, if the coalition is a good thing, then we really give them credit for it, but they did not mean it that way. I will further show that the Labour party, or the Socialistic party, is not true to its own platform.

LABOUR MEMBERS: Ah, ah!

MR. LENNON: That's good—let us have it.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: They take credit for being a straight party, never deviating from their platform. The hon. member for Maryborough claimed that a week ago. He said "We never deviate from our platform." The hon. member for Ipswich paid them the compliment too, and several other hon. members have stated that the Socialistic party is a straight party that never deviates at all from its platform.

MR. LENNON: Hear, hear!

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member says "Hear, hear!" I will show him that since he has been in the party it has deviated from the platform. The party have deviated from the platform when it suits them. They have allowed legislation to go through this Chamber which is diametrically opposed to their platform. The hon. member for South Brisbane, Mr. Airey, in making comment upon my admission to the Ministry, pointed out that I was a conservative. The hon. member for Cairns a few minutes ago said that I was a radical conservative. I do not know what he means by that. The hon. member for South Brisbane said, "consequently, being a conservative, I was in my right place in a Conservative Government." But, strange to say, immediately after stating I was a conservative, he found fault with the Premier for not placing me in the Home Secretary's Department, where I could run amuck with the licensed victuallers—where I could smash up things amongst the licensed victuallers.

MR. MANN: He knew you would not do it.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member evidently considered that I was not such a very great conservative in that respect. I was rather a wild kind of revolutionist. The hon. member for South Brisbane should remember that when he was a Minister sitting here, a great many complaints came from the Labour party in connection with his conservative administration of Dunwich. Leaving out small details, I will show that the criticisms of hon. members opposite largely answer each other. Hon. members' speeches are contradictory. Hon. members on this side could make out a good case by just going over the speeches made by hon. members

opposite, and showing how they absolutely contradict each other, particularly in connection with this coalition. For instance, one hon. member states the Premier is an autocrat, bossing everybody. Another hon. member says the Premier is the tool of the hon. member for Townsville, Mr. Philp. There are two diametrically opposite statements. They cannot both be true.

Mr. MANN: They may be true at different periods.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: It is said they are true now. The hon. member for Fassifern stated the other night that the hon. member for Townsville had no hand in the appointment of members to the Cabinet when the coalition was formed. That seemed to be a complaint the hon. member had against the Government. How can hon. members reconcile those statements? Then one hon. member says the programme submitted in the Governor's Speech is no good, but immediately afterwards—I believe it was the same hon. member—he said there were Bills in this programme that many hon. members sitting on this side of the House could not vote for. Again, how can you reconcile these two statements? Some hon. members opposite want thousands of immigrants to come here, and other hon. members do not want immigrants at all; although they may profess they do, they do not want immigrants. Some hon. members opposite want freeholds, and other hon. members—the socialist members—do not want freeholds. They won't have freeholds at any price; it is against the platform. How are you going to reconcile those statements? The socialist members want a land tax, and hon. members in the corner party do not want a land tax.

Mr. MANN: That is not correct. I have always advocated a land tax.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member is in favour of a land tax, but he does not believe in the exemptions. The hon. member gave his reasons why he could not adopt the platform of other hon. members sitting on the same side of the House; he could not accept the socialist objective, which were very good reasons—reasons I approved of, and the very same reasons that influenced myself and other hon. members sitting on this side.

Mr. MANN: Why are you not sitting over here?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member should not have deserted his leader—the man he was elected to support. The hon. member was elected to support the Premier and the Rockhampton programme, and he should have remained on this side of the House. Then we find the hon. member for Fassifern stating that the hon. member for Townsville, Mr. Philp, is being deceived by the Chief Secretary. Hon. members will remember that: but the hon. member for Cook states that the Chief Secretary, Mr. Kidston, is being deceived by

[8 p.m.] the hon. member for Townsville.

How can you reconcile those statements? Are they both deceiving each other? Then let me point out to hon. members opposite, who think that this Government is such a terribly Conservative Government, that, according to the admission of the hon. member for Fassifern, we are getting into socialism bit by bit.

Mr. LENNON: That Government has done nothing at all yet.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: If we are coming to socialism bit by bit, how is it that the hon. members are so bitter against the Government?

Mr. MANN: We want a bigger bit.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: We can quite imagine that the policy of the Government is just about the right one; a middle course between the two extremes is the right course.

Mr. BOWMAN: You are rightly designated the leader of the mid-way party.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The middle course is the safe course, I can assure the leader of the Opposition, and he will find that out if we go to the country in a short time. (Opposition laughter.) He will find where the votes of the people will be. They are not going to support a socialistic party like that which the hon. gentleman leads, and I am quite certain that they will not support a party composed of men who have deserted from this party, and who have a platform in no way dissimilar to that on this side of the House.

Mr. MITCHELL: You did not say that at the last election.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I want to make reference now to another hon. member. The hon. member for Nundah pointed out that under party government speeches did not influence votes. That, I believe, as a generalisation, is pretty correct—that under our system party government speeches do not influence votes. In the old times in the House of Commons speeches were not reported, but it is quite different nowadays. Members' speeches in the old time, not being meant for publication outside, were not designed to influence people outside Parliament, but for many years now it has been the custom for parliamentary speeches to be reported, and it is quite a legitimate thing for members of Parliament to speak to the "gallery". I do not mean that in the flippant sense in which it is often used. If a member speaks to the "gallery" with the view of appealing to sentiment, to the passions of the electors, then that is not justifiable. A member has no right to be insincere; but he is quite justified in speaking through *Hansard* and through the public Press to his constituents or to the electors.

Mr. BOWMAN: Or to the dress circle.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member now refers to the dress circle, an expression that the Premier made use of in a humorous sort of way. (Opposition laughter.) Hon. members may laugh, but they know very well that when the Chief Secretary said that he was speaking to the dress circle he was simply indulging in a little joke. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. MULCAHY: You are his apologist.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: It is rather dangerous for politicians to joke. I had a little experience of that not very long ago when I was with the Premier at Mackay. The Mackay people were very nice to us when we landed there. We had not time to stop a day, but they gave us a nice little reception, and some speeches were made. They were very pressing that the Premier and his party should stay longer to see their very fine district; they wanted us to wander about, I suppose among the canefields, sipping sweets from every cane stalk. (Opposition laughter.) In speaking, I ventured to make a humorous remark that it was a pity that Parliament had to meet at all, that we could not stop there altogether. I said it was a pity there was any meeting of Parliament at all this year.

Mr. BOWMAN: It is not often you are in a humorous strain, you know. (Laughter.)

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I think I can enjoy a joke as well as the leader of the Opposition. A week or two after that someone showed me a copy of the *Worker*, the organ of the Labour unions, in which there was

Hon. G. Jackson.]

actually a special leader devoted to this little innocent remark that I made at that Mackay function. They referred to George Jackson as having made the startling proposition that Parliament should shut up altogether. As I say, it is rather a serious thing for politicians to make a joke, and I think the Premier had better be more on his guard in the future, because, judging from the interjections of hon. members opposite, they contend that the Chief Secretary was speaking seriously when he spoke about addressing the dress circle. Now, although members may not be converted by the speeches made on the opposite side of the House, they are converted sometimes. People outside are saying very unpleasant things in connection with those members who recently deserted the Government. Those members may be acting in the public interests. They may be like the patriot, Brutus, who was "The noblest Roman of them all" when his dagger dipped in the blood of Cæsar.

Mr. BOWMAN: Are you quoting poetry now? (Laughter.)

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Well, it is Shakespeare. I am not going to quote very much poetry. I was pointing out that Brutus was considered the noblest Roman of them all because his dagger was dipped in Cæsar's blood.

Mr. MULCAHY: An honourable man.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Yes. Those hon. members who have deserted the Chief Secretary may be patriots in the same way as Brutus was, when Mark Antony said—

They that have done this deed are honourable. What private griefs they have, alas, I know not, that made them do it. They are wise and honourable, and will no doubt with reasons answer you.

Well now, we have heard their reasons. I think every member of that party who deserted the Chief Secretary has spoken and attempted a justification for their action with the exception of the hon. member for Port Curtis.

Mr. WOODS: There are five yet.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I am not referring to the members who left last year; I am referring to the members who have left the Government since last Parliament. I am not referring to the hon. member for Cairns or the hon. member for Woothakata; I am dealing with the hon. members who deserted the Government quite recently. I have listened to their speeches to see if there was any possible excuse for their desertion, and I have not been able to find any at all. As I said, I was not present at the caucus deliberations last year, but we have this fact standing out: that the hon. member for Toowoomba, the hon. member for Cook, and the other hon. members, gave the Government support during last session. They were advocates of the coalition, and have not denied that they advocated the coalition. What they say is that they gave the Premier a free hand. That is the only excuse the hon. members make. They say that they voted to give the Premier a free hand. What does that mean? What does a free hand mean? It means a free hand to choose his colleagues, I suppose. And after the Premier exercised that free hand they gave him, what did hon. members do? Did they leave the Government as soon as they found that the Premier had chosen certain individuals to become colleagues of his own in the Ministry? If they had done that, there might have been possibly some excuse, although even then, under the circumstances, I cannot see that they would be justified in leaving after voting for the coalition and giving the Premier a free hand. But they remained supporters of the Government after the Premier exercised the

[Hon G. Jackson.

free hand that they gave him, and they still continued to sit on this side of the House last session.

Mr. D. HUNTER: And gagged the Labour party.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: They are waiting for the psychological moment.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Now, with reference to the hon. member for Fassifern, Mr. Jenkinson, I recognise that the hon. member for Fassifern is a very able member, and he made a very able speech from his point of view the other night; but there is no justification, so far as I can see, for the action he is taking. I have not made a note of it, but I remember that the hon. member complained about the Government's expenditure. He dealt with some excessive expenditure of the Government, and he found fault with some administrative acts of the Government. But the faults which he found with the Government would have applied just as strongly last year as they do now. They would have applied just as strongly as an indictment against the Government at the very time that the hon. gentleman accepted the Chief Secretary as his leader. The hon. member for Fassifern does not deny that he agreed to accept the Chief Secretary as his leader, and his charges the other night would have applied just as strongly as when he first accepted the leadership of the Chief Secretary. So, what becomes of his speech? I think that the hon. member for Fassifern is disappointed at not getting office.

