

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 22 JULY 1909

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

Mr. COYNE: Well, I understand from the hon. member for Rosewood himself that that is what he did say, and I regret very much that I was the cause of any mental anguish to the hon. member, and I hope he will accept this apology.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: I am glad to hear that correction from the hon. member. Under the circumstances I desire to remove my censure from the hon. member for Rosewood.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

WANT OF CONFIDENCE MOTION—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. ALLEN (*Bulloo*), who was received with cheers, said: I desire to say a few words upon the amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition. During the recess I was returned to this House by the Bulloo electors as a supporter of the Labour party and in direct opposition to the present party in power. I was returned as an advocate of the Labour platform, which will bring in its train land settlement, immigration—of the right sort—and railway construction. But that did not bind me to the Government policy. I was in opposition to the policy of the present Government in regard to land settlement, in opposition to their policy in regard to immigration, and in opposition to their policy in regard to railway construction. I will deal with the latter plank first. There is no electorate in Queensland in greater need of railway communication than mine. We have not one inch of railway in that immense area.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: Lucky fellow!

Mr. ALLEN: There is no electorate in Queensland that would benefit more from railway communication. But, although I am extremely desirous of railway communication in my electorate, I do not want to see railway jobbery, and that, I contend, is the policy of the present Government. I am going to quote a few remarks which were uttered by the Home Secretary in my electorate. During the campaign he visited my electorate to support my opponent. This is the gist of his remarks, which were made in a speech at Windorah—

If you want railways and bores, vote for our candidate. If you don't want railways and bores, vote for the Labour candidate.

(Laughter.)

The HOME SECRETARY: May I ask what the hon. member is quoting from? Is it from a newspaper, or where?

Mr. ALLEN: From my own notes.

The HOME SECRETARY: Your notes—oh!

Mr. COYNE: They are more reliable than many newspapers.

Mr. ALLEN: In many cases they are more reliable than a newspaper, because I heard the remarks; and if the hon. gentleman wants me to give reasons as to why I should be in a better position than he to know what he said, I am prepared to give those reasons. (Opposition laughter)—

If you return a supporter of the Government we shall lend a sympathetic ear to your local wants. If you return a Labour man, expect no sympathy from us.

This, Sir, is the State socialist. I am not at all surprised that we have anti-socialists on the other side when this is the type of socialist with whom they come in contact. In support of these remarks that I am making as to the assertion of the hon. gentleman, I want to quote from a letter written to the *North Queensland Register* of 5th April. The letter was written by the owner of Morney Plains, out in my district,

Mr. Allen.]

THURSDAY, 22 JULY, 1909.

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. COYNE (*Warrego*) said: By leave of the House, I desire to make a personal explanation. During the progress of the speech of the hon. member for Burnett yesterday, the hon. member for Rosewood made an interjection. I understood him to say that the hon. member for Burnett was making a disgraceful speech. Since then I have learned that what the hon. member for Rosewood said was that the streets of Gayndah were in a disgraceful condition.

Mr. KENNA: That is not so. You only saw that in the *Courier*.

showing that this gentleman was under the same impression as myself in regard to the words of the Home Secretary.

Mr. KERR : So were all the people of Windorah.

Mr. ALLEN : As the hon. member for Barcoo says, so were all the people of Windorah. These are the words of that letter—

I am very anxious to see a railway out in this direction ; but, if I had to put a member in for that only, I would say " No."

This gentleman was under the impression that some such threat was made. However, the hon. gentleman came to threaten the wrong people when he came out to threaten those stalwart warriors in the back country.

LABOUR MEMBERS : Hear, hear !

Mr. MURPHY : He ought to stick to Moreton.

The SPEAKER : Order, order !

Mr. ALLEN : When we look over the railway policy that has been submitted to us by the Government, what do we find ? That three of those railways are in the electorates of supporters of the Government, and one railway is to be built in an electorate which they are trying their best to win, and which they think they have some little hope of winning.

Mr. JONES : No hope at all.

Mr. ALLEN : I am sure they have no hope, but they have some funny hopes at times. Hon. members opposite must admit that appearances are against them. I want to know why the Charleville-Adavale railway has not been brought down. There is no mention of this railway, regarding which the Home Secretary insinuated in my electorate that, if they dared to put in a Labour man, they would not get the railway. It did not matter what the justice of their claims was at all ; if they dared to act in opposition to the Government, they would get nothing.

Mr. KENNA : They would not have got it, any way.

Mr. ALLEN : However, they are going to get it before I cease to be member for Bulloo.

LABOUR MEMBERS : Hear, hear ! and laughter.

Mr. MURPHY : All right ; we will give it to you.

Mr. ALLEN : I contend that railway construction should be strictly a non-party question. This party is not opposed to railway construction, and is not opposed to borrowing for railway construction. The members of this party believe in building every railway on its merits, and I want to know why the Government are trying to make a party question out of railway construction. Why should they run up and down the country saying, " We are in favour of a vigorous railway construction policy, and anyone in opposition to us is against that policy " ? I want to know their reason for making that statement. I say we cannot reasonably expect from such a Government a railway policy which will be a real benefit to the country. I dare say we shall get political railways. We have had some railways of that kind in the past, and who is prepared to say that such railways have always been the best thing for the country ? Is not the line from Brisbane to Toowoomba a lovely line ? Could that line not have been built in a straighter course ? What was one cause for its not being so built ? History will tell you. I am also opposed to the Government on their land policy. I contend—and in this contention I am supported by the workers and selectors in my own constituency—that the Government are not treating the poor man

fairly ; they are not giving the poor man a fair deal. They do not want to do so. They are supported by the pastoralists. I have here some figures showing the rents paid by pastoralists and selectors in the same district. The lessees of Tilbooroo pay 14s. 6d. per mile, while selectors in the vicinity pay for country which is of no better quality 3d. per acre, which comes to £2 per square mile. Other selectors in the vicinity pay even higher rents.

Mr. COTTELL : Who fixes the rents ?

Mr. ALLEN : I do not care who fixes the rents. Those rents are in existence, and they are not right. I am here in opposition to that kind of thing. The lessees of Norley pay 10s. per square mile, while selectors in the same district pay £1 6s. 8d. per square mile. The lessees of Ardoch pay 15s. per square mile, while some selectors on the Ardoch resumption pay £1 6s. 8d. and others £2 per square mile. How can a selector make a success on the land under those conditions ? Does he get any more for his sheep and cattle than the pastoralist gets for his stock ? No. This increased rent is a tax on the poor man. But the contrast does not end there. The large holders get their land without any fencing or residential conditions, while the selector—the poor man—has to fulfil conditions. He is hampered in every way. He has to put up an elaborate net fence to save his few acres, and this and other conditions which he has to fulfil entail the expenditure of money. How can the selector compete with the pastoralist under those conditions ? The first thing the Government should do is to equalise the rents. That is one point on which I arraign the present Administration. I could quote a few more similar cases to those already given. I have a list of them, but I think I have quoted enough to show the inequalities which exist. In the Windorah district there is Tenham, the lessee of which pays 9s. 6d. a square mile, and Hammond Downs, for which the lessee pays 10s. per square mile, while the selectors in that district pay £1 6s. 8d. per square mile. That is the encouragement the poor man gets from the Government. Those figures are not mine, but are supplied by the Lands Office.

Mr. KERR : There is a good list in the *Courier*.

Mr. ALLEN : Yes, and I will quote that list ; it is taken from the annual report of the department. That report says—

When the rents offered by selectors for the quarter resumptions of some pastoral holdings which were opened for selection during the year are placed side by side with the rents of the remaining three-fourths of the holdings, some remarkable contrasts are presented, as subjoined :—

Holding.	Annual Rents of the resumed one-fourths under Grazing Selection.		Annual Rents of the remaining three-fourths under Pastoral Lease.	
	£	s. d.	£	s. d.
Rodney Downs ...	358	2 1	193	18 5
Strasburg ...	157	19 0	43	19 9
Aramac ...	551	15 1	466	16 0
Saltern Creek North	1,184	10 7	897	15 0
Stainburn Downs...	194	15 10	153	6 0
Coreena ...	1,114	5 0	704	16 3
Evora ...	235	16 7	272	12 0
Delta North ...	347	9 2	107	16 8
Delta South ...	135	9 3	108	10 2
Avington ...	458	12 10	523	4 0
Dillalah ...	521	3 9	£42	6 0
Burenda ...	939	14 9	709	10 0
Rockwood ...	640	11 11	535	18 9
Culloden ...	390	1 4	304	8 6
Tower Hill ...	451	7 1	204	15 0
Glengel ...	270	0 10	151	2 6
Texas ...	337	17 1	77	13 9
Corona ...	703	8 10	645	15 0

[Mr. Allen.

Mr. COTTELL: The Government do not fix those rents.

Mr. ALLEN: The Government are responsible for the rents.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: No!

Mr. ALLEN: The Government are responsible for the rents. Those things exist and the Government are making no move to alter them, and that is one reason why I am against the Government. It is no use just sitting on those front Treasury benches and saying, "We are not responsible for that," and sheltering themselves behind the Land Court.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: We resume land every time we can.

Mr. ALLEN: I am here to give the poor man the same show as the big man.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The poor man tenders his own price—what he pleases

Mr. ALLEN: I am coming to that tender system by and by. My contention is that the land has a certain market value—it has not two values—and if there is to be any difference made, then the poor man—the grazing farmer—should have that difference in his favour.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ALLEN: It has to be borne in mind, not only has he certain conditions to carry out, but his profits, whatever they are, are spent in the district. Those grazing farmers whom I have mentioned all live out in the Bulloo. They all help to make up what little population there is there, but the pastoral lessees, taking them as a whole, are conspicuous by their absence. We have South Australian cattle kings, we have banks and syndicates, and we have distant M.M.L.A. They have all these things in their favour, but the man on the land—the poor man who comes at a later date—he has got to foot the bill. He has to pay three, four, five, and six times as much as the man who came there first. Is that fair? I say it is not fair. The Secretary for Lands has interjected: "Who is responsible for those high rentals?" The Acts of Parliament, and the Government which allows those Acts to remain in existence without attempting to alter them. The minimum rental for grazing farms is £1 6s. 8d. per square mile. I contend that that should be altered if the Government are prepared to give the leaseholder lands at 5s. or 7s. 6d. a mile.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Where? At Birdsville.

Mr. ALLEN: There is any amount at 10s.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Which has been unoccupied for years. I hope it will be taken up.

Mr. ALLEN: Although I have come here denouncing this position, I have not come without a remedy for it. (Hear, hear!) I say the Government assessors should place a valuation on those selections—a valuation which would compare with the existing pastoral rentals in the vicinity. In some cases it would be a little higher, and in some cases a little lower, but the average for the selections should be the same as what the large holder is paying for the three-fourths that is kept. The Government should throw open for grazing selection these areas at a certain specified rental—its fair value.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is what is being done.

Mr. ALLEN: And if there is more than one applicant, let them do the same as they do on the Darling Downs and in other agricultural districts—ballot for it.

The PREMIER: And then they would sell the selection for the difference in price.

Mr. COYNE: You can prevent them.

Mr. ALLEN: The Government could prevent dunnyming. There is no one who has a greater set against dunnyming than I have, and I tell the Minister for Lands that dunnyming is rampant under the system to-day. This is what the Warrego Selectors' Association says about the present system—

We consider such a system is not conducive to placing *bona fide* selectors on the land; that it creates false land values, and is in every way against the best interests of this district and Queensland generally.

What do we find under the present tender system? That the man with the money—the man with the bank behind him—scores every time, and the poor man, who has little capital, has to take a back seat, and go on some rubbish. He has not to do that in the agricultural areas. I contend if the ballot system is a good thing in the agricultural districts, it is a good thing for the grazing farmer; but the Downs members sit mute.

Mr. THORN: No, we don't; we believe in it.

Mr. ALLEN: Then why do you not come over here? (Laughter.) Actions speak louder than words.

Mr. THORN: We are the Liberal party.

Mr. ALLEN: The hon. members opposite are sitting behind an Administration which permits this pernicious system. They are sitting behind a Minister who defends this system, and then they ask me to believe they are in sympathy with the selectors. I must say they have a most peculiar way of showing their sympathy.

Mr. THORN: Who voted for it in the first case?

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. ALLEN: I heard the Minister for Lands during this debate call the ballot system a gamble. I hope he will knock gambling on the head all round. I am not advocating gambling at all—I do not call it a gamble. Last year, in the department which he administers, there were 1,963 agricultural farms selected under that ballot system—that gamble, as he terms it—and all I want is that this ballot system may be extended to 405 other cases. It would be a good thing for the small man who is battling against the squatter, and battling against other things, too.

Mr. THORN interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. ALLEN: The Downs members will remember the fight that the small man on the Downs had in years gone by against the squatter.

Mr. THORN: We drove them off.

Mr. ALLEN: Eventually they drove them off, but "the leopard does not change his spots"—except when he goes from one place to another—and he is as bad on the poor man in the Western parts of Queensland to-day as he was on the Downs years ago, and he has the Downs members to assist him. Not only have these selectors three, four, and five times as much rental to pay to the Government, but they have also got three, four, and five times as much local government taxation to pay, because their properties are valued in the same proportion. Do hon. members consider that

Mr. Allen.]

a fair thing? It is no wonder there are only 880 electors in Bulloo. If the people got a fair deal there would be two or three thousand there at least.

Mr. THORN: You would not get in then.

Mr. ALLEN: It would make no difference. That is what I want to see. Does the hon. member mean to insinuate that the electors would not put in the man who does the most for the district? My policy is the policy which will send the Bulloo district along, and that is why I have been sent in here.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ALLEN: I went out there and spoke to the electors calmly, soberly, and laid reasons before them as to why they should vote for me, and if they did not like it—well they could

[4 p.m.] vote for the other man, and they sent me in here with a thumping majority in spite of the Minister. In spite of those pamphlets which were distributed by the Premier giving them words of wisdom, advice, and exhortation, and in spite of threats, I came down here. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. THORN: You represent gum-trees.

Mr. ALLEN: If I do represent gum-trees, I am trying to replace those gum-trees by settlers, while the hon. member opposite is doing all he can to keep the settler away from the gum-tree.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ALLEN: Now, in further support of my argument, I propose to read a paragraph from a leader in to-day's *Daily Mail*—

The anomalous condition of the law, as illustrated by the Under Secretary's table published yesterday, contrasting the revenue received from the resumed fourths of pastoral runs, with the three-fourths retained by the lessees, is little short of a public scandal. Either the pastoralist is paying far too little, or the closer settler, like the grazing farmer, is paying far too much.

Mr. THORN: Your party have said that in the House for years.

Mr. ALLEN: We keep on saying it, too—

Make what allowance the department may for the larger areas held by the pastoralists, and the consideration they are entitled to as the inheritors of vested interests created years ago by the expenditure of health and life, in addition to money, in making those lands habitable by wealth creating live stock—the difference of treatment noted out is indefensibly great. Assuming that it is the pastoralist who pays too little, and not the grazing farmer who pays too much, it is evident that the pastoral runs of the State ought to be resumed at the earliest time the law permits if closer settlement—of which there seems to be no question—can be substituted. Grazing farmers, it is found, pay four times as much as per acre for their areas as the pastoralist pays for his. And as the land is used for identically the same purposes in both cases, the preference enjoyed by the lessee is intolerably unjust. The three-fourths still held under lease on the eighteen runs mentioned by the Under Secretary, now pay less than £9,000 a year; they would pay over £20,000, his report tells us, were the rents levelled up to the grazing farm average.

Mr. COYNE: Hear, hear!

Mr. ALLEN: I pointed out to the electors that one plank of the platform which I was supporting contained this—equalisation of pastoral and selectors' rents.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ALLEN: Now, I think the Government ought to take a hint in regard to this question, and hasten to make amendments; but I think they are too far gone to make amendments, and consequently I am supporting this motion with the hope of seeing some Government in power which is prepared to be more sympathetic to the poor man, and to give the

[Mr. Allen.

struggler out in the far West a better deal than he has received from this or any past Government. We hear a lot of talk about the large acreage of lands that are being selected at the present time, but there is one thing we never hear quoted by the Government apologists—they never attempt to quote the number of men who are going on these lands. I am satisfied that hon. members opposite would get a rude shock if they found how very few of these men who are taking up lands are bound personally to reside on those lands. The only kind of settlement that we can call closer settlement is when the selector is bound to personally reside on the land and fulfil the conditions. If we had the figures showing the number of men who are on that land, I think we would find that, although there is not a great deal of settlement, there is a great deal of land grab, and it appears to me that that is what the Government is encouraging. Now, the hon. member for Fassifern quoted some startling figures the other night in connection with the number of agricultural farms that have been selected during this year, and he pointed out that there was a considerable falling off in the number of men who were taking up small holdings. I can assure you that that is just what I expected. I would not expect anything else from this Government, which is a Government that I consider to be the tools of the capitalists of Queensland.

Mr. FORSYTH: And what do you think is the reason for the falling off?

Mr. HAMILTON: It is the Act of 1902, which they are responsible for.

Mr. ALLEN: I am prepared to give a reason. I gave a reason by way of interjection when the hon. member for Fassifern was speaking. The main reason for this falling off in selection is the change of Ministers. I do not want to say anything personally against the present Minister for Lands; I consider that, on the Treasury bench, he is the man above all best fitted for Cabinet rank; but I say that he has not the particular qualification necessary for Minister for Lands. I want to know where he has gained experience?

Mr. FORSYTH: Perhaps you might fill it better.

Mr. ALLEN: I have better experience, and you will forgive me for saying so. I do not say that there are not dozens of men better fitted to be Minister for Lands than myself, but at the same time I do say that I have had more experience of agricultural life than the Minister for Lands has. I know the difficulties of the agriculturists better than any man in this House, although I am only a young man. I say that Queen street is not a good training ground for Secretary for Public Lands.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ALLEN: That is the reason why there is a falling off. In you, Sir, we have a man filled to the brim with experience of land matters—a man who was full of sympathy for the agricultural selectors—but you had to go, so the man in the street says, at the instigation of some outside power. It was not the Trades Hall push, it was some outside power—the man in the street has a name for it, but I am not going to mention it. That is the secret of this falling off in land selection—in agricultural farm selection—a change of Ministers; a man who had experience in this matter, a man who understood the conditions of the selector fully, had to give place to a man who had got his experience in Queen

street, and I say that Queen street is not the best place to learn the conditions of the agriculturist.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and laughter.

Mr. ALLEN: Another point for which I condemn this Government is the very loose manner in which they are going about providing for water in the Western districts of Queensland. We have had serious droughts in the past, and we will have them again, and I want to know what steps the Government are taking to place the pioneer of the back country in a better position with regard to water in the next drought than what he was in the last drought.

Mr. THORN: You want to kill the pioneers every time.

Mr. ALLEN: The other night the member for Warwick tried to convince the House that the Government were very active in this matter, but, as representing a Western electorate, it just convinced me of the opposite. It just made me realise how very little they were doing. He said in his speech—

During 1908 no less than eleven bores and seven wells were sunk, and from the 1st of January of this year until the 30th of June nine bores and four wells were sunk, and at the present time three bores and two wells are being sunk.

That is for the whole of Queensland. Why, there is any amount of room for all those bores and wells in my electorate alone. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. THORN: How many were sunk in the Maranoa electorate?

Mr. ALLEN: There is any amount of artesian water in the Bulloo, but since the drought, so far as I can gather, they have only put down one bore there, and there is another in the course of construction. That is the vigorous water conservation policy of the present Government! There is any amount of room to put down all these bores in my electorate, and with profit to the State. The Western districts are not getting a fair deal at all, because they are represented by Labour.

Mr. FORSYTH: They had wells there before.

Mr. ALLEN: And I would further point out that where they are putting these two bores it is being done at the instigation of the shire council, and the Government are not altogether responsible for them. In fact, they have done absolutely nothing.

Mr. PAYNE: The Windorah bore.

Mr. ALLEN: No; the Windorah bore was put down before the drought. The shire council has taken certain action out there in connection with the putting down of bores, and the Government have assisted them, I admit; but it must not be forgotten that nearly the whole of that electorate, 79,000 square miles in area, belongs to the Crown. It is their own estate.

LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ALLEN: I think it is the duty of the Crown landlord to appreciate the value of their own property. But what are the Government doing? They are doing nothing. During the late election campaign in the Bulloo I went through in one trip from Windorah to Birdsville, and from the time we left Whicchello Creek to Morney, a distance of 60 miles, all the water we got was from a well which was just about enough to keep a house going. There was no drought then. It was just an ordinary time, and, if that sort of thing happens at an ordinary time, what must happen in drought time?

Mr. PAYNE: All the roads are shut up.

Mr. ALLEN: All the roads are shut up, as the hon. member reminds me. And when those roads are shut up Queensland loses a certain amount of the cattle trade that rightly belong to this State—that is, the cattle from the Birdsville district. These cattle go down into South Australia because South Australia has made proper provision on her stock routes by having them well watered by means of bores which have been sunk every 30 miles and even less than that, while in Queensland from one puddle to another puddle—for that is just what that is—the distance is 60 miles. That is a policy which I condemn. Is it any wonder that the Western districts are up against the present Administration? Not at all. Then, again, on the Nocundra road—going from Thargomindah to Nocundra, in some of the best sheep country in Queensland—we have another stage of 60 miles without water. It is artesian country too, but the Government are doing nothing. They—the people of the district—sent in a petition twelve months ago to get a bore put down on the Nocundra road on a certain spot, but nothing was done in connection with it. Consequently, in a bad time, the road is closed. When men go out to the back country to settle they cannot get their stock in. Morney Plains had a mob of cattle, but they could not get them into Queensland as they could not get them over a 60-mile stage, and they had to go the other way. What is being done by this Government which pretends to be so progressive and which professes to be so jealous of the interests of Queensland? Why, they are allowing all this cattle trade to go from Queensland into South Australia. In many cases where land is thrown open in the West we have had large areas in which there was no water thrown open for occupation. The Government threw that land open hoping that it would be taken up. I want to know how the Government could expect a poor man to come on to dry land—on country where there was no water? The Government have not attempted, in any shape or form, to make water for the poor man when he is going on to the land in the Western districts. The hon. member for Warrego advocated that before the Government threw Western land open to selection they should see that each block had a permanent supply of water on it, and if it is dry country they should put down a bore or make some provision for the water supply. This Government have done nothing in the past, and they are not doing anything now.

Mr. COYNE: They don't intend to do anything.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. ALLEN: This Government put the sum of £50,000 on the Estimates for the purpose of bringing out immigrants to this country so that they might crowd into an already overcrowded labour market. This £50,000 would be spent with very much more profit to the State, and it would be the means of bringing more people out here if it were spent in putting down bores in Western Queensland. That would be a progressive policy. It would put people on the land. I would like to know how many of the immigrants who are now coming out are going on to the land. I took up the *Courier* of last Saturday week, and I saw a list of the immigrants, and how they were going on to the land. One had £50—two had £50—one other had £100, and the largest amount held by anyone was one with £200. I wonder how it is possible for them to go on the land. Just take the Maryvale Estate, and see the conditions attaching to going on the land. Here is an area of 116

Mr. Allen.]

acres, and the total survey fees and rent amounted to £143. Yet these immigrants are supposed to be able to go on the land when they come here.

Mr. LESINA: They will walk out there on the bottom of their pockets. (Laughter.)

Mr. ALLEN: I was much amused at the ingenious excuses made by the present Home Secretary when he was in my electorate, when he told the electors to blame the Federal Government—the Federal Labour party—for bringing out the indented labourers.

Mr. KERR: He said you were magnificent men out there.

Mr. ALLEN: Yes, he did. I will come to that later on. He said, "It is not our Government at all who are bringing out these indented labourers; it is the Federal Parliament—your Labour party." And yet the Premier's pamphlet, which was issued throughout the electorate, pointed out that it was his work, and stated that we had given untrue utterances as to his intentions. Then he went on to say that the article that appeared in the *Worker* in January or February last was got up specially for the Bulloo election. I am rather inclined to think, judging by the Premier's utterances, that he must think that we are in league with the gods. How did the *Worker* know, when they were publishing that article, that there was going to be an election in the Bulloo? He must have thought that we were in league with the gods when he said that, and also with regard to my visit to the Bulloo, which I will come to later on. When I was up there during my tour of the electorate I found that the men out there were very wrath with the Premier helping the pastoralists to get cheap labour.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ALLEN: That is what it amounted to. The lowest rate that the men are earning in the Bulloo district at the present time is £1 5s. a week. That is the minimum, and they earn up to £1 10s. and £1 15s. a week. Yet we had indented labourers brought out from the old country for the lordly sum of £1 a week.

Mr. HAMILTON: Some of them are getting 10s. a week in my district.

Mr. ALLEN: And this Government are not bringing out immigrants to bring down wages at all! The hon. member for Warwick the other day was pleased to know that they had brought out 2,000 immigrants this year. I want to know what has been done with them. I am sure they are not going on the land.

Mr. FORSYTH: How do you know?

Mr. ALLEN: I am sure of it, because it takes money to go on the land at the present time. You cannot start farming with £50; and if the hon. member thinks it can be done he is making a mistake.

Mr. FORSYTH: I know many have gone on the land with nothing at all but wages.

Mr. ALLEN: I give place to no man in this House, though I am but a young man, as far as experience of the conditions of agricultural life are concerned. The hoe was put into my hand when I was five years of age, and I worked on the farm till I was nineteen; yet the hon. member for Moreton, another Queensland agriculturist, comes along and says I know nothing about it.

Mr. FORSYTH: Nothing whatever.

Mr. ALLEN: I would like to see the hon. member for Moreton go out as an immigrant

[Mr. Allen.

to a new country and go on the land with £50 in his pocket, when in the most favoured district—and I think a newchum should get a chance in a good district—it costs the immigrant £140 to go on the land. It is stated in the *Alert*, a paper published in Maryborough, that—

The Bundaberg Government Labour Bureau has 1,000 men registered on its books as waiting for work, and more are being registered daily, and it is pretty certain that not half of those offering will be able to find employment this season.

Yet we brought out 2,000 more this year to glut the already overcrowded labour market. This is progress! I fail to see what advantage it is to the country to have a large army of idle men fed at the expense of the country.

Mr. LESINA: It cheapens wages.

Mr. ALLEN: It cheapens wages, as the hon. member for Clermont says. It gives the friends of hon. members opposite their desire, cheap labour—7s. 6d. a week as an agricultural labourer. It is very nice for those who employ men at 7s. 6d.

Mr. GRAYSON: Who gives 7s. 6d. a week?

Mr. ALLEN: We had the statement here.

Mr. BOWMAN: In his extremity he offered himself at 7s. 6d. a week.

Mr. ALLEN: We have the admission on the floor of the House that a man, in his extremity, was prepared to take 7s. 6d. a week. Is it reasonable to expect that any man would take 7s. 6d. a week if he could get £1 or £1 5s.?

Mr. HAMILTON: Some of them do when there is a strike. That's all.

Mr. ALLEN: The Home Secretary came back from my district in very good humour—he had had such a good time, but it was not on electoral matters. He had an interview with the *Telegraph*, and I propose to read extracts from the report of the interview. It appeared in the *Telegraph* of 2nd April—

Referring to the labour question, Mr. Appel said that, judging from the utterances of Labour members, he expected to find the Bulloo a wilderness.

No man on this side ever described the Bulloo as a wilderness—or any other part of Western Queensland. That only existed in the imagination of the hon. gentleman—like many other strange things. The Bulloo would hold four or five times as many people as are there now if it only had a fair deal from the Government.

Mr. PAYNE: Ten times.

Mr. ALLEN: As the hon. member for Mitchell says, ten times as many. He goes on to say—

On the contrary, he found it a land of wealth, and the cry from end to end was that it was impossible to secure a sufficient supply of suitable labour.

The HOME SECRETARY: Hear, hear!

Mr. ALLEN: I would like to find the hon. member's authority. I was at Birdsville and I came across two men humping their drum, right on the border of South Australia, with 60 miles dry stretches, looking for work, begging for work, and not able to get it. And when I was coming in from Thargomindah by road on my bike I came across a number of men out of work. The hon. member drove along in a four-in-hand special coach—I suppose at the expense of a bleeding country—and he went so fast that it is quite reasonable to suppose he didn't see any unemployed.

As an instance, he said that a drover had offered men £2 a week and rations on a six weeks' trip, but the offer was refused.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is so.

Mr. ALLEN: But he did not tell us all the conditions.

At Stoney Creek Station casual labourers could not be secured for £2 10s. a week.

The HOME SECRETARY: Hear, hear!

Mr. ALLEN: I don't think they could, considering that such a place as Stoney Creek Station does not exist. There is no such station in the Bulloo electorate, and the hon. member must have been very near some of those shanties he spoke of during that interview when he got that idea.

Very few men were met with who were not following their ordinary work, and at every place at which he spoke Mr. Appel challenged the statement that crowds of unemployed could be found.

The HOME SECRETARY: Hear, hear!

Mr. ALLEN: The hon. member did not make that challenge at Windorah—he knew better. We are coming back now to Stoney Creek. There is such a place as Stoney Creek, but there is no such place as Stoney Creek Station.

Several members interjecting,

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. ALLEN: He says—

At Stoney Creek Station the boundary rider owns some splendid horses which Mr. Appel says are worth £300, and others are equally well situated.

Though there is no such place as Stoney Creek Station, I will tell you what there is: There is a deserted opal mine on Stoney Creek, and on the diggings there is a residence—I hope the hon. member admired the residence that poor labourer was forced to reside in—and in that residence there is a rabbit board boundary rider. As the hon. member says, he owns horses worth £300. He uses these in

doing his work, and he has to [4.30 p.m.] keep his own ration-bag going, with flour at £2 5s. to £2 15s. a bag, and other things correspondingly high; and what do you think he gets for all this? He gets £112 a year. Those are big wages for his work, having to find his own rations and use his own horses—£112 a year! If I were a boundary rider, and saw a casual labourer getting £2 10s. a week—and I suppose that means rations, because the casual labourer generally gets rations—I would very quickly sling the job at £112 a year, find yourself and horses, and having to go 40 miles for a drink of water. The Home Secretary thinks the conditions of the worker out there are ideal—a pure paradise—

Generally speaking, said Mr. Appel, “the conditions of the working man in the West are far superior to those under which men have to work on the coast.”