Mr. MULCAHY: He was offered office.

The TREASURER: By whom?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member for Gympie says that the hon. member for Fassifern was offered office, but the hon. member for Fassifern did not prove that.

Mr. HARDACRE: Yes, he did.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member said that the hon. member for Townsville went to him and asked him if he would take a portfolio if it were offered to him. But the hon. member did not say that the hon. member for Townsville offered him a portfolio, because if he had said that he would have contradicted himself, because the hon. member for Fassifern said that the hon. member for Townsville had no hand in the formation of the Government.

Mr. HARDACRE: He said he was foolish not to accept it at the time.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member for Fassifern was sent for by the Premier, as he said, and when the hon. member was giving an account of what happened at that interview with the Premier in his speech the other night, he was pressed to say if a portfolio had ever been offered to him by the Premier, and he would not reply. As a matter of fact, he was never offered a portfolio by the Premier.

Mr. BOWMAN: He was told that he was fitted for Cabinet rank.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: That is another matter altogether. He may have been told that he was fitted for Cabinet rank, and then not be offered a portfolio. Let us consider for a moment or two the career of the hon. member for Fassifern, Mr. Jenkinson. I do not want to speak in terms of opprobrium of the hon. member, because we are the best of personal friends, still I must point this out to the House, just to show that the hon. member for Fassifern has shifted about from one side to the other. (Labour laughter.)

Mr. MULCAHY: What about yourself?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member for Gympie interjects, "What about

yourself?" I would like the hon. member, or any other hon. member opposite, to get up and show me where I have been inconsistent. They have had three weeks to do it, and they have not done it yet; but as this debate is likely to go on for some time, they will probably have time to do it yet. I remember a year ago issuing a challenge to hon. members when I was discussing the question of socialism, and the objective of the Labour party, on the Address in Reply, and I challenged them to quote from any speech which I had made, or from anything which I had written, to show that I ever believed in the nationalisation of all the means of production, distribution, and exchange. That challenge still exists; and to-day I again challenge anyone to prove that I ever advocated such a thing. (Hear, hear!) To come back to the hon. member for Fassifern, that hon. gentleman, in 1903, helped to defeat the hon. member for Townsville, Mr. Philp.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: That is so.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: He joined Mr. Morgan in 1903 to help the coalition that was formed in that year. In 1904—the following year—the hon. member became a Philp supporter again.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: No.

Hon. R. PHILP: Sir Arthur Rutledge.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Yes, he became a follower of Sir Arthur Rutledge when that hon. gentleman was commissioned by the Governor to form a Government. The hon. member for Fassifern then became a supporter of Sir Arthur Rutledge, but it was the same party that had been previously led by Mr. Philp. So that the hon. gentleman at that time shifted about from one side to the other. Then, in 1908, the hon. member for Fassifern agreed to take the present Premier as his leader, and then, in 1909, he goes back to another party—he shifts his support from Mr. Kidston, whom he agreed to accept as leader, and he has gone over to another party. Does it not show a peculiar bent of mind on the part of the hon. member when he moves about like that. Whether it is disappointment at not getting office or not, I do not know. I will now refer to the actions of the hon. member for Cook, Mr. Douglas. That hon. gentleman came into this House under very auspicious circumstances. He was a most loyal supporter of the present Premier when he first came into the House. I have made an extract from *Hansard* from a speech delivered by the hon. member for Cook, but it was read last night by the hon. member for Warwick, Mr. G. P. Barnes, and I do not need to repeat it to-night. That extract shows clearly that the hon. member for Cook announced himself as a loyal supporter of the present Premier. In another part of his speech not quoted by the hon. member for Warwick, the hon. member for Cook said—

The question of the coalition so far as I am concerned did not crop up on the last occasion. I may tell the House that in my election campaign of May, 1907, I advocated a coalition between the Kidston party and the Philp party.

The Treasurer informs me that the hon. member for Cook acknowledged it last week. I do not want to deal further with the hon. member for Cook, as it is not necessary for me to go over the whole ground covered by the hon. member for Warwick yesterday. I just want to deal with one or two criticisms made by the hon. member for Nundah, Mr. Sumner. I think the strongest justification that hon. member gave for not standing by the coalition was that he had promised his electors he would not support the coalition.

Mr. Woods: Didn't you?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I gave an answer to a question asked at a small mining field—Woodville—when asked if I would support a coalition between the leader of the Opposition and the Premier.

Mr. Woods: You replied very distinctly, too.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I stated that I would not support a coalition. But what is meant by a coalition? (Opposition laughter.)

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: You want to wriggle out of it.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: A coalition means a compromise of principle on one side or the other—a give-and-take arrangement, the same as happened when Sir Samuel Griffith and Sir Thomas Mellwraith formed a coalition. This is not a coalition in that sense; this is a fusion. When I gave an answer like that, as other members may have done, it was not expected that the members of the Philp party would come and accept our policy; and the hon. member for Nundah would have been perfectly justified in staying on this side, even though he had given a promise of that kind. That hon. member was elected to support the present Premier on the Rockhampton policy.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No coalition!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: No coalition in the sense hon. members spoke of it; but this is an absolute fusion of parties on a common policy.

Several members interjecting,

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Now I come to the leader of the Opposition. He has been complimented by several members for having made a moderate speech. It was a moderate speech; I might go further and say it was a very, very weak speech indeed, coming from the leader of an Opposition challenging the right of the Government to occupy these benches. What was the hon. member's indictment? I know he spoke some considerable time, but boiled down the hon. member's indictment consisted of three points. The first was that the Government were not giving sufficient facilities for land settlement.

Mr. BOWMAN: Which was admitted by your Minister.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: It was not admitted by the Minister for Lands. If ever a Minister justified the Government, it was that hon. gentleman when dealing with that matter. And the hon. member for Burnett this afternoon admitted that he had no complaint to make about his own district. I don't know what other places he has to complain about.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: Did he not complain that there was not 1,000 acres available in his district?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: In reply to that, the Secretary for Lands pointed out that over 200,000 acres were either ready for settlement or were being designed for settlement. That is the first point in the indictment made by the leader of the Opposition. The second point was in connection with immigration; and the third point was that there was a strike on at the Boyne Valley. With regard to the first point, I do not want to touch on that, because I think the Secretary for Lands completely answered the hon. member. But with regard to immigration, about which there has been a great deal of talk, I would like to say a few words—though the Secretary for Lands also dealt with that point in a very admirable way. The Secretary for Lands quoted statistics showing the number of people

Hon. G. J. Jackson.]

to the square mile in European countries; I want to show the density of population in Australia per square mile. New South Wales has 310,000 square miles, with a population of 1,526,000; Victoria has 87,000 square miles, with a population of 1,231,000; Queensland has 670,000 square miles—twice that of New South Wales, and eight times that of Victoria—with a population of 535,000. These figures may be a year or two old—

Mr. HARDACRE: What does it prove? There is no population in the moon; but that is no argument in favour of immigration there.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I think they prove a good deal. During the last few years—since the Russo-Japanese war—there has been a considerable change in the opinion held, not only by members of Parliament, but by the general public, in regard to the question of immigration. People who at one time did not favour State-assisted immigration are now very keen and strong and ardent advocates of State-assisted immigration—not indiscriminate immigration. I know some members say they are not against immigration, but are only against indiscriminate immigration. They say, "We want the right brand of immigrants."

Mr. BOWMAN: You have advocated the same thing in years gone by in this House.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I am pointing out that a few years ago some members of Parliament—I was one of them—did not believe in State-assisted immigration; but since the development of the great power of Japan our opinions have changed, and we now recognise that it is necessary we should do all we can to fill up the waste spaces of Australia. That is the reason why I, and probably thousands of others, have changed our opinions in connection with the question of immigration. Some years ago it was recognised by the Labour party that the question of immigration was a Federal matter rather than a State matter; but they have continually got up in the House and talked against it. Now I want to read a little quotation in connection with the matter of immigration—an extract from a Charters Towers paper of something said by Mr. Collins. He said—

They had two members in Parliament, who should receive their instructions direct from an organised body here. He advocated the election of mine inspectors by direct vote of the miners. Things wanted organising at the meatworks as well as on the field. Immigrants have more go in them than the people here, and should have the hand of fellowship extended to them and induced to join the union. Then the people should go away and kick themselves for having them here. They are not responsible for being here; the people of Queensland are responsible for allowing the Government to bring them out.

I don't know whether the members for Charters Towers endorse the opinion of Mr. Collins in connection with that matter. The real reason that is at the bottom of the objections by members of the Labour party to any assisted immigration is this: They believe that the introduction of immigrants will reduce the standard rate of wages. That is their objection. They believe that wages will come down. The hon. member for Charters Towers, Mr. [8.30 p.m.] Winstanley, admitted that money wages do not represent the true wages. The hon. member said that wages boards are not doing such a great amount of good—that, when every man becomes a member of a union and wages boards are applied generally, the men will be no better off, if they are as well off as before. And he further said, "Anyway, wages boards are doing this good, that, if they are not improving the material prosperity of the workers, they are teaching them political economy." And he pointed out that it is not

[Hon G. Jackson.

only a question of money wages when you are estimating the recompense of the working man, but what you have to consider is what the money wages will buy. If you get more people here, what does it matter if the wages go down so long as the cost of living goes down too.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: Ah!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: That is an almost inevitable law. In densely peopled countries the cost of living is lower than in countries where the population is smaller.

Mr. HARDACRE: The United States are densely peopled, and yet the cost of living is high.

Hon. R. PHILP: That is because of protection.

Mr. HARDACRE: Never mind about that—I am replying to the argument of the Secretary for Mines.