Then I am very sorry for the coastal men, and I think that, if they want to get their conditions altered, the best thing they can do is to change a representation that allows such things. Here is another extract—

“The conditions generally are in favour of the working man,” said Mr. Appel. “In some cases families live by trekking along the stock routes as the Boers or the patriarchs of old did in their respective countries.”

(Laughter.)

Mr. Appel met and spoke with one family who so lived. There were three teams, in which were all the belongings, and along the stock route fed the horses and cattle and goats. The sight was one, he said, which one could never forget.

I wonder if the Premier is going to get this printed in pamphlet form and distributed in the old country to get immigrants to come here, showing them the kind of life that people lead in our Western country. That kind of life may appeal to the Home Secretary; but, if it does, his ideal of what life

should be in a civilised community is very low, and I advise him to get back to the plains of Arabia or South Africa of which he is so fond. I want to know what chance a family have of getting a living by the way-side. How is their education going to be attended to?

The HOME SECRETARY: By the itinerant teachers whom this Government are providing.

Mr. ALLEN: I want to know what kind of home life—what kind of home comforts can the mother of a family have under such circumstances? Does the hon. member think they are sufficient? I hope, when I am next touring my electorate, to see the hon. gentleman out there like a patriarch of old.

The HOME SECRETARY: I would like to be there.

Mr. ALLEN: I am sure that, if the hon. gentleman did go, there are quite a number of members on his own side of the House quite willing to take his portfolio, and I do not think the country would lose much. The hon. gentleman also said in that interview—

“The great curse of the West,” said Mr. Appel, “is the existence of small miserable shanties, whose owners take the cheques of the hard-working men and then turn them adrift, and very often at a time when the men are incapable of taking care of themselves.”

I want to know did the hon. gentleman himself further the cause of temperance during his visit to my electorate?

The HOME SECRETARY: I know you did not. (Laughter.)

Mr. ALLEN: If Dame Rumour does not prevaricate—as she usually does—he did not do very much to promote temperance.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. ALLEN: And again, if there are these miserable shanties, it does not say much for the administration of the Home Department over which the hon. gentleman presides. Does not our existing licensing law prevent the existence of these shanties, if it is properly carried out?

Mr. LESINA: They are characteristic of Australian bush life.

Mr. ALLEN: I would like the hon. gentleman to get up and specify some of these shanties, and I would like to know what the hon. gentleman has done to remove them since he came back to Brisbane. Again, quoting from this interview—

“It seems odd,” said Mr. Appel—

The SPEAKER: Order, order! The Home Secretary should be referred to by his official title.

Mr. ALLEN: I am quoting from a newspaper, Sir—

It seems odd, said the Home Secretary, that the Government compels the station-owners to erect comfortable quarters, supplied with bathrooms and other conveniences, for the men, and at the same time permits the existence of so great a curse as the miserable shanty where horrors-breeding spirits are retained.

This is news to me. This is a real surprise packet to me—to hear that the Government can compel station-owners to erect comfortable quarters, and supply bathrooms and other conveniences for the men.

The HOME SECRETARY: You will learn a lot before you are here long.

Mr. ALLEN: And, if it is the law, I want to know why it is not being administered, because the men have not got all these things. I admit that there is an Act providing accommodation for the shearer, but the shearer is

Mr. Allen.]

not the only worker in the West—he is only one section of the workers. What about the permanent station hands? Do they not want this accommodation? Is there an Act compelling station-owners to erect comfortable quarters and supply bathrooms and other conveniences for their permanent labourers? I say "No." It just shows how much the hon. gentleman knows when he comes back here and talks in that way. And speaking now about the Shearers and Sugar Workers Accommodation Act, I wonder how many exemptions are granted in the Bulloo electorate.

Mr. HAMILTON: It is a dead letter there.

Mr. ALLEN: There is an Act on the statute-book but it is not administered. To my knowledge exemptions have been granted in one place for three years. Any little excuse is good enough to deprive the men of all the comforts which the law demands for them; and yet we read misrepresentations like this. This is absolutely unanswerable. There are two stations in my electorate, that I know of, which have exceptionally good accommodation and baths for the permanent working men, but the Home Secretary did not see those two stations.

Mr. HAMILTON: It is not right that any further exemptions should be granted. They have all had plenty of time.

Mr. ALLEN: It is no wonder that the people are gulled when they read in the daily newspapers such interviews, which are very far distant from the actual facts. When I was in another electorate not long ago and quoted these differences in the pastoral rents, "Oh!" they said, "you are only quoting one particular case." They had been used to reading the newspapers and believing that the Government were absolutely fair all round. We have heard a lot about the few people who are living in my electorate. At Duck Creek a few years ago there were 300 miners working, but at the present time there are only about four. That district contains a large area of opal-bearing country, and if it were prospected, I am quite sure there would be another Duck Creek, perhaps three or four Duck Creeks discovered, and the population of the Bulloo electorate would increase to 4,000 or 5,000.

Mr. BOWMAN: And Erourngella Hills

Mr. ALLEN: Yes, Erourngella Hills and Dnyevor Downs are opal-bearing country, but it is not prospected. During the election campaign the people were promised that steps would be taken to provide water in that district. I wonder what has been done by the Government in the way of fixing them up with water. All opal-bearing country is dry country. The great difficulty prospectors have to contend with is want of water, and when they strike good country half their time is spent in going to and from water. Yet the Government have done nothing to help them in this matter. I think all that the whole of that district has received from the Government in the way of help in prospecting for opals was a grant of £40, which was made some years ago. What we want is a live Secretary for Mines—a Secretary for Mines who attends to his work and is sympathetic with the small man who is working on his own, and who does not bother so much about syndicates, and if we had such a Minister, the Bulloo would soon be carrying a much larger population than it is doing at the present time. Let me quote another statement made by the

[Mr. Allen.

present Home Secretary. The hon. gentleman made inquiries concerning the opal fields, and he said that—

With a plentiful supply of water, work could be found for a large number of men.

The HOME SECRETARY: Hear, hear!

Mr. ALLEN: Exactly; but what did the hon. gentleman do before he left the Mines Department? He did absolutely nothing. That is another point on which I condemn the Government. Right throughout the agricultural districts the Labour party have been held up as opponents of the farmer, and it has been said that we intend to tax them off the land. My contention is that the Labour party, in proposing a land tax, do not intend to tax the man off the land, but to tax the land monopolist and keep down the price of land. (Hear, hear!) What the agriculturist wants, what the man who is going to make his living out of the land wants, is cheap land. He wants to get his tools and his necessaries as cheaply as possible, but land is his chief necessary. I am quite prepared to admit that the land-jobber likes to see the price of land high, but that is no good to the genuine agriculturist. It does not matter to the genuine agriculturist if the land is not worth a shilling so long as he gets a return from it. If we wish to get men to go on the land, it is desirable that they should be allowed to obtain good land as cheaply as possible, and the best way to provide them with cheap land is to impose a land value tax—a tax on publicly created land values, with an exemption up to £300.

Mr. LESINA: Cheap land means high wages.

Mr. ALLEN: Exactly. Land on the Maryvale Estate, which was recently repurchased by the Government, has been sold to farmers, the best of it, at £12 3s. 9d. per acre. It is no wonder that farmers are afraid of a wages board. But I say when a farmer is afraid of a wages board he is looking the wrong way—he should look at the land monopolist. I know this estate very well, and I know of one piece of land there which was sold nine years ago for £2 10s. an acre. A piece of similar country adjoining that land a selector has now to pay £9 15s. per acre for. What has been done to that land in the meantime to make it of more value? Nothing at all. The increased price now paid for it is the unearned increment. I want to point out what kind of a tax this payment of the unearned increment is on the farmer. The proprietors of the station have had the use of that land for nine years, and now the selector has to pay for it, not £2 10s. an acre, but £9 15s., or an advance of £7 5s. an acre. Five per cent. on £7 5s. is 7s. 3d., so that the agriculturist who now takes up that land has to pay a tax of 7s. 3d. per acre for all time. Yet hon. members opposite are crying out against a proposal to impose a land tax. Why, even the outrageous proposals of the hon. member for Clermont, as they are called, would not hit the farmer nearly so badly as that. This piece of land which was sold at £9 15s. an acre has an area of 77, say 80 acres. At £2 10s. an acre, the cost of that land would amount to £200. It would not be taxed under the proposal of the Labour party, because they exempt £300 of publicly created land values. Yet under the present system of private ownership of land the man who buys that farm must pay what is practically a tax of 7s. 3d. per acre for all time, as long as those values keep up. I contend that the Labour party are the true friends of the farmer, and that the hon. member for Cunningham, the

hon. member for Cambooya, and the hon. member for Aubigny, are the men who are in favour of landlords and of heavily taxing the poor man on the land, because interest is, after all, only another form of taxation.

Mr. GRAYSON: You know that is not true—that I am not in favour of land monopolies. Speak the truth.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. ALLEN: The hon. member may not knowingly do this, but I know it is a fact. I am quoting facts, and he cannot get away from them. They cannot be denied. They are not my words. The agriculturist on that block has to pay a tax of 7s. 3d. an acre in the shape of interest on the unearned increment after the lapse of nine years.

Mr. GRAYSON: Those two blocks are not of the same value, and well you know it. You are misleading the House.

Mr. ALLEN: I am not here to mislead the House, and let me say this: I know that land better than the hon. member does. He has only paid flying visits to it, while I have ploughed it and worked it. I know what the land is. I know where to strike good soil. I know the piece I quoted at £2 10s. an acre is every bit as good if not better than the piece I quoted at £9 15s. an acre. When the hon. member tackles me on this question, he tackles somebody who knows something about this land. We all know there was something curious about the purchase of the Maryvale Estate. It happened during an election. As many members of the Kidston party said, it was done for the purpose of securing for the then Philp party the Warwick and Cunningham seats. It had that effect.

Mr. GRAYSON: I did not get a single vote through it.