Hon. R. PHILP: Take China.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I have been reading the articles by the hon. member for Clermont, which have been appearing lately in the *Courier*. I have read them with a great deal of interest, and I compliment the hon. member upon the way in which he has described the conditions in New Zealand. The hon. member has told us in those articles that, notwithstanding all this legislation in New Zealand—notwithstanding wages boards—notwithstanding their high tariff—everything has got dearer, and the working men are no better off, despite all these palliatives. The Labour party's platform is loaded up with palliatives, which I imagine they will strike off now, because they are coming to recognise they are no good to them.

Mr. BOWMAN: The hon. member for Clermont gave you a reason for it.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: He has given no reason in the articles.

Mr. BOWMAN: He did last night.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Probably the hon. member may give a reason for it, but he has not given any reason in his articles in the *Courier*.

Mr. MANN: Be fair.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I think am fair when compared with the hon. member for Cairns. I imagine that the hon. member for Clermont puts the solution on the land question.

Mr. LESINA: That is correct—chiefly.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Well, when hon. members have got leaseholds instead of freeholds, they will find that they will still have the same troubles that they have now. If every acre of land in Queensland were held under lease, would there not be the same bad conditions if we had a series of droughts? What would it matter whether land was held under lease or freehold if a drought came along?

Mr. LESINA: Or even without a drought.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member admits that the conditions would be no better if we had the leasehold system.

Mr. LESINA: I maintain the conditions will never be any better while the wages system lasts.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member is now going further still.

Mr. LESINA: I am a socialist.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member now says that he is a socialist. Many members of the Labour party, including the hon. member for Charters Towers, Mr. Winstanley, hold that the land question is at the bottom of all the trouble. The hon. member for Clermont

says, "No; if you nationalise your land, you will still have the same trouble so long as you have the wages system."

Mr. LESINA: Not the same.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Well, what do they believe in? What are they advocating? Is there any solution? I tell hon. members there is no solution to this question. I will deal with that later on. I have been drawn off the track of my argument by an interjection made by the hon. member for Clermont. I was speaking of immigration and money wages, and an interjection from the hon. member reminded me of his articles in the *Courier*. I have one of those articles here, which is headed, "New Laws by Hundreds. New Zealand's Experience. A Statute-mark Millennium." I am not going to read the whole article—though it would be very good to get it all into *Hansard*, but I have some consideration for hon. members' feelings. I shall, therefore, only quote two or three short passages. The hon. member said—

Another important feature of this "current of tendency," particularly noticeable in New Zealand, is that every extension of this regulative policy involves an addition to the regulative agents—a further growth of officialism, and an increasing power of the organisation formed of officials, and we all know that an organisation of officials, once passing a certain stage of growth, becomes less and less resistable.

I have only had a short experience as a Minister in charge of a department—only a week or two—but it has already come under my notice that there is a demand for an inspector here, and a demand from some other town for an inspector there, and the hon. member for Clermont is perfectly correct when he points out how the tendency is for more Government officials to be appointed under this mania for regulation. Too much regulation!—Then the hon. member goes on in another passage—

Only the other night, speaking at a meeting of the Sydney Labour Council, a representative of the Canterbury (New Zealand) Trades and Labour Council stated "that the experiment of raising wages by legislation in the Dominion had been a failure."

The socialists think that the experiment of raising wages by legislation—if they can only get socialism—will not be a failure, but they would find that it would be a very much worse failure than the present industrial system. Where we have enterprise now, we should have stagnation, if hon. members opposite could have their way. Going on with the quotation made by the hon. member, he says—

"Better wages, and in some cases shorter hours, had been obtained, but the extra cost of living left the workers where they were before."

Then the hon. member goes on in his own words—

This is precisely what every union secretary and Labour supporter told me during my visit. And they furthermore asked me to tell the Labour party of Australia that fact; and repeat it as loudly as possible, as the fervent and romantic rhapsodies of some visiting Labourites has led the Government to declare that the New Zealand worker is better off than his fellow in Australia, and that it proposes to give the Dominion a rest from further experimental legislation.

Mr. AIREY: Anybody must see that the condition of things in New Zealand is entirely due to their mad financial system. It is not a matter of industrial legislation.

Mr. LESINA: That is only one factor.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member for Brisbane South says that it is owing to their mad financial system—that New Zealand has been borrowing rather excessively, but as the hon. member for Clermont points out, that is only one factor. If you put high duties on imported goods, those goods are bound to be dearer. I know that protectionists claim that in the end they will be cheaper; but they are

bound to be dearer all the time. New Zealand is a highly protected country; they have wages boards, and all these regulations, and they have to pay for them. But who is it pays for them? In the first instance, the primary producer—the farmer has to pay a great deal of them. The miner—whom the hon. member for Clermont represents—has to stand a great deal of the cost.

Mr. LESINA: A big share of it.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: And after they have borne their share of all this expense, the wages men themselves have to bear a share. The wages man in a union under a wages board gets his wages raised. But, if everything that the wages man consumes becomes dearer, owing to the rate in wages having been put up in all other industries, evidently the wages man is no better off, but probably worse off, because he produces one article and buys twenty other articles, so that it is quite evident that he is really worse off than before. Now, let me return for a short time to immigration. I said a little while ago that the reason why members of the Socialist party object to immigration is that they believe that the introduction of immigrants will bring competitors into the labour market, and that there will not be as much work for the men who are here as there is at the present time, or, if there is work for them, that the remuneration for that work will be lower than it is at present. The best cure for unemployment is to expand our productive industries. That is what members on this side believe in. We believe in expanding our productive industries. I do not say that during an industrial crisis, or even during a time when there is no industrial crisis, it may not be desirable that the State or the local authority—the people collectively, whether through the Government or a local authority—should do its best to assist the unemployed. I do not go back on the principle that we should do our best to assist the unemployed. And this Government have done their best to help the unemployed. There are not many unemployed in Queensland at the present time.

A LABOUR MEMBER: Hundreds.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Well, hundreds may mean 200 or 300. I have got a return on this subject from the Under Secretary for Works. Hon. members may not know that a return is furnished every month to the Minister for Works by the Labour Bureau showing the numbers of persons who have registered at the different labour bureaux throughout Queensland.

A LABOUR MEMBER: That does not show the number of unemployed.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I admit that the return does not show all the unemployed, but it shows all those who go to the Government Labour Bureau. The last return furnished to me shows only 300 persons registered in excess of the supply over demand, and at that particular time, which was just before the sugar season, men were gathering into the sugar districts in search of employment. I do not know how hon. members opposite propose to deal with the unemployed question. They may have some remedy for the trouble, but I do not know it. But, as I have already said, I think it is the duty of the State to lend a helping hand when there are unemployed in the country. The matter is a most difficult one, but in my opinion the best way to assist the unemployed is to encourage private enterprise, to expand our productive industries. Now, I want to deal with one remark made by the hon. member for Bowen. The hon. member for Bowen alluded to the Premier's reference to a dissolution, and

[Hon. G. Jackson.]

made a great deal of capital out of that reference, trying to make out that the Premier had threatened a dissolution of Parliament. The hon. member pointed out what an impertinent thing it was for the Premier to talk about a dissolution, and assumed that the Premier was arrogating to himself the right of dissolution of Parliament. That is all bunkum, if I may use a pretty plain expression. The Premier never talked in that strain at all, and never meant any such thing when he spoke on the matter. What the Premier said was that if hon. members opposite wanted a dissolution, if they were agreeable to a dissolution of Parliament, there would be no difficulty about it—there would be no difficulty in fixing the time for a dissolution if both parties agreed and made known their agreement through their leaders. I believe it is the custom in the Imperial Parliament—though I speak diffidently on this point, but you, Sir, will know what is the practice—I believe it is not unusual in the old country for the Premier to consult the leader of the Opposition a year or two before the close of a Parliament—they have seven years' Parliaments in Great Britain—as to the proper time for going to the country.

Mr. BOWMAN: That did not happen before the last election.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: There is no reason why it should not happen here. As any rate, the hon. member for Bowen is not justified in assuming that the Premier was talking in any dictatorial way in connection with a dissolution of Parliament. With regard to a remark made by the hon. member for Ipswich, Mr. Blair, I wish to say a word or two. The points I have referred to struck me as being worthy of reply, even though they do not deal with the administration of the Government. The hon. member for Ipswich, Mr. Blair, took advantage of the occasion when he made his speech to announce the programme of his party—the Independent Opposition. He stated that he is in favour of a vigorous policy of assistance to farmers and graziers. That is exactly the policy we are in favour of; and I suppose hon. members opposite will also say they are in favour of that policy. We are carrying out that policy at the present time. The hon. member for Ipswich, speaking about the question of the ownership of land, further said that, "After a certain number of years you will only be entitled to retain a certain portion of that estate." The hon. member was not very clear when he said that.

Mr. BLAIR: It did not appear clear to you, you mean.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: It was not clear to me, and I shall be glad if the hon. member will assist me as to his meaning by way of interjection.

Mr. BLAIR: I do not want to assist you: I want to turn you out.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Well, I will try to come to some conclusion as to what the hon. member meant. If he means that it should be in the power of the Government to repurchase a certain portion of the estate for close settlement, then he is asking for nothing beyond what we already have the right to do.

Mr. BLAIR: You set up a bogey and then knock it over.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: If the hon. member will not explain what he means, I can only try to arrive at a conclusion as to his meaning. If he does not mean that the Government should have the right to repurchase a certain portion of an estate after a number of years,

[Hon. G. Jackson.

he must mean the other thing—that we should have a right to confiscate a portion of that estate. (Opposition laughter.)

Hon. R. PHILP: Perhaps he does not know himself what he means.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I imagine that the hon. member knows what he means, and what I desire is to understand his meaning. For that purpose I put two propositions before the House. Does the hon. member mean that the Government should have the right to purchase a portion of that estate, or that they should have the right to confiscate a portion of that estate?