Mr. ALLEN: I can assure the hon. member I am not very often in his electorate, but I happen to know two votes that he got, and that counts four out of his small majority of sixty-eight. If I happened to find out two when I was not looking for them, I wonder how many I could find out if I went looking for them?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: A whole lot.

Mr. ALLEN: At any rate, it had an important bearing on the Warwick election. That estate was bought to secure for the Government the Warwick and Cunningham seats. The hon. member for Cunningham said the other day it was a good bargain, and he said the Government had got rid of every block. I dare say they did. There is a thirst for land, but because there is a thirst for land I do not see that the Government should raise the values. There are other points which he conveniently forgot to mention. The Government purchased those lands for £87,000, and they got rid of them. Certainly. But what had they to do before they got rid of them? The hon. member did not tell us. He did not tell us that the Government had to go to the expense of building a railway which will cost £60,000 to get rid of that land. I happened to be on those lands since the House has been sitting, and the cry of every selector I met was: "What about our railway? When is it going to come? This land is no good to us if we do not get the railway." Which proves my contention. I say, without fear of contradiction, if that railway had not been passed, the Government would not have got rid of the land so easily. They did not lose anything by

it, but the selector has to pay a pretty dear price to enable the hon. members for Cunningham and Warwick to secure their seats.

Mr. MANN: I said the same thing last year.

Mr. ALLEN: Then, again, there is a piece of land which I have marked at £12 per acre. The whole cry right through the Maryvale Estate is that the selector from the Government have to pay about £2, and, in some cases, £3 an acre dearer for his land than for what the syndicate was selling similar land. Can the hon. member deny that?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No, no!

Mr. ALLEN: Those figures are there—they cannot be denied. There again, the friends of the poor man! For local government purposes last year this land was valued at £49,000. Then, the poor men who go on to it will have to pay taxes on over £90,000. The local government tax at the present time hits the poor man, and the monopolist escapes. Look at Jimbour. First of all for local government purposes Jimbour was valued at 19s., £1 1s., and then at £1 10s. an acre. What has the selector to pay in the shape of local government taxation? He has to pay on £6 an acre.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Did not your party assist in the repurchase of the Jimbour Estate?

Mr. ALLEN: Jimbour does not stand alone. Glengallan is the same. Glengallan for local government purposes was valued at £2 10s. an acre.

Mr. MANN: All the repurchased estates are the same.

Mr. LESINA: The whole system is bad.

Mr. ALLEN: My experience of repurchased estates is that there has only been one good bargain—that is, Headington Hill Estate.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Are you forgetting the Seaforth? (Laughter.)

Mr. ALLEN: I do not know anything about the Seaforth Estate. Take the Glengallan Estate, No. 1. That was bought thirteen or fourteen years ago. The price then for the best land was £5 an acre unimproved, and at the same time anywhere at all you could buy improved land in the vicinity, with a house and fenced in, at £5 an acre. The Administration in the past have done all they can to spoil those Acts. They have never driven one hard bargain yet with the landlord. I consider the Maryvale owners had a good thing on in selling to the Government. They got a better price for the land from the Government than they would have got by cutting it up, and they were saved all the worry.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: The selectors were very glad indeed to get the Maryvale Estate.

Mr. LESINA: They are glad to get land anywhere.

Mr. ALLEN: Yet they are very loud in their denunciation of the price. If bread cost 2s. 6d. a loaf, and a man was starving, he would have to get it. It is just the same with those people up there. They have to get land—they cannot go idle. We have heard a lot about the Agricultural Lands Purchase Act, and the number of persons settled under that Act. I am very sorry to say, from my experience of that Act and the administration of it, that although a large number of settlers go on the land in the first instance, they are bought out subsequently. Those small holdings are getting larger and larger every year, and I dare say in the course of time—even where we have holdings of 80 to 100 acres—you will find the

Mr. Allen.]

smallest holding contains 1,000 or 1,200 acres. They are gradually being bought up. You can see it all over those repurchased estates. I will give hon. members an instance.

Mr. LESINA: Aggregating. There is nothing to stop it.

Mr. ALLEN: Yes, aggregating; it is freehold tenure. I want to refer to another question. I have put the case of the poor agricultural farmer—to save them from their friends. Now I come to myself. The Premier, in his speech, went out of his way to attack me, and he made a statement regarding my actions during the Christmas vacation which is not in accordance with fact. Now, up to the end of January this year I was a junior officer in the Education Department. I worked my specified time, and did it well, too—(hear, hear!)—and after those hours I claimed my time as my own. When the Christmas vacation came, part of that time was spent in the Bulloo electorate; what I was doing there is my business, not the Premier's.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ALLEN: While I was in that department I always did as I pleased in my own time, and I do not see why in this [5 p.m.] free country, in this British community, I should go to the Premier—the accidental Premier for the time being—and ask him where I shall spend my holidays. He has no right to impute motives as to what I was doing. I say that I was not organising the Bulloo electorate; I never did any organising in the Bulloo electorate while I was a member of the public service. I have been organising though in other places in my own time, and in my own way, and in a way which did not come into conflict with the regulations which governed me. (Hear, hear!) I say that politics have got into a very poor condition, when the Premier of the State will lend his ear to some idle gossip who comes along with a tale, unsupported by any proof, that a Government official has been doing organising work. It appears to me that he instituted a kind of Star Chamber system in the public service. He has instituted a system of espionage. No man is safe while there is any spy about. We do not know who the spies are. I wonder if he is going to table a list of the spies he has throughout the country watching the public service. I want to know why the Premier, when he was shown that letter, did not tell that individual to go and lay a complaint? Why did he not tell him that he did not want to hear any idle gossip; that he was there as Premier of the State, and was not at all concerned about the private actions of a member of the public service, and that this letter-writer, this spy, this assassin, or whatever he was—the man who stabs you in the back—should lay a complaint. If he was dissatisfied with my conduct, if he thought I had committed a breach of the regulations, I want to know why this Premier, who believes in fair play, did not tell him to go and lay his charge in the proper place where it could be dealt with, and I could have had a fair deal? It appears to me that this informer did not want to give me a fair deal. If he did so, why did he not lay the charge in the proper place, so that I could refute it? No, he came along to the Premier, he knew where he could get a sympathetic hearing; but I want to tell the Premier that if he had tried to punish me as a public servant for going where I chose during my Christmas holidays he would have found out his mistake; he would have found out that he could not persecute

[Mr. Allen.

me, and that I was quite ready for any little trick that he might have been prepared to play upon me.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: He never tricked you; he treated you very liberally.

Mr. ALLEN: I have nothing to thank the department for.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: He took you back into the service.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Because he was a good man.

Mr. ALLEN: Because I was a good man, as the hon. member says. The head teacher of the school, when I was going away, said, "Of course I do not know anything about politics. If you happen to get in, and you are as good a member for your district as you have been a teacher here under me, the electors will have no cause to regret putting you in."

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ALLEN: That is the opinion of my immediate superior. The Minister for Public Instruction has insinuated that the Premier did me a good turn.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: No; I said the Department of Public Instruction.

Mr. ALLEN: Well, I had to stand out and fight my case. The Secretary for Public Instruction said that the Premier had done me a good turn. He only gave me fair play, and I do not call fair play a good turn. During that 1908 election, when the time came, I resigned. I had no understanding. I never ran to any man before the elections, and said, "Well, if I resign, will I get back?" Everybody cannot say that. I wonder if the present Home Secretary or the present Minister for Public Instruction can say that every other man acted in the same way, according to their knowledge. At any rate, I have grave doubts about it. When I came back, I put in my application in the proper way. I refused to be penalised. I said, "Mr. Charlton, a staff surveyor, resigned, and fought the Burnett in 1907, and he got back again on his old standing. He resigned again, eight months later, to fight the election for Maryborough, and got back again on his old footing." I said, "You are going to treat me the same way." The department did not want to do so. The Minister was very fair and just to me, but a certain official was not. One of the officials went out of his way to make a deliberate misstatement to thwart me. I do not want to follow it up. I hung back, and told the Minister that I asked for nothing but a fair deal, and I was determined if I did not get it I would not go back again. I wanted to be treated the same way as Mr. Charlton and other men. I pointed out to the Minister that I had served in a bush Provisional school and in the Western districts of Queensland, and had only been a certain time in the metropolitan area, and that I considered that if the department could not send me back to Warwick they were in duty bound to put me in one of the Brisbane schools. That is the statement I made. They tried to get out of it, and I pointed out that I was not prepared to go in on any other understanding. The Minister did me justice. As I said before, one official at the time made a misstatement to thwart my desires, so that I could not get into the metropolitan area.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That is a very serious charge to make against a public officer.

Mr. ALLEN: He is not there now. I may say that since then new regulations have been gazetted by the Department of Public Instruction. According to those new regulations, I would have been still entitled to eighteen months in the metropolitan area, or in the vicinity of my home. All I asked the Minister for was three months, and I had to fight to get it. They gave me the three months; and, as it happened, it suited them to keep me in the metropolitan area at the end of that time. I got no special favour. I only got justice.

Mr. THORN: If you got justice, what are you complaining about?

Mr. ALLEN: Because the hon. gentleman said that he treated me exceptionally well. I say he did nothing of the kind. I do say this, as I said before: that the Premier of this State had very little to do when he lent his ear to someone who was not prepared to lay charges in a straightforward manner or come out into the open and fight me. There are certain matters in connection with the Education Department which I would have liked to have spoken about, but I will reserve them for the Address in Reply. To sum up my reasons why I am opposed to this Government, I want to answer first of all a certain question that the Premier asked. He said, "If the Government has been good in the past, how has it become bad now?" My answer to that is, "Because it has undergone a change, and this change has a detrimental effect on the legislation, and on the administration of the State. He asks us to judge the Government by its actions. What actions have the Government done?"

Mr. HARDACRE: Adjourned Parliament for nine months.

Mr. ALLEN: What democratic legislation has this strong, coherent, democratic party put on the statute-book? Absolutely none. "Do nothing" seems to be their motto, and for that motto we condemn them. I am opposing this Administration because I have a mandate from my constituency to do so; because it exists in opposition to the expressed will of the people at the ballot-box in 1908; because it is composed chiefly of the whole wreckage of the reactionary forces; because it has made no appreciable effort to lighten the burdens of the small man on the land; because it is playing into the hands of the capitalists and reducing the miserable pittance now payable to the wealth producers of the State by bringing more competitors into an already overcrowded labour market.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. G. Appel, *Albert*): I desire, in common with all the rest of the members of this Chamber who have already done so, to express the regret that I feel at the loss which this House and his native State have sustained in the death of the late Mr. J. D. Campbell. He was one of those native Australians who, having made a name for himself in the commercial world, also made a name for himself in the political world, and the loss of whom, I venture to say, will be felt by the whole of the members of the community, whatsoever their political opinions may be. (Hear, hear!) I confess that I had not intended to occupy the attention of the House upon this want of confidence motion, for several reasons; and in that respect I may say that one of them was a physical one, and I trust that hon. members will bear with me if, owing to the cold from which I am suffering, I am not up to the form which I confess I would like to be, were I addressing a public meeting, or this House. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. KERR: What about Windorah?

Mr. COTTELL: What about "rats"?

The HOME SECRETARY: It is quite possible that the hon. member for Barcoo, who represents the West, could relate incidents of the West far better than I could do, and I am sure he could give many personal experiences of his own out there. One of the reasons why I had not intended to trespass on the time of the House was this: I may be wrong, but I certainly have heard nothing but abuse from hon. members, so far as the misdeeds of the Government are concerned.

Mr. COYNE: Even the camels could not carry them.

The HOME SECRETARY: Possibly not, in the opinion of the hon. gentleman. Furthermore, I also felt that if we were to do any work or do anything for the State, the question of whether this Government should be turned out or not was a question which did not necessitate pages and pages of *Hansard*, and, in many cases, repetition and narration of ancient history, in view of the fact that not alone in connection with the proposed legislation, but in connection with certain necessary amendments and additions to the industrial legislation which has lately become law, and which, from experience of the Administration, it is absolutely necessary to amend in the direction proposed as soon as possible. Now, the hon. gentleman who has just sat down must not expect me to take any notice and reply to all that he has said.

Mr. ALLEN: You can't. (Opposition laughter.)

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. gentleman says I cannot. He is quite safe in saying that, for the simple reason that I won't. When he has been a member of this House for some time, and has gained a little more experience, he will discover that he does not add to his weight or influence in the House by casting personal reflections at any other member of this Chamber. So far as his veiled innuendo concerning myself is concerned—well, he must not expect me to say anything about that. (Labour laughter.) He must not expect me to do it, because if I do say anything it would be a virtual admission that there was some truth in it. (Labour laughter.) Before proceeding with the few remarks which I intend to make on the main question before the House, I shall say a few words with regard to the electorate which the hon. member represents, and I shall also say a few words in connection with his remarks concerning myself. I am pleased, at any rate, that I have afforded the hon. member a subject upon which to express himself this afternoon; and, speaking personally, considering the apparent self-gratification he showed, I venture to say that I was a very good subject. So far as that great electorate is concerned—

Mr. KERR: "Magnificent," please.

The HOME SECRETARY: Magnificent, as the hon. member for Barcoo says. I say truthfully that that great tract of country is one of the most valuable portions of territory which this great State possesses.

Mr. ALLEN: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: And it was a revelation to me to see the possibilities in connection with that great tract of country. The hon. member, quoting from his notes or from his memory—I forget which—spoke about what I had said so far as railways were concerned. I can tell the House that what I did say was this: that if I was an elector of the Bulloo electorate, the one policy I would advocate would be railway construction to open up that great district. And I say the same

Hon. J. G. Appel.]

thing now—that the possibilities of that vast district are such that so long as I remain a member of this House, whether sitting on this side or on the other side, my support will be given to railway construction to open up that valuable portion of the State of Queensland.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: We have as good as got it now.

THE HOME SECRETARY: I don't want to digress too much, but, in reply to the interjection of the hon. member, I will point out that he is quite correct, because it is forecast in the Speech. It is part of the policy of this State to construct those connecting links of railway which will give a line of rails from the Southernmost to the Northernmost part of this State; and in that construction the great portion of Queensland called "the Bulloo" will receive the railway communication that is absolutely necessary for its future welfare. The hon. member was good enough to be sarcastic concerning a typographical error in the report of a conversation I had with the reporters of a newspaper when he spoke of Stoney Creek Station. For the benefit of the hon. member I may tell him at once that I knew perfectly well that there was no such station in the Bulloo of that name.

MR. ALLEN: Why didn't you contradict it?

THE HOME SECRETARY: I am not going to reply to these interjections. I propose, Mr. Speaker, to continue my address. He knows as well as I do the Stoney Creek I spoke about, and he apparently knows of the boundary rider who resides in the vicinity or at that particular place. The information I received concerning the wages that boundary rider was prepared to pay, and would pay, came from the boundary rider himself and from other sources, which to my mind were reliable. Concerning the style and class of residence which people occupy in that portion of the electorate, it is all very well for members to come here and say, "If you only knew the class of residence!" It is not a question of the class of residence, but the condition of the atmosphere in that portion of the State, which is absolutely different from the coastal portions of Queensland. This particular residence is simply a bark humpy, and some portions are simply rough shelters; but in connection with that little camp there was a small portion of the humpy which was fitted up, and which was used by the itinerant teacher when he came at certain specified times for the purpose of instructing the children of that same boundary rider. And as the hon. member has spoken of Windorah, he will also possibly recollect that at Windorah I met a friend of mine, who comes from my district, and who is one of the itinerant teachers employed by the Department of Public Instruction, and who at that particular time was on his round from one station to another in connection with his duties. And in that connection let us, through this House, once more inform the country what work the Department of Public Instruction is doing to provide instruction for the children in the West by increasing the number of itinerant teachers. And I trust that we shall receive the support of every hon. member of this House in providing for a considerable increase in the near future. Talking of the conditions in the West, I say they are absolutely different from those which exist on the coast. I did not intend to be as discursive as this in addressing the House, but it is necessary for me to let those of the electors of this State who may be misled by what fell from the hon. member—it is necessary for me to give them some account of the conditions of the West.

MR. KERR: Will you tell us about the special coach?

[Hon. J. G. Appel.

THE HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member for Barcoo, I see, is making his little bullets, or somebody is making them for him to fire. He, as a Minister who has travelled in the West, knows all about four-horse coaches; and possibly the hon. member was not satisfied with a four-horse coach, because, from the dignified bearing he possessed while he held Cabinet rank, I venture to say that nothing short of a six-horse coach would have suited him. (Laughter.)

MR. KERR: I always travelled with six.

MR. MANN made an interjection.

THE HOME SECRETARY: I do not object to interjections, but I am not going to allow myself to be drawn too much away from what I wish to say. I noticed last night that the hon.

member for Clermont referred to [5.30 p.m.] the hon. member for Cairns as "a man of wood." His senseless inter-

jections remind me of an old saw, "You may lead an ass to knowledge, but you cannot make him think." So the hon. member will pardon me if I take no further notice of his senseless interjections. (Laughter.) Addressing myself to where I left off before hon. members distracted my attention: To one who lives on the coast the conditions of the West are so absolutely different that, until a man has actually had the experience of viewing them personally, he will hardly credit what they are. When you go to a homestead you find the whole of the beds standing out in the garden or out in the yard, the people living in the open air, for there the open air is the best and the most comfortable place to sleep in. On some of the largest pastoral holdings we find that, owing to the lack of timber and building material, they have built with green brick, with ant-bed floors and thatched with lignum—I think that is the name of the grass which grows in the swamps. Perchance those ant-bed floors may be covered, or they may not be covered, but those dwellings may be occupied by persons who, under ordinary conditions, if the material were procurable, could have a very much more pretentious class of residence. However, in every practicable case, owing to the atmospheric conditions, the greater part of the life is spent in the open air. With the small rainfall in that portion of Queensland, people are able, and they do, live for the greater part in the outer and open air. Under the same conditions which do not enable people to build more pretentious houses, those who have not the funds simply live in bark erections, or in many cases under grass shelters. These are the actual conditions; but the feeling that is engendered in one in that dry exhilarating atmosphere is one which causes you to feel an indescribable lightness and vigour; and, in that respect alone, it enables men to live a life which, in the coastal districts, would be absolutely impossible, and would be most injurious to health. The hon. member for Bulloo endeavoured to be sarcastic in connection with what I said concerning the large teams which travel over the country. To me, as I said in that interview, it was a revelation to see those great teams with their great Western bullocks. It reminded one of the stories of the Arabian Nights or of the Boers who trekked in South Africa. For, travelling along, one sees in the far distance—because there the roads are perfectly straight, and, owing to the fact that the country is level, you can see for miles—and as you go along you may see in the dim distance just a little column of dust; as you approach nearer and nearer you come across these teams one after the other in the way that I have mentioned. Any hon. member who has any knowledge of the West knows that those men and women, who have travelled for years

and years on those roads carrying loading, would not give up the life to come to the coast for any other conditions whatever that might be offered to them.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: They stick as tight to that as you do to the Treasury benches.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes, and as tight as the hon. member for Maranoa sticks to anything he can get his fingers on.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and laughter.

The HOME SECRETARY: And, if all accounts are true in the Maranoa, he takes very good care to get as much as he can into them, too. (Renewed laughter.) I do not like to digress, but, if we have middlemen, such as the hon. member for Maranoa, who are living on the sweat of the toilers upon the soil, continually interjecting, it causes one to think that there is a certain amount of hypocrisy about it.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member for Bulloo spoke about indented labour in the West. This House knows that, before any indented labour can be introduced into Queensland, the permission of the Commonwealth authorities must be given to their introduction. The Works Department, which administers industrial legislation, supplies to the Chief Secretary, and, through the Chief Secretary, the Commonwealth, a list of all the wages which are paid in the particular district where that labour is to be introduced.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: Yes; and it was proved on the floor of this House last session that they supplied wrong information.

The HOME SECRETARY: I venture to say that what the hon. member has interjected is absolutely incorrect, and he is casting an aspersion upon the permanent officials of the Works Department which may be worthy of him, but which is unworthy of a representative sitting in this House.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: It is all very well for hon. members to drag a herring over the track. The Premier insisted, so far as indented labour is concerned—and rightly, too, so as to prevent the flooding of the labour market in those districts—that they should only be introduced under agreement, and that there must be a deposit of £5, so that those men who were introduced into a district would have work to go to, and would be provided for under proper agreements.