Mr. MANN: He may mean a land tax.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: No, he said nothing about a land tax; he does not mean that. The hon. member said that "After a certain number of years you are only to be entitled to retain a certain portion of that estate." What can that mean except that the State may take a portion compulsorily by purchase or by confiscation? There is no other construction that can be put on the words. But I will leave it to the hon. member for Ipswich to explain by and by when he again addresses the House. I cannot see any other explanations than the two I have submitted to the House. Then the hon. member for Ipswich, in speaking about the possibility of the leader of the Opposition being called in to form a Government, referred to the position in 1904, when Sir Arthur Rutledge was commissioned by the Governor to form an Administration, and the hon. member was dealing with it from this point of view: That although a member commissioned to form a Government had not sufficient supporters to enable him to carry on, he ought to accept the Commission and go on. That was the hon. member's argument. He said Sir Arthur Rutledge made the greatest mistake of his life when he resigned his Commission into His Excellency's hands. What is the deduction we must draw from that statement? I assume that when the leader of the Opposition accepts a Commission from the Governor to form an Administration he should be able to assure the Governor that he has got sufficient support to carry on. I think that is the first thing the Governor should be told. Now, the hon. member for Ipswich evidently contends that any hon. member who has a Commission to form a Government should fill all that to the winds.

Mr. BLAIR: Nothing of the sort.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: That he should not tell the Governor he has not enough members behind him to carry on. I do not want to put words into the hon. member's mouth; but I am drawing a fair deduction, and the deduction is, that the leader of the Opposition, or whoever is commissioned to form a Government, should cover up from the Governor whether he has any possibility of carrying on.

Mr. BLAIR: No, you are altogether wrong.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: That he should accept the Commission and then take the opportunity of forming his Government—

Mr. BLAIR: You draw an absolutely wrong deduction.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: To buy support. I am not saying that the hon. member used those words, but that is a fair deduction from what the hon. gentleman stated.

Mr. MANN: You are showing how badly the hon. member for Townsville acted last year.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Let me give another aspect of the question. The hon.

members supporting the Chief Secretary have been condemned for accepting help from the party supporting the hon. member for Townsville, Mr. Philp. We have been condemned for accepting help from them. The Socialist party would not help to form a coalition; they have adopted a policy of not giving immunity to any other party, of going on alone, of playing a lone hand. Whether they are going to continue that policy remains to be seen. That has been their policy in the past. Whilst they have been saying "no coalition" they want to dictate to the Philp party and the Kidston party as to what we should do. They are not satisfied with adopting a policy of their own, but they say to hon. members supporting the Chief Secretary, "You must not join hands with the members supporting the hon. member for Townsville;" and they say to the supporters of the hon. member for Townsville, "You must not do anything of the sort either." Why do hon. members adopt this dictatorial attitude?

Mr. HARDACRE: It is going against the pledges given to the electors.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: There is no going against election pledges so long as our platform is not deviated from. Let me ask members of the Labour party whether they would object to assistance from members who are willing to go over and accept their platform? They blame us for accepting assistance from the Philp party, while they themselves do not object to assistance. If hon. members are prepared to accept their platform, they would take them to their arms at once. Why do hon. members condemn us for doing a thing that they themselves would be quite prepared to do? Members of the Philp party came over and accepted our platform. Why should we turn them away if they were prepared to accept the balance of the Rockhampton platform? Then hon. members opposite preach "measures, not men." That is what the Socialistic party is continually preaching, "measures, not men." Now, if it is a question of "measures, not men," why should we refuse to accept support from the hon. member for Townsville?

Mr. BLAIR: There is no business in your measures.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Hon. members have been prophesying, of course, that we have been conservatised—that we won't bring in the balance of the Rockhampton policy—and to prove that, they start to stonewall this side of the House. Last session there was only a couple of months in which to do business, and yet look at the time they took up last year, and the same thing is happening this session.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: You have taken up a good deal of time.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I am the first Minister who has spoken for some time, and only two others have spoken. Hon. members opposite say we are conservatised—that there is no business in our measures. They have made this forecast, and they mean to prove it by stopping us from doing business. I would remind the hon. members opposite that the coalition they are condemning—they are condemning us now for coalescing with the Philp party—but in 1903 their party did not object to form a coalition with some hon. members sitting as independent members and some members who were supporting the hon. member for Townsville. If it was desirable to do it then, why do they object to it now?

Mr. BOWMAN: We profit by past experience.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member has got wise. He knows very well that

the result of the coalition that was formed in 1903 has been most beneficial to Queensland. The hon. member cannot dispute that.

Honourable members interjecting,

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: During this debate it was shown—I think the hon. member for Woolloongabba gave an extract from *Hansard* to show, or tried to show—that the Labour party last year were willing to coalesce with the Philp party. The hon. member read an extract from *Hansard* which I will repeat, because it will fit in with my argument.

Mr. BOWMAN: It was not true.

Mr. D. HUNTER: I quoted from *Hansard*.

Mr. BOWMAN: I don't care if you quoted from a dozen *Hansards*.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: In November, 1908, on the Address in Reply, when the hon. member for Leichhardt was speaking, Mr. Cowap interjected—

And then you tried to refuse Supply.

Mr. HARDACRE: Exactly.

Mr. COWAP: And you tried to coalesce with the Philp party.

Mr. HARDACRE: And what was the reason? We had at the closing hours of the last session exactly the same kind of thing as we had to fight against during the Morgan-Kidston Government, and for many years of the Philp Government. They have the same system in force in America. We had brought down two syndicate railways.

The hon. member for Leichhardt, when he said, "And what was the reason?"

Mr. HARDACRE: That is incorrectly reported in *Hansard*.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member repudiates it now—I never heard the hon. member repudiate it before. I do not wish to discuss the two syndicate railways. That is the first proof I want to submit to the House—that the Labour party, or some of them, were quite ready to coalesce with the supporters of the hon. member for Townsville in order to turn out the Premier, the hon. member for Rockhampton.

Mr. HARDACRE: I absolutely deny it.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: If the hon. member did not say it, he certainly ought to correct it.

Mr. HARDACRE: I did not see it before the other night.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I want to strengthen my argument by giving [9 p.m.] an extract from the speech of the hon. member for Gregory, who, speaking on the same debate, said—

I say that no sooner did the Premier land in Australia on his return from the old country than he said he had done with the Labour party. Of course, he knew we were done with him.

Now that is the point I want to fasten on hon. members. The Chief Secretary has been blamed for leaving the Labour party, and yet here is a statement from the hon. member for Gregory that the Labour party had done with the Chief Secretary.

Mr. MULLAN: As a consequence of having done with us. (Government laughter.)

Mr. BOWMAN: What did the Premier say before he left for the old country? Just give us a reminder of that.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I am assured by the Chief Secretary that there was no arrangement whatever when he left for the old country. (Labour laughter.) But the Chief Secretary, I believe, recognised—I am not disputing that—he recognised that the breach had

Hon. G. Jackson.]

come between the Labour party and the Kidston party. That is not the point I am labouring. The point I want to show is that the Labour party had decided—

The PREMIER : They also recognised that.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES : Yes, the Labour party also recognised that a breach had come between the two parties.

The PREMIER : They were rejoiced.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES : If they were rejoiced, as the Premier interjects, they should not find any fault with the coalition. Here are a few words now from the speech made by the Premier in April, which will prove what the Premier has just admitted—that he had done with the Labour party and the Labour party had done with him. Each party had come to the conclusion that it had done with the other. The Premier, in a short speech at the close of the session, said—

Now, this is not a personal matter at all. It may be me, or it may be someone else, but it is desirable, in the interests of Queensland, that the present unsatisfactory position of parties in the House should come to an end before the House meets again.

Mr. LESINA : It has come to an end.

The PREMIER : It really has come to an end.

It really has come to an end. (Opposition laughter.) I have proved from the speech of the hon. member for Gregory, and the interjection of the hon. member for Clermont, that the working together, as far as they did work together, had come to an end. I want to make it clear—not to hon. members, because they know it—but to the electors outside, who are being misled very often, when it is pointed out by the newspapers, or the Labour Press, that it was the Chief Secretary who deserted the Labour party.

Mr. BOWMAN : You have not made it clear that the Labour party wanted a coalition with the Philp party.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES : I have quoted from the speech of the hon. member for Leichhardt.

Mr. HARDACRE : No ; he denies it.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES : I can only quote it from *Hansard*. I want to give a short quotation now from a speech of the hon. member for Barcoo.

I am certain they would never have defeated him (if he had come down with his Rockhampton policy) to put the Philp party in power.

Mr. KERR : And the first plank of that was no coalition.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS : Hear, hear !

The SECRETARY FOR MINES : We have heard that during this debate. After the hon. member for Barcoo said that, Mr. Lesina again interjected—I want hon. members to listen to this point—

Mr. LESINA : I am not so sure about that.

Now, I have proved by the hon. member for Leichhardt's admission—

Mr. HARDACRE : No.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES : That they were ready to coalesce with the Philp party. The hon. member for Clermont, by that interjection, said that he was not so sure about that—implying that they were quite prepared to coalesce. I think I have proved as reasonably as anyone can do—

Mr. BOWMAN : To your own satisfaction.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES : That they were trying to coalesce with the Philp

[Hon. G. Jackson.

party. I don't want to labour that ; it is not such an important point, but I thought I would mention it. The Chief Secretary has been blamed for forming this coalition. The Chief Secretary recognised, I think, that he could no longer depend upon the Labour party for support. That hon. members will admit. I have told hon. members that I was not present in the House when these semi-Government railways—I will not call them syndicate railways—were introduced, and I was not a witness of what took place.

Mr. KERR interjected.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES : The hon. member knows very well that I left to go away to the old country. The hon. member knows that I went on the morning before the troubles occurred. I had left Brisbane then, so that I was not a spectator or a participator, but I read the debate after. I do not know whether it will be in order for me to quote the language which the leader of the Opposition used in reference to the Premier, but I want to draw the attention of members and the people outside to the fact that when such language was used it was impossible for the two parties to work together.

Mr. MANN : Look what the hon. member for Nundah said about him.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES : The hon. member for Barcoo, speaking on the Address in Reply in the second session, said this—

I had reasons why I could not work with the Philp party, and I left the late Ministry in an honourable manner.

The TREASURER : Of your own accord.