Mr. HAMILTON: Yes, and they “outed” men who were already in the district.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

The HOME SECRETARY: If the hon. member for Gregory will allow me, I am coming to that. Allusion has been made to the number of unemployed in the West. One of the objects that I had in visiting the West was for the purpose of ascertaining what those labour conditions were—for the purpose of ascertaining where these large numbers of unemployed were, and the reasons for their unemployment. My experience in the West was given in the interview which appeared in the *Telegraph*. I repeat again that the conditions of the worker in the West are very much superior to the conditions of the worker on the coast; his payment is better, and the conditions of his life are better. I found that the opal-miners the hon. member spoke of—

Mr. HAMILTON: There are no flies on the coast.

The HOME SECRETARY: I can show the hon. member places on the coast where the flies are equally as bad as they are in the West.

Mr. LENNON AND LABOUR MEMBERS: No, you can't.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member for Warrego practically represents rabbits. There are more rabbits than white people in the hon. member's electorate.

Mr. LENNON: Do you represent “rats”?

The HOME SECRETARY: I will come to the hon. member for Herbert directly, and I am sure I will quite satisfy him, if he wants anything. Now, with reference to the opal-miners: During my trip out West I made a detour to the opal mines for the purpose of seeing what was being done in connection with them. I met an old opal-miner who had been away on the Murray, and who was then travelling back to try his luck again at the opal mines. I have already pointed out that teamsters who have driven their teams from one place to another, year in and year out, will not leave that work for any other occupation. So it is with either a goldminer or an opal-miner—he will always go back to the particular class of work in which he has been for a long time engaged. This old opal-miner was going back to the opal mines. And what was his condition? He had come all the way back from the Murray, but he had a capital buggy to carry his kit, and that buggy was drawn by a first-class pair of Western horses. The case of that old opal-miner was similar to that of other men whom I met travelling on that road. Some were travelling in sulkies, and some were riding bicycles.

Mr. ALLEN: Broken down.

The HOME SECRETARY: If the hon. member wishes me to reply to his interjections—

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the hon. member will not notice interjections—they are quite disorderly.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes, Sir; but I shall be only too pleased to satisfy any hon. member who makes a sensible interjection if I can hear it. But I must ask the indulgence of the House, because I am suffering from a cold which has rendered me rather deaf.

The SPEAKER: Order! We do not want any interjections, sensible or otherwise.

The HOME SECRETARY: Perhaps the hon. member would have to get someone to write it for him, if he is to make a sensible interjection. However, to continue my remarks: Only in one instance did I meet a man travelling along the road on foot, and he had an excellent kit; his clothes were good, and from what he told us he was then within a few miles of his destination.

Mr. KERR: What has this got to do with the want of confidence motion?

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member for Barcoo is no doubt a great man in his own estimation, but if he could only see himself as others see him—

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the Home Secretary, in continuing his remarks, will address himself to the question before the House.

The HOME SECRETARY: I will do so with pleasure, but interjections of the character which usually emanate from the hon. member for Barcoo are not such as are likely to assist one to continue one's speech connectedly. With regard to the matter of shanties, which I mentioned in that interview, I will give the hon. member one instance which is typical of many. In giving a

Hon. J. G. Appel.]

description of this one shanty, I do not for one moment say that there are not decent licensed houses in the Bulloo electorate. At the same time, I venture to say that there are a great number of houses which are licensed, and which are mere traps to get the wages of the worker, and by getting those wages—legitimately, as the law stands—they reduce the worker, for a period, to a condition of practical destitution. The case I allude to is a house on the Langlo.

Mr. ALLEN: That is not in the Bulloo.

The HOME SECRETARY: I am referring to the condition of the West, and I am giving one instance of a shanty on the Langlo. It is a mere slab humpy, which, if it were situated on a pastoral holding, would not be considered a fit place for the housing of men working on that holding. How a license was obtained for that place is certainly a puzzle to me, but we know how licenses are sometimes obtained under the present constitution of the licensing benches. We know that there are justices who are willing to sit on a bench and grant licenses.

Hon. R. PHILP: Do you refer to the house at Langlo Crossing?

The HOME SECRETARY: I do.

Hon. R. PHILP: I have seen worse places than that.

The HOME SECRETARY: Quite so; so have I. The pastoralist is compelled to provide for his shearers certain accommodation.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: So he should.

The HOME SECRETARY: I do not for one moment contend that he should not be compelled to provide that accommodation. What I say is that by law he has to provide such accommodation, and yet when a man has earned his wages he can go to such a house as that at Langlo Crossing.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is not a shanty.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is a licensed house, but it is nothing more or less than a shanty building. I can cite an instance of what happened to a number of men who went there with their cheques. When their cheques were reputed to be gone, some of those men, practically in the horrors, were taken by either the licensee or his agent, and driven out to Ambathala Lake, and turned adrift on the shores of the lake in that condition.

Mr. ALLEN: That is a scandal. Private enterprise.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is a scandal. We do not know what might have happened to those men had not the manager and employees of Ambathala Station turned out and found the men. The men when found had stripped their clothes off, and were badly eaten by ants. The manager brought them to the homestead, and there nursed them back to life. I should like to hear hon. members who say they represent the men who were treated in that way make such things public.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: That is an indictment against your own Government.

The HOME SECRETARY: I should like to see the members who represent those districts make these things public. When I was in the West I asked why they were not made public. What was I told? Because the licensees of those houses are supporters of the Labour party—

Mr. LENNON: Question! and Opposition laughter.

[Hon. J. G. Appel.

The HOME SECRETARY: They are the men who horse them, and provide them with board and lodging when they visit the West.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Question! and other interjections.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

The HOME SECRETARY: I am quite satisfied that there are hon. members sitting on the benches opposite who are not aware that such things take place.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: You have only just discovered it.

The HOME SECRETARY: I only discovered it on that visit, and I think it my duty to make it public.

Mr. KERR: The Minister in charge of the police should stop it.

The HOME SECRETARY: Those are the conditions. The hon. member knows very well that under the Licensing Bill it is impossible to stop licenses being granted to premises of that class. He is an ex-Cabinet Minister, and he only makes the interjection for the purpose of casting a reflection upon the Government which has consistently endeavoured to do its duty so far as carrying out the provisions of the liquor laws of this State are concerned.

Mr. LENNON interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. LENNON continued to interject.

The SPEAKER: Order, order! I hope the hon. member is not going to persist in disregarding a call from the Chair. I pointed to the hon. member, and called him to order, and yet he persisted in his interjection. The hon. member knows perfectly well that conduct of that kind is unworthy of a member of Parliament.

Mr. LENNON: Mr. Speaker, excuse me, but you did not call me to order before.

The HOME SECRETARY: I am endeavouring to show to this House, and through this House to the electors who are unaware of these things, what the conditions of the West are. The matter was brought up by the hon. member for Bulloo, who preceded me, and what I say is this: If it were not for the fact that the men who, during the season, make good wages—would enable them to enter into some occupation more remunerative and tide them over that period between the two seasons—if it was not for the fact that their money is practically spent under the conditions I have named, we would not hear of men having to walk about in the Western portions of the State.

Mr. BOWMAN: I think there is a great deal more sobriety in the West to-day than there was years ago.

The HOME SECRETARY: I have no doubt about it, because the number of men one meets at the present day in the condition I have mentioned is comparatively small.

Mr. BOWMAN: It is fast disappearing.

The HOME SECRETARY: As the conditions disappear, so undoubtedly will disappear the number of men who, in the off period—having spent their money in the way I mentioned—are compelled to walk about from one station to another begging food to carry them on. I was told that I would be met practically at every place in the West by deputations from men who had no work and were unable to obtain work. I put this question at different places that I visited, and was told that a deputation would meet me, first at Thargomiuda, secondly at Charleville.

A deputation did meet me at Cunnamulla just a few moments before the departure of the train in which I was returning to Brisbane. The clerk who accompanied me, and who was taking notes for me, counted the number who were on the platform in the deputation. He counted twenty.

Mr. BOWMAN: Oh, bunkum!

The HOME SECRETARY: He counted twenty; I counted fifteen. However, I do not propose to rely upon what I thought I had seen. I was determined to get at the bottom of this, and I wrote to Mr. Dorsey, the acting clerk of petty sessions, who has charge of the Labour Bureau at Cunnamulla, to report, and this is his report—

Your telegram of 10th inst., wherein you require me to report on the unemployed in this district, and, secondly, as to whether members of the deputation which met the Minister for Works when here recently, were *bona fide* unemployed, is duly to hand.

To gain what may be considered as reliable information into the question of unemployment in the Cunnamulla district as possible, I referred to the following various sources:—

1. To my Labour Bureau register, and I find there has not been one single application in answer to the large posters exhibited at this office, and also at the railway station, requesting those seeking work to apply to me.

2. I have consulted Mr G. H. Beardmore, of Messrs. Story and Co., who do business as agents for a great number of the pastoralists here, and he (Mr. Beardmore) informs me that only within the last few weeks have any applications been made to him by station workers for employment, the numbers and vocations of whom were about twelve to fifteen rouseabouts, and some four fencers.

Mr. WOODS: What were the wages?

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

The HOME SECRETARY: That is not the question at the present time. I am just quoting the report which I received. The report goes on—

I learn the first-named class of men were men who had recently knocked down their cueques, which they had earned at various woolsheds, and the balance were men of a nomadic character, who had arrived from New South Wales, *via* Bourke.

The men whom Mr. Beardmore denominated as fencers were the only real residents of the districts, and only within the last week have the latter given any evidence of want of employment.