Mr. KERR : Yes, of my own accord.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES—

Mr. KERR : I left of my own accord. I did not believe that the coalition was going to accomplish the work that it was said it was going to accomplish.

The hon. member was not dismissed from the Ministry, evidently. Neither the hon. member for Barcoo nor the hon. member for Brisbane South was dismissed from the Ministry ; they left of their own accord. At any rate, the hon. member for Barcoo admits that, and it was simply because those two hon. gentlemen left the Ministry that there was a certain amount of suspicion created in the public mind. People began to think there was something particularly bad or offensive about this coalition when these two hon. gentlemen left the Ministry of their own accord. They were not dismissed from the Ministry by the so-called Conservative members. But I would like to ask the hon. member for Barcoo how he reconciles the fact of his having accepted help from the Philp party previously on the question of those railways—how did it come that the hon. member began to be so sensitive—

Mr. KERR and several other hon. members interjecting,

The SECRETARY FOR MINES : It is an effort for me to speak, because I have not a very strong voice. When these interjections take place, I have to raise my voice. I am asking the hon. member for South Brisbane and the hon. member for Barcoo how they reconcile the fact that they were willing to help the Chief Secretary pass those railways—so-called syndicate railways—to apply the closure, and to get the help of the Philp party to do it? Why then did the hon. members become so sensitive about receiving help from the Philp party?

Mr. MANN : Why did you receive the Chairmanship of Committees from them? (Opposition laughter.)

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I will deal with that later on. I want to say a word or two later on about the vendetta of the Labour party against myself.

Mr. BOWMAN: You were never worthy of the position.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I want to speak about the vendetta of the Labour party against myself when I was nominated for the Speakership and Chairman of Committees, and I will deal with that later on.

Interjections from Opposition corner.

Mr. MURPHY: It was the Premier who sacrificed you.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: There are a number of hon. members opposite interjecting, and I cannot hear them. If I heard them, I would reply to what they are saying.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the hon. member for Cairns and other hon. members who are interjecting will realise that it is their duty to refrain from making interjections. The Standing Orders provide abundant opportunities for any hon. member to express his sentiments on any hon. member's speech in the form of another speech. (Hear, hear!)

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I ask how the hon. members for South Brisbane and Barcoo reconcile their positions? Then we find that hon. members made a point that they were afraid that they would be conservatised. To use the words of the hon. member for Cook in speaking at Cooktown, they were afraid they would be "engulfed in the waters of conservatism." Just fancy this party being conservatised! We have a system of triennial elections in Queensland—it has been an annual election lately—and we have got one adult one vote, and in a short time, even if this Parliament runs its full course, we shall have to go to the country again, so where is the conservatising going to be done when we have got a franchise like that we have? To talk about being "engulfed in the waters of conservatism" is simply ridiculous. The Premier described the policy of the Opposition as one of revenge, not reform, and I think there is a certain amount of truth in that. I spoke a moment ago about the vendetta which the Labour party took up against myself and other ex-members of the Labour party. I do them the justice to say that it was not against me personally. I believe it was not. There is no reply. I would like to know from the leader of the Opposition if that vendetta was against me personally or against the ex-Labour members sitting on this side.

Mr. BOWMAN: Against the ex-Labour members generally. One of our reasons was that you were incapable of holding the position. You were weaker than any man I know for the position.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member says that I was not capable of holding the position.

Mr. BOWMAN: You were as weak as water.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I held that position five years, but I am not going to say anything about my own qualifications. All I wanted to know was whether the vendetta was against myself personally or against the ex-Labour members generally. In 1907 I was proposed for the position which you now fill so well, Mr. Speaker—the Speakership of this Assembly. The *Worker*—the Labour party's newspaper—the socialist newspaper—the exponent of the Labour party's policy—

Mr. BOWMAN: It suited your book once.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: On the day that the election of Speaker was to take place the *Worker* came out with a strong leading article denouncing me, and telling the members of the Opposition what they should do. It said that they must vote against me for that position, and so they did.

The PREMIER: Of course they did.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The Chief Secretary says, "Of course they did." I am not suggesting that because the *Worker* said that, that the Labour party did it; but it was very significant, because, in the following year, when I was again nominated for the position, the *Worker* did exactly the same thing. It came out with a leading article telling the Labour party that they must not vote for me, and again the Labour party refused to vote for me. In 1907 I thought it was a personal matter against myself. I had not got behind the scenes then.

Mr. BOWMAN: It is a wonder you did not say you are a good burrower.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: In 1908 when I was defeated for the position, I noticed that one or two other ex-Labour members were also proposed and defeated. It was quite clear then that the Labour party were not prepared to accept as Speaker or Chairman of Committees any member who had been a member of the Labour party. What kind of a party is this which adopts a policy of revenge against members who were once members of that party, and who left them in an honourable way?

Mr. MULLAN: It is not revenge, but retribution.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: We never went back on our party at any time, and I will prove that right up to the hilt directly. What kind of a party is this Socialist party that they take up an attitude of that kind? We had never gone back on the platform. Is a party with such high ideals justified in proclaiming a vendetta against ex-members of that party? The leader of the Labour party admitted just now that a vendetta was aimed against every ex-member of the Labour party. He has just admitted it. What about the high ideals that they profess when they descend to persecuting men who once belonged to that body? I have never made any complaint about the Labour party until now. In 1907 the Philp party came to the rescue and, voting with the Kidston party, elected me Chairman of Committees. In 1908 the Philp party would not do that because the leader of the Kidston party was so anxious to work with these hon. gentlemen that the Philp party said, "No, we will have nothing to do with your men. If you had come to us first we would have dealt with you, but you first went to your friends, the socialists, to see if they would help you."

The PREMIER: And I was anxious to work with them until I got dead sick of it.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: We could not expect the Philp party to support me for the position of Chairman of Committees. I never found fault with the members of the Philp party because they did not vote for me on that occasion. People told me outside that it was meant that the supporters of the hon. member for Townsville did not support me when they got in their own man as Speaker. I said, "No; it was not," and I explained to them how the Premier was trying to work with the Labour party in connection with the appointment of the

[Hon. G. Jackson.]

Chairman of Committees, and I said, "There is no fault at all to be found with the Philp members for refusing to support me."

Mr. MURPHY: The Premier sacrificed you rather than sacrifice himself.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Either in Parliament or out of it I have never previously made any complaint because the Labour party boycotted me. This is the first time that I raised the question.

The PREMIER: It was a very strange attitude to take up on the part of the men with whom you were once associated.

Mr. BOWMAN: It was stranger conduct on your part as to whom you wanted in the chair.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I did propose to review the situation for some years back, but I find I have taken up too much time.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Oh, no! Plenty of time! Go on.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I have some distance to go yet.

Mr. KERR: Tell us what the hon. member for Townsville said about you on that occasion.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: On what occasion?

Mr. KERR: The occasion of the Chairmanship.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the hon. member will be allowed to make his speech without these frequent interjections.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I don't know what the hon. member for Barcoo is referring to, Mr. Speaker, but I know that after the election of 1907 the Labour party took up a position on the Opposition side of the House. That did not look as if they were particularly anxious to work with the Premier. And on the Premier making a nomination for the Chairmanship of Committees, they immediately nominated another man. Whatever may be said about the appointment of Speaker, the Chairmanship of Committees is usually regarded as a party question; and when the Premier proposes a member for the position, and another party proposes somebody else, that is equivalent to a vote of want of confidence. That is what the members on the other side did in 1907—they set their backs up against the Premier.

Mr. MURPHY: They worked with him a long time after that.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I agree that after the trouble in connection with the election of Speaker and Chairman of Committees, the Labour party gave support to the Government in their legislation when it suited them; but when anything that did not suit them was introduced, of course they opposed it. As the hon. member for Cook, I think, said on one occasion, "It is all take and no give with the Labour party." When the Kidston party wanted reforms, the Labour party said, "Oh, no! That is not in our platform"; and they voted against it. That is all right—the Labour party have a right to do as they choose.

Mr. BOWMAN: That was the condition laid down by me when we took our position on that cross bench.

Several HONOURABLE MEMBERS interjecting,

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Now let me come to the immediate cause that separated the two parties. I contend that after the election of 1907 the Labour party had no occasion,

[Hon. G. Jackson,

unless they specially wished, to sit on the Opposition side, and they would have been consistent if they had sat on the Government side. They had no particular fault to find with the Rockhampton programme, which was a most democratic policy. But, notwithstanding the fact that they did not object to any plank in that policy, as far as I know, they took their seats on the Opposition benches, and challenged the Government immediately the Chairman of Committees was proposed. The trouble started between the Labour party and the Kidston party in 1905—the trouble between the democratic members of the Labour party and the socialistic members of that party.

Mr. HARDACRE: It was long before that. It was at the time of the official statement.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: It was in the year 1905, when the convention was held, at which the socialistic objective and the land plank were altered. In 1905 the Labour Convention was held; and it was at that convention that the trouble came between the radical members and the socialistic members. The socialistic party were in the ascendant, and they inserted in the constitution what is known as the "socialistic objective." That was the time the breach came. The general election took place in 1904, when we went to the country together. The policy of compromise or coalition or alliance which they now condemn, proved most beneficial in the past. If we go back to the 1904 election, when the Labour party worked with the Morgan party, when they had a joint committee, when they showed the people of Queensland that they were willing to work with other members who did not have the same ideas as they had—at that time the electors showed by the return of thirty-four Labour members that they endorsed the policy of compromise.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: We were elected in 1904 on the old Labour platform. The convention was held in 1905, when the socialistic objective was introduced into the Labour party constitution, and the land plank was altered so that no more freeholds could be granted. We protested; and I appealed to the Premier and the hon. member for South Brisbane, Mr. Airey, who was then a Minister—I felt so strongly on the question of the socialistic objective and the alteration of the land plank—that it was going to wreck the Labour party—that I made a special effort to invite them to come to the convention the next morning to speak against it. The Premier is represented as a man who is always pulling the wires. On that occasion I saw the danger, and I appealed to those two hon. gentlemen, believing that they had much more persuasive power than I, and that they would be able to put the case better. Mr. McDonnell was a member then, and a delegate to the convention, and we both felt strongly that it was going to wreck the Labour party; so I appealed to those Ministers to come to the convention. They came, but it was of no avail. The convention was controlled by the socialistic members there, and all the talk was in vain. But what I forecasted came true, because it divided the party. The members in the House in 1905 were elected on the 1904 platform; and the fact that the convention introduced this objective did not have any effect on the members elected on the old platform; so we worked along under the old platform until 1907, and the Labour party were sitting on this side. Between 1905 and 1907 we appealed for another convention. We have been charged continually with a desire to wreck the Labour party. I want to show that that is untrue, and I

am proving it absolutely, because, if we had wanted to break up the Labour [9.30 p.m.] party, would we have taken up the attitude we did in appealing for a fresh convention to reconsider the points of difference? Up to the very last moment before the general election in 1907, on the expiration of the term of Parliament, no effort was made on the part of Kids onians to form organisations. That is to say, the members of the party who did not agree with the socialistic objective made no effort to form organisations throughout the country. We still relied on the convention that we knew was going to be held in the beginning of 1907 rescinding the objective.

Mr. MURPHY: It was the land question you were most concerned about.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: It was not altogether the land question, although it had something to do with it, as I shall show later on. The objective was the serious matter to me, anyway, because I never in any way advocated it, or stated that I believed in the theory of the nationalisation of all the means of production, distribution, and exchange. As a matter of fact, I had spoken against it in this House and elsewhere, and I can quote from my previous speeches showing that I had always been against accepting an objective of that kind.

Mr. BOWMAN: You favoured the Federal objective.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Yes, I had no objection to the Federal objective.

Mr. BOWMAN: I would like you to define the difference between the two.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: One hon. member on the other side attempted to show that they were identically the same in meaning, but if hon. members will wait awhile, I will knock the stuffing out of that argument very easily. I was showing that up till the eve of the general elections in 1907 ex-Labour members were anxious to work with the Labour party, if it were possible to do so, and we refused to form organisations. We took no steps at all before the Rockhampton convention was held.

The PREMIER: Believing that the breach would still be healed.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Yes, believing that the breach would still be healed. I suppose that even after my speech hon. members on the other side will get up and try to show that the Premier and myself are traitors and renegades, and that we have always been trying to burst up the Labour party. But let them offer some proofs in support of their statements. I am giving facts to show that we actually took no steps in 1907 until the general election was on us, hoping that the Labour party would come to their senses and drop the objective.

Mr. BOWMAN: You have not said anything about the official statement yet.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: No, but I have it here.

Mr. COWAP: The party believe in it yet.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I have it here, but I do not know what the hon. member wants me to prove from it. I can prove from it that the larger number of the members of the Independent Opposition—that is, the hon. member for Brisbane South, the hon. member for Barcoo, and a large number of other hon. members—left the Labour party for the very same reason that we left it. I have only to quote them,

as a matter of fact, to prove my case, because those hon. members agreed with the statement we published appealing for a fresh convention.

Mr. MURPHY: The majority of them agreed with it.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I thank the hon. member. The hon. member for Croydon points out that the majority of the party agreed to that statement, but they went back on us. They "ratted" on us, as a matter of fact. I suppose they went back on the statement because they got scared of the organisations. They saw the organisations were not going to support them. Now we have a right to complain about the members of the Labour party going back on what they had agreed to in that published statement.

Mr. BOWMAN: It was you who published it.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member wanted to know about the statement, and he has got to know a little more than he wanted. The whole of the Labour party published the statement. It was signed by the chairman and the secretary.

Mr. COWAP: And carried by a majority.

Mr. HARDACRE: Where is that majority now?

Mr. COWAP: Here.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I propose to omit a good deal of what I wished to say, as I do not want to take up too much time. But I do intend to deal somewhat fully with the attitude taken up in 1907 by the Premier when he sent that letter to the leader of the Opposition asking the Labour party to stand behind our party in the fight with the Legislative Council. I propose to show that the Labour party were not able to respond to the Premier's invitation to work with us. I know what the excuse is that has been made by hon. members opposite. They say that the Premier knew, when he sent the letter inviting their co-operation when the crisis came, that the Labour party could not agree to coalesce with regard to going to the country.

Mr. BOWMAN: That we could not grant immunity.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: It was not altogether a question of immunity. I interjected, when some member on the other side was speaking the other night, that it was a poor party that could not make some terms with another party. I did not mean, when I spoke of a "poor party" to use the words in any offensive sense; but I do think that a party should be able to make some terms with another party if they are fighting against a common enemy. I know all about the consent of the Central Political Executive. I know that they arrange the elections. But this is the point I wish to make: When the crisis arose, after the Premier said in the House that he would give immunity to Labour members—that he would not endorse any man against a member of the Labour party—the leader of the Opposition got up, and on one or two occasions, while he did not say distinctly that he would give immunity to members of the Kidston party, he said that the parties would go to the country working together in a friendly way.

Mr. BOWMAN: What I said was that we as a party might run individual members, but where a Kidston candidate was running against a Philp candidate, we would advise our supporters to vote for the Kidston candidate.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Did you do it

Mr. BOWMAN: Yes, I did.

Hon. G. Jackson.]

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member said nothing about individual members. On 12th November, 1907, the hon. member said—

When there is a question such as that brought before the House by the Government, and when the Government are prepared to resign in reference to the question of getting their legislation passed in another Chamber—which is the will of the people as expressed by a majority of the representatives in this House—then I can say with safety this afternoon that the Labour party are behind the Government in this matter.

Then the hon. member said a little further on—

So far as the fight in connection with this Legislative Council is concerned, I stated yesterday that this party is prepared to support, either in this House or in the country, as warmly as we can the action that has been taken by the leader of the Opposition.

In another place he said—

Reference has been made to the differences that have existed between the two parties sitting on this side of the House. While we will go as independent parties to the country—

Mr. BOWMAN: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES:

I can say this: that the personal spleen that was poured into the Kidstonians by the Labour party and *vice versa*—I believe that whatever differences have existed in the past, the parties at the present time are determined, whatever happens, that the Philip Government, at any rate, will never occupy that position after the elections.

The hon. member in speaking as he did led this House and the country to believe that there would be none of that personal bitterness against members of this party which had characterised previous contests, and that, generally, while going to the country as an independent party, they would work with our party. That was not done. I was opposed as bitterly as it was possible for hon. members opposite to oppose me, and other members of the party were opposed in a similar manner.

Mr. HARDACRE: And the Premier tried hard to get a candidate against me.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The Premier never endorsed any candidate against a member of the Labour party. What is the Labour party's policy? It is to get progressive members to work with them in the House, and then to try to appropriate their seats at election time. That has been their policy. That is also the policy of the Federal Labour party. That is why the fusion of parties has taken place in the Federal Parliament—because the Federal Labour party were trying to get the support of the members of the Deakin party in the House for what they called progressive measures, and then, when it came to an election, they endeavoured to appropriate the seats of Deakin members. That is exactly what the Labour party are doing here. The hon. member for Ipswich, Mr. Maughan, shakes his head, but it is an absolute fact that the Labour party tried to appropriate our seats. I do not know whether the Labour party are going to continue that policy with their new-found friends.

Mr. MURPHY: That is our trouble; not yours. (Laughter.)

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member admits that there is going to be trouble, then! I imagine it will be a trouble, and it will be most interesting to find out whether the Labour party continue their policy of non-immunity. The hon. member for Ipswich, Mr. Blair, has probably good reason to speak well of the party, and so probably has the hon. member for Brisbane South, Mr. Airey, since both those hon. members managed somehow to keep all

[Hon G. Jackson.

Labour competitors out of the field in their electorates, and to pull together with the Labour party.

Mr. BLAIR: What are you worrying about?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I am not worrying about the matter. I am simply showing what is the policy which the Labour party have pursued in regard to the question of immunity at election times to those members who have worked with them in the House. This reminds me that the leader of the Opposition stated somewhere the other day that he hoped the hon. member for Brisbane South, Mr. Huxham, would come back with a mate to this House. That seems to indicate that the party are not going to give immunity from opposition to members of the Independent Opposition, so that the position is looking serious for the Independent Opposition. Fault is found with the Premier because he wants to have a solid party behind him. The Premier announced at Rockhampton that he wanted to have a solid party behind him to carry his policy through the House. The leader of the Opposition wants to have a solid party behind him, and is it not a very natural thing for the Premier, after having worked for one or two years with the Labour party, and having found that he was not able to get a solid party behind him to carry out his policy, is it not natural, I say, that he should form an alliance with some other party who are willing to support him in getting his platform placed on the statute-book? That is exactly the position. In the first session of 1908, as soon as we got back, and the hon. member for Townsville had resigned, and the difficulties with regard to the Speakership and Chairman of Committees had been got over, the Premier went on to carry out the policy which he had previously failed to carry out owing to the obstruction of the Legislative Council. And in that first session we passed the Wages Boards Act, the Old-age Pensions Act, the Factories and Shops Act.

Mr. BLAIR: Who are "we"?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member was one, I think.

Mr. BLAIR: Exactly; and members of the Labour party assisted.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I do not dispute that; I have never disputed that the Labour party assisted to carry those measures. I do not mind including members of the Labour party in the "we," if they are anxious to be included. We passed the Wages Boards Act, the Old-age Pensions Act, the Factories and Shops Act, the Act abolishing the two-thirds majority required to amend the Constitution Act, and the Referendum Act. Those measures were passed.

Mr. RYLAND: By us.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I give hon. members opposite credit for their share in the work. Then the so-called "syndicate railways" were introduced. Whether the question of semi-Government railways was included in the Rockhampton policy or not I am not going to discuss.

The TREASURER: It is.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Well, whether it was or not does not affect the question.

A LABOUR MEMBER: Don't you know whether it was or not?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The supporters of the Premier, the Kidstonites, surely had a right to get something! We had

passed legislation that the Labour party wanted; but when it came to a question of putting through a couple of railways that were for the benefit of Queensland, the Labour party opposed the Government. I guarantee that, if those railways had been submitted to the electors of Queensland, they would have been approved by an overwhelming majority. But when it came to a question of getting something which the Government desired for the benefit of Queensland, what was the attitude of the Labour party?

Mr. BLAIR: You didn't vote for the railways yourself.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I wish the hon. member would refrain from making interjections of that character. I would reply to them if there was time, but there is not. It is now nearly 10 o'clock, and I have still an important matter to deal with. Coming back to the two railways which were introduced last year, I again ask what was the attitude of the Opposition with regard to them? They say they had to oppose those railways. I know there is a plank in their platform opposed to the private ownership of railways, but that is not a sufficient reason for their opposition to those two railways. It does not matter what proposal of that kind was submitted by the Government to the House; it does not matter how favourable the terms were in connection with a railway of that character, the Labour party, true to their platform, as, I suppose, they would say, would have voted against it. No matter how liberal the agreement might have been they would have voted against the proposal. That is an absolute fact. I am not quarrelling with the Labour party for voting against the Albert River Railway and the Burketown Railway; but I would point out that in 1906 they had the same plank in their platform, and they did not then stonewall the Etheridge Railway as they stonewalled the two railways I have mentioned.

Mr. BOWMAN: We voted against them.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member says they voted against them. If they had satisfied themselves by voting against those two railways last year there might not have been any split—there might not have been any trouble, but they were not satisfied with voting against them. I have said we would not have found any fault with them for voting against those railways, but they organised a stonewall. In caucus they agreed—

Mr. BOWMAN: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The leader of the Opposition admits it. They agreed to stonewall those railways.

Mr. BOWMAN: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Why did they, in 1908, agree to stonewall those two railways, when in 1906—when the Etheridge Railway Bill was introduced—which was, in my opinion, not nearly as much a Government railway as these two, because the two railways introduced in 1908 are built by the Commissioner, and run by the Commissioner, whereas the Etheridge railway was built by a private contractor—they satisfied themselves by simply making one or two speeches and voting against it. They took up practically no time at all. What I want to point out is the inconsistency of the Labour party.

Mr. HARDACRE: We opposed the Bill strongly in 1906.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I said that I would show that the Labour party were

not true to their platform; that when it suited them they let their planks go overboard. I am going to prove that now. One of the planks of the Labour platform is "No freehold." We have heard that from hon. members themselves.

LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: They adopted that plank in 1905. Previous to that they had a plank which read "No Crown land sales."

Mr. LESINA: That is the first plank in the New Zealand Labour party's platform.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: That plank only referred to the sales of Crown lands, not to selection. That plank was put in mainly at the suggestion of the Western members, who objected to the sale of large areas of the Western country. In 1905 they made that plank more drastic. They adopted the principle of no freeholds at all, not even for the selector. Seeing that that plank is one of the most important in their platform, what I want to know is: Why in April of last year they allowed a Bill that was introduced by yourself, Sir—a Land Act Amendment Bill—I want to know how it was the Labour party sunk their principles in connection with this most vital part of their platform, when you introduced a clause in that Bill providing for free homesteads? How is it the hon. members allowed their platform to go overboard when it suited them?

Mr. HARDACRE: You are only twisting.

The PREMIER: It is freehold just the same.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I am referring to the Act that was introduced last session, providing for free homesteads; and hon. members on the other side allowed that Act to go through without even calling for a division on it. I will tell the House and the country why. Because they recognised that it would not be a popular thing to attempt to block free homesteads. I will read what the leader of the Opposition said when this clause was in Committee last year, and the Labour party's plank of "no freehold" was adopted in 1905.

Mr. MAUGHAN and LABOUR MEMBERS: There is no such plank as "no freeholds."

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: What, no freeholds?

LABOUR MEMBERS: No, and you know it.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I am simply astounded at what the hon. members say—that there is no such plank. Here is the plank dealing with the matter—

Immediate stoppage of all further sales of Crown lands (fixity of tenure). Leasehold only, with periodic reappraisements of rent.

That is the plank in their platform. Last year there was a clause in the Land Act Amendment Act providing for free homesteads, and this is what the leader of the Opposition—the leader of the Labour party—said—

As leader of the Labour party he desired to enter the protest of the party against land being alienated at all. One of the principles they advocated was that leasehold should supersede freehold, because they believed that in every country freeholds had led to the curse of landlordism.

He made his protest. He said that one of the principles advocated by the Labour party was that leasehold should supersede freehold, because they believed that in every country freehold had led to the curse of landlordism. Hon. members on this side do not believe in landlordism either. The hon. member goes on—

If they supported that clause, they would be doing something contrary to their platform. Speaking on

Hon. G. Jackson.]

behalf of the party, he desired to say they could not support any measure which involved the alienation of land.

They could not support any measure which involved the alienation of land—

They did not propose to take up any time in discussing the question.

A question of the most vital importance to them—the main plank of the Labour party's platform.

The PREMIER: They stonewalled the two railways.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Yes, they stonewalled the two railways which were more Government railways than private railways. But on this occasion they did not want to take up any time.

Mr. HARDACRE: One is a small thing and the other is a big thing.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member further said—

They intended to vote against the clause because it involved a principle they did not believe in.

Look at the records of *Hansard* and see if they voted against it. They did not even call for a division. They were not game to call for a division, because they knew it would be unpopular to prevent a selector getting a freehold. I will deal a little further with the land question. It has been contended, and may be contended again during this debate, that, really, there was no change in the plank I have just referred to. In fact, Mr. Mat Reid, who was president of the Central Political Executive, and took a very prominent part at the Labour convention in 1907, referred to fault-finders—those who found fault with the alterations made in the land plank. He contended that the land plank was the same now as it had always been.

Mr. HARDACRE: The same, only a little more emphatic.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Let me try and prove to the hon. member that it is not the same. Mr. Reid, at the convention in 1907, in his address said—

Our methods and platform are no more extreme than when we took those backsliders into our ranks. If anything, it is milder owing to the conservative reactionary influence they always exerted upon the movement.

Evidently we were considered reactionaries and conservatives even in those days, before we joined the Philp party.

LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Mr. Reid goes on—

Why this cry of extremism? Because Labour will not agree to the alienation of the people's land, and these fault-finders have been signing our platform containing that plank for years.

Mr. HARDACRE: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member endorses that: I shall take up a little more time to knock that argument out. I am going to show, by one or two quotations from speeches of Labour members—still Labour members—that that plank of the Labour party's platform was not aimed against the selector getting a freehold.

Mr. HARDACRE: Not until it was altered.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Oh! That is only trimming. I am going to show this by one or two extracts. I have an extract here from

[10 p.m.] the speech made by the hon. member for Leichhardt on the Special Sales of Land Bill in 1901. I may explain that we were working under the old

[Hon. G. Jackson.

platform in 1901. It was only in 1905 that the plank was made more drastic. On that occasion the hon. member for Leichhardt said—

The money realised by the sale of land will really be realised from the sale of our assets—our capital—and therefore should not be put to revenue.

That was quite a legitimate contention. In fact, the Premier adopted that principle—that money derived from the sale of lands should not be placed to revenue, but be put to a special fund.

Then the hon. member goes on— but should go to a special fund.

The hon. member was quite right in arguing that way—

It is a part of our national assets. What kind of financing is it that would propose to sell our assets, and put the proceeds into current revenue? It is the kind of financing that a reckless spendthrift would indulge in.

The hon. member was not finding fault with the principle of alienating in fee-simple; he only dealt with the principle that was adopted of selling land and placing the proceeds to revenue account. Let me now give a short extract from a speech delivered in 1904 by the hon. member for Clermont. He said (see page 1121 of *Hansard*)—

The late Mr. W. H. Browne, the then leader of the Opposition, and since a member of the present Cabinet, said he was in favour of selling land to pay off the public debt, but not for ordinary revenue purposes.

Now, hon. members will see my point. The Hon. W. H. Browne, who was then a Minister, said that he was in favour of selling land to pay off the public debt. Is it likely if the plank as it now stands in the Labour party's platform had been in the platform then, that Mr. Browne would have made a statement like that?

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: Are you defending the Government or accusing the Opposition?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Here is another extract—it may be a bit wearying, but I want to give evidence; I am not satisfied with having one member to prove my case, I am quoting two or three. I have quoted the hon. member for Clermont, and now I will quote the hon. member for Gregory.

Mr. HARDACRE: You have only half quoted me.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: It was on the same debate on the Land Bill, page 115 of *Hansard*. The hon. member for Gregory said—

A man who takes up an agricultural farm can buy the freehold on the time-payment system extending over twenty years, and town allotments are continually being put up for sale. To that we do not object.

He was speaking as a Labour man on the old platform. Hon. members opposite will find it somewhat difficult to get away from that—

But what I and the party I belong to object to is the system carried on in the past of selling land out West in large areas.

Now, that is the position. I think hon. members will find it somewhat difficult to dispose of what I have said. But coming back to what Mr. Reid said at that convention of 1907 in connection with the plank "no more freeholds." Why, Mr. Reid himself admitted that no party could carry the people of Queensland with them in a policy of that sort. Mr. Reid said—

Public opinion may favour a freehold system—

I think some hon. members on the other side get a freehold for themselves if they can. (Hear, hear!) I am glad to hear hon. members acknowledge that—and no Government could keep office who would refuse a freehold.

That was the opinion of Mr. Reid, who is now

the president of the Central Political Executive. I think the prospects of the socialistic party, if an election comes, carrying the people of Queensland with them on these two points—the socialistic objective and that land plank, “no freehold for s-lector, no freehold for anybody”—I think their chances of getting into power are very remote indeed. Now, I want to make a few remarks about the objective. I have no fault to find with that.

LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and laughter.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: A political party should be judged not only by its actual platform, but it must be judged by its aims and objects. I propose to briefly inform hon. members on the other side, who want educating probably, as to what is the objective of the People's Progressive League.

Mr. MURPHY: Their objective is £1,000 a year. (Laughter.)

The SPEAKER: Order! I should like to point out to the Minister that this is a debate on an amendment to the Address in Reply. I have given a great deal of latitude to the Secretary for Mines.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and laughter.

The SPEAKER: I think that not many people listening to his speech would have realised the question before the House is a vote of want of confidence.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and laughter.

The SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman should say something in regard to the question before the House. (Opposition laughter.)

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I think you, Sir, will recognise that really the want of confidence motion is based on the fact that a coalition has been formed between what is called the Kidstonian party and the Philp party, and it was necessary to justify how that coalition was brought about. I have been doing that by showing the change made in the platform or the policy of members on the opposite side—that it was owing to that change having been made that really forced the Kidstonian party to accept the help of what is known as the Philp party.

Mr. BOWMAN: Which made it possible for you to get your position?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: That is the argument I have been using during this debate. Seeing that the objective of the Opposition has been quoted and discussed, I think it would be quite legitimate for me to show the objective of the party that I belong to now. It reads as follows:—

The objects of the Progressive League are—

To promote the progress and prosperity of the people.

To secure and maintain satisfactory relations between the Commonwealth and the State.

To preserve the individual and collective rights and liberties of all citizens, and to promote improvement in the social, industrial, and material conditions of the people.

To advance the principles of progressive democracy, and generally to secure such reforms as are necessary in the interests of the whole community.

To secure the registration of all persons entitled to vote at parliamentary elections.

To select or assist in the selection of suitable candidates for election as members of the Federal and State Parliaments.

That is the objective of our party. The objective of the Labour party has been mentioned by hon. members opposite as the nationalisation of all means of production, distribution, and exchange. That is not disputed.

Mr. HARDACRE: Yes, it is,

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member for Charters Towers, Mr. Mullan, speaking about the Labour objective, tried to show that the Premier had gone back on the belief that he once entertained in connection with this question of socialism. I want to say to the House, and to whoever reads my speech, that the hon. member for Charters Towers, Mr. Mullan, misled the House. The hon. member referred to the pronouncement of the Australian Labour Federation in 1890, but the Premier was not present at that convention at all. The hon. member said that the Premier was there, but he was not, and he had no more to do with that platform than I had.

Mr. BOWMAN: He was at the first political convention after that. I just want to put you right.

Mr. BARBER: He was present at the 1892 convention.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The Premier was not present at the convention when the pronouncement was adopted. But at the convention of 1892 the Premier was there as a delegate, and a platform was framed. I will not read out the platform, but you can see it in the *Courier* of 1892. It was published just at that time. That platform was adopted by the Labour party when they went to the country in 1893—the following year. I was a candidate at the 1893 election, and was returned to this House. I forget whether I signed the platform on that occasion or not. I know that I was opposed by the *Worker*. The Labour movement was in a rudimentary condition then, and they did not know much about North Queensland in Brisbane. I do not think I signed the platform on that occasion, as I was opposed by the *Worker*, and they wrote an article against me, although the Labour people of Kennedy chose me as their candidate. My point is that the Labour party's platform, adopted in 1892 and used at the election of 1893, was not a socialistic platform. It had no reference whatever to socialism in it. But the pronouncement of the Australian Labour Federation, which was adopted two years before, was socialistic.

Mr. MULLAN: The platform adopted by the Australian Labour Federation was adopted at the 1892 convention, and it was included in the fighting platform in 1893.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The junior member for Charters Towers says that the Australian Labour Federation platform was included in the 1893 platform, but he is wrong.

Mr. MULLAN: I can prove it.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I would like to have some proof of it. The platform of 1893 did not include a land tax or an income tax.

Mr. LESINA: Those were oversights. (Laughter.)

Mr. HARDACRE: Yes, they did.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: And they said nothing whatever about an objective. There was no socialistic objective in connection with the 1893 fighting platform in any shape or form.

The PREMIER: There was no objective in the platform till 1905.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: As the Premier reminds me, there was no objective in connection with the Labour party's platform until 1905. I had been a member of the Labour party since 1893, and I know that there was no objective till it was adopted at the 1905 convention. Then, in 1907, the party divided. Members had to make up their minds one way or the

Hon. G. Jackson.]

other. Some went with the Socialistic party and accepted the objective and platform. Other members, who could not accept it, went the other way, and they followed the hon. member for Rockhampton and his democratic policy.

Mr. MURPHY: Yes, a democratic party.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: You must be guilty to make such a defence about it.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. MURPHY: Will you explain why the Premier burst up that democratic party?

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. MURPHY: I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member for Croydon will not disobey my call to order. I cannot conceive of any member of Parliament with any decency, or respect for parliamentary procedure, disobeying my call to order in that way.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The Premier did not burst up any party. The Premier was only too anxious to consolidate the two parties so as to work together. The hon. the senior member for Gympie, who now laughs, was the most anxious of any member to leave out the socialistic objective; but when he found there was going to be trouble with his organisation, he swallowed the objective and platform.

Mr. MULCAHY: Quite untrue.

Mr. COWAP: And signed it.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I will just make one or two remarks in conclusion. Mr. Frederic Harrison, in a lecture on Republicanism and Democracy, at New York, said:—

Try the effect of a right moral education in the world before you seek to pull things to pieces by legal and practical revolutions.

Then again, Mr. Harrison said, speaking on national and social problems—

Society can only be regenerated by sound religion, true morality, right education, wise institutions, and good government. And industry can only be regenerated by regenerating society.

This, all wise and good people are continually striving for, and only as human nature changes and man becomes more intelligent and altruistic can society advance.

I could touch on that question at greater length, but I have taken up so much time by explaining the reasons of the coalition and the trouble with the Labour party that I will not go further into that. I have dealt with what is, perhaps, ancient history, but it was necessary for me to put it before the electors of Queensland and before my own constituents.

Interjections from the Labour members.

A LABOUR MEMBER: Stonewalling.

Mr. MULLAN: It is a deliberate stonewall.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I am not stonewalling. I shall be done in two or three minutes. Hon. members opposite have not dealt with me fairly. They have submitted me to a continuous fire of interjections, and they have not treated me as I have treated them.

The PREMIER: That is to show an example to their supporters outside.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: That is what some of their supporters have been doing at the meetings at which the Premier spoke. Hon. members on this side never interrupt hon. members on the other side.

Mr. MITCHELL interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member complains about interjections from hon. members; but I must confess that he distinctly encouraged

those interjections himself. He was more responsible for them than any one by the way he replied to them.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and laughter.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I know something about the rules and practice of this House, and I know it would be unbecoming of me to reflect on you, Mr. Speaker. I recollect that on several occasions you called hon. members to order for making interjections. You say that I encouraged hon. members in their interjections. I certainly did reply to one or two interjections that were *appropos* to the subject that I was dealing with, but there is no one in this House dislikes interjections more than I do. They tend to put me off my argument, and I do not like them. If we have an election soon, and the electors of Queensland, who fairly understand the position, and understand the difference between the aims and objects of the Socialist party and the aims and objects of this party, I have not the slightest doubt as to what the result will be.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. LESINA: Well, what will the result be?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member's party will be obliterated except in the West and some parts of the North; and if a Redistribution Bill—

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Oh, ah! and laughter.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Hon. members should not object to one vote one value, considering that annual Parliaments and one vote one value were in their platform fifteen or sixteen years ago. But I am getting away from what I wished to say. I have no fear of the result of an election. The hon. member for Clermont, in his nice scoffing way, pointed out yesterday that the hon. member for Kennedy ran a chance of losing his seat if an election were to take place. He knows very well that I have been returned by the Kennedy electors at the last two or three elections when opposed by the Socialistic party and the Philp party, and that if I had not been opposed by the Socialistic party I would probably have got their votes against the Philp candidate. I have had a greater proportion of majorities than any other member in this House, and I feel satisfied that the electors of Kennedy will return me when the next election comes, if I stand—and I suppose I shall—with a larger majority than ever. If the hon. member is only as safe for Clermont as I am for Kennedy he will be all right. I have no fear as to the result when the people of Queensland recognise that on one side there is a Socialistic party that aims at blocking all private enterprise. They cannot be true to their socialistic objective and at the same time encourage private enterprise. I say that without any doubt whatever as to its truth, because to encourage private enterprise is to go in direct opposition to the objective which aims at the nationalisation of all industries.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No, no!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: They say the trend of society is towards nationalisation.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: That is not true, and they cannot prove it, because the facts are the other way. I say that private enterprise is increasing in a greater ratio than State enterprise. Look at Australia! They quote the railways and telegraph lines as instances of State enterprise and socialism, but in connection with those undertakings there is a national debt of more than £200,000,000. And

even supposing we did not owe that money—that these railways and telegraph lines were not in pawn to people on the other side of the world—I challenge hon. members to prove that State enterprise is increasing in a greater ratio than private enterprise. They profess that they are in favour of close settlement; but every man settled on the land is an opponent of their policy.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No, no!

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Because hon. members, to be true to their platform, cannot allow a single individual to own his own frehold. Look at what private enterprise is doing! Clearing forests, settling people on the land, and establishing industries. And was not the Federal tariff passed in order that industries might be established in Australia? And is not that private enterprise? Not long ago, I remember seeing an article relating to the great negro problem in the United States of America—one of the biggest problems they have to face in that country. The writer of the article pointed out that fifteen years ago their property was valued at £64,000,000, and now it is worth £500,000,000. That shows how private property is increasing, even amongst the negroes of the United States. And the same thing is taking place in Australia. Hon. members cannot shut their eyes to the fact that private enterprise is increasing by leaps and bounds.

Mr. LESINA: That's what makes the Labour party.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I don't agree that that should make the Labour party. Where is the Labour party? What do they believe in? As soon as I nail them down to one thing, they say they don't believe in it. I say their theory is wrong in regard to socialism, and their facts are wrong. They cannot prove that State enterprise is increasing at a greater rate than private enterprise.

Mr. LESINA: We don't say that.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I thought that was one of their contentions. They often get up and say, "Look how State socialism is progressing!" I say, in conclusion, that I have proved their theory to be a fallacy and their facts to be all wrong.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ALLEN (*Bullo*): I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Question put and passed.

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

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