3. The next source I applied to was the sergeant of police here, and he, after referring to his books, informs me that during the last twelve months the number of rations issued by the police to travellers who have applied, and those camped in the vicinity of the town, have been twenty-four; and for the first quarter of the present year only four persons have come to him for orders for rations. This, in face of the fact that it is perfectly well known to working men travelling looking for work that, when they are without means, they simply have to apply to the police, and they will then obtain an order on one of the storekeepers, when their wants will be attended to, will, I think it will be considered, go far to disprove the statement of there being unemployed in this district to any marked degree, if at all. As to the so-called deputation that waited on the Minister for Works, the police have kindly assisted me as to the *bona fides* of the persons who composed the deputation and, after their making inquiries, they tell me that they have ascertained that there were about twenty men who spoke to the Minister. The spokesman of the party was a man named Quirk, who had been working on several of the pastoral properties recently, and another was a man who had been convicted several times during the last six months for obscene language and disorderly conduct, and others were travellers from Bourke and other towns in New South Wales.

Trusting you will consider this report sufficient.

Mr. BOWMAN: You will never get a job at counting sheep if you say there were only twenty men on that platform.

The HOME SECRETARY: Now, that report practically embodies the whole of my own observations in Western Queensland, which are these—that if a man is prepared and willing to work, the work is there for him. If those men who, for a portion of the [7 p.m.] year, are walking about in a state of unemployment, could be kept from the curse of the worker—the drink—their position would be so improved that during the period which exists between the seasons they would be in a position, with what they have earned, to live comfortably and improve their condition.

Mr. COYNE: Do you think a man with £1 a week can keep a family and spend money in drink?

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member interjects concerning a man with £1 a week. My experience in the West is that it is impossible to obtain the services of a man for £1 a week.

Mr. COYNE: What about the indented immigrants?

The HOME SECRETARY: The indented immigrants are receiving a certain rate of pay for a certain time, in accordance with the average rate of wages paid in the district and sanctioned by the Commonwealth. During that time they are obtaining the necessary experience of colonial life, with which, if they take advantage of it, they will be able to obtain top wages at the end of the agreement. That is the position from my own observation of the conditions in the West, and I am very glad to have had the opportunity afforded me of giving the information which I obtained to this House, and through this House to the electors of Queensland, who are not acquainted with the state of affairs which exists in the great Western portion of our State—that portion which has so many possibilities before it.

Mr. COYNE: I will give you my version later on.

The HOME SECRETARY: I am sorry to have occupied so much time in replying to the remarks which fell from the hon. member for Bulloo, but there is a certain matter which he mentioned that in my opinion had to be replied to, and I am very glad the opportunity was afforded to me of giving the House some of the experiences which I gained from my visit to the West. Now, there is only one other matter that I wish to mention in connection with the remarks which fell from the hon. member, and that is in relation to the conditions under which land may be procured. It is as well that the electors of this State should know that, so far as the pastoral lessees are concerned, their rents are decided by the Land Court, an authority over which no Minister has any control—a court which has been placed above the authority of any Ministry. The court has the power, whether the administrative head thinks the rent sufficient or not, to fix the rents for pastoral holdings. I quite agree that it is a position which should not exist, but it does exist.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The leases exist.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is the trouble.

Mr. BOWMAN: And the anomalies exist, out of all proportion.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is so. I venture to say that if the matter were in the hands of my colleague, the Minister for Lands, a very much larger amount would have to be paid by pastoral lessees than they pay at the present time. However, that is a matter which rests with the House to consider—whether an authority shall continue, which—over the head of the

Hon. J. G. Appel.]

administrative branch, and over the head of the Government of the State—is authorised to fix rates that undoubtedly in many instances are lower than they should be in the interests of the people of the State.

Mr. COYNE: The law has fixed the power of the Land Court.

The HOME SECRETARY: So far as the tender system is concerned, I confess that I think it is an admirable one. It is a far better one than the ballot system. Possibly something might be devised—I do not know that it has been yet—whereby a better system than either the ballot system or the tender system might be evolved. But where a man is prepared to pay down a certain amount, because he is determined to get a certain piece of land over the head of other men, I do not see that he deserves any relief when, after having obtained it, he comes crying for a reduction of the rent.

Mr. BOWMAN: Don't you think a man with a long purse has an advantage over a man with a small one?

The HOME SECRETARY: Unfortunately, that is the condition of society, and I venture to say that we will be very grey before we can improve it.

Mr. COYNE: You could abolish the tender system.

The HOME SECRETARY: Hon. members must recollect that the man who is prepared to reside upon the grazing selection gets priority.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: At the lower rent. If the homesteader tenders 3d., and the grazing farmer 3d., the homesteader gets it.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is in the hands of the man who wished to get the selection. With the man who is not prepared to do that, but in his anxiety to obtain a certain piece of land is prepared to make a high bid, I have no consideration. Why should we have? As the leader of the Opposition observes, it is the man with the long purse who is invariably not prepared to reside on the selection, and I do not see why, either from this side or from that side of the House, he should receive any consideration. However, that is the position as it exists at the present time.

The PREMIER: The man who is prepared to reside has the advantage.

Mr. COYNE: He gets a dummy to reside on it.

The HOME SECRETARY: He cannot get a dummy to reside on it, and should not be permitted to do so. If he puts a dummy on the land, the selection should be forfeited, because the man who *bonâ fide* is prepared to reside on the land, and thereby gets it above all others, should certainly be considered, and any Government who insists upon that should receive the support of both sides of the House. We should insist that the selector carries out the condition of residence on the piece of land for which he has received priority. Now, I have endeavoured to deal with every matter mentioned by the hon. member for Bulloo, who preceded me. In connection with the Maryvale land, as my colleague, the Secretary for Public Lands, has already spoken, I may point out this: It is only a fair thing that where the State repurchased land for the purpose of close settlement, they should be recouped the cost of the repurchase. I venture to say that in no other State of the Commonwealth nor in the Dominion of New Zealand is it possible to obtain land of the quality that is obtainable in the State of Queensland for the small amount of money and favourable conditions of payment that exist here. I challenge any member of this

[Hon. J. G. Appel.

House to show that in any other State the conditions are better for the acquirement of the Crown lands of the State or the lands that have been repurchased for the purpose of closer settlement.

Mr. BOWMAN: The Land Monopoly Tax Bill, which was introduced by the Premier in 1905, would have had a much more beneficial effect in giving cheap land than the repurchasing of estates.

The HOME SECRETARY: In reply to the interjection of the leader of the Opposition, I confess that there is a great deal in that Land Monopoly Tax Bill, and I am glad that the hon. member has given credit to the Premier for the introduction of that measure.

Mr. BOWMAN: And also a certain amount of discredit, because he would not put it through the House.

The HOME SECRETARY: No man could have fought more for those two measures which were introduced than did the Premier during the time that he endeavoured to make them law.

The PREMIER: Unfortunately the Labour party had not got enough sense.

Mr. MANN: You were not game to go on with it, as we could have passed it.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is all very well for the hon. gentleman to be wise after the event. I once more thank the leader of the Opposition for the credit which he has given to the Premier for attempting to bring in a measure which I say myself was a measure which deserved the most favourable consideration in connection with the lands of this State.

Mr. BOWMAN: It is a pity you did not put it on your programme in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech.

The PREMIER: What difference would that make?

Mr. BOWMAN: You know what difference it would make.

Mr. MANN: The Secretary for Lands was against the Land Monopoly Tax Bill.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

The HOME SECRETARY: I hope I have not wearied members of this House with devoting so much time in discussing that portion of Queensland which is called "the Bulloo," but to myself it was a most interesting portion of the State. The problems there were so interesting, and the conditions were so interesting, that I believe those electors of Queensland who read the pages of *Hansard*—and I believe a considerable number of them do so—will receive information of which they were heretofore not aware. In connection with the speech of the leader of the Opposition in support of the motion of want of confidence, I must confess that on the strength of it, and on the forcefulness of it, I cannot compliment him. I must confess that, accustomed as I have been to hear him discourse upon political matters, he was positively weak upon this particular occasion. But while I cannot compliment him in connection with that, I must confess that I feel impelled to compliment him upon his moderation.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOWMAN: Good old moderation.

The HOME SECRETARY: Good old moderation, as the hon. member observes. (Laughter.) The moderation of the hon. gentleman's speech, and the absence of vilification from it, I think conclusively proved that he realises the importance and dignity of the position which he holds as leader of the Constitutional Opposition.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MANN : Good old word "constitutional."

The HOME SECRETARY : In his address by which he supported the contention that this Government had not the confidence of the House, and consequently the country, he did not in any way indicate a policy which was superior to the progressive and democratic policy which has been placed in the Address by this Government.

Mr. BOWMAN : We will give your our policy when we get there.

Mr. MANN interjected.

The HOME SECRETARY : I do not wish to be personal with the hon. member for Cairns, but I must confess that, if he continues his senseless interjections, I will probably have to say something I won't like and he won't like. The leader of the Opposition, in his speech, did not show that there had been any faults in the administration of the different departments by the present Government. He did not show that in the administration there had been any laxity on the part of the present Administration. Nor did he show or indicate in any way that in the administration of that legislation which had been claimed by the Labour party as being their special production—

Mr. BOWMAN : And rightly so.

The HOME SECRETARY : Although carried into law by the head of this Government—he did not show that in the administration of that legislation, which only came into force a few months ago, there had been any failure to carry out the democratic spirit which ran through it, and without which it would not have been a success. Of course the natural assumption is that the colourlessness of that speech was a matter of indifference, because I think we may fairly assume that whatever argument this Government brought forward, whatever their administration had been, however democratic the legislation was—had it even been socialistic—whatever their administration was, still, as it was not in the programme of the leader of the Opposition, and as it was not in the administration of the leader of the Opposition, that in itself made it bad, and the Government who brought down that programme was unworthy of the confidence of the people.

Mr. BOWMAN : We judge you by your past.

The HOME SECRETARY : I suppose that was the reason why the hon. gentleman did not consider it necessary to make his speech such a speech as would in itself have convinced this House and the electors of the State that his proposition was a correct one.

Mr. COYNE : The guilt of the Government was too obvious.

The HOME SECRETARY : There is the hon. member for Warrego again. (Laughter.) I include the hon. gentleman—and he may assume that henceforth—I include him with the party with which he now sits.

Mr. KERR interjected.

The HOME SECRETARY : There is the hon. member for Barcoo again. I suppose as he sits there and contemplates the Treasury benches, of which he was such an ornament, he misses them, and he likes his little voice to be heard occasionally.

Mr. BOWMAN : Your chief thought he was an ornament.

The HOME SECRETARY : I have already asked the indulgence of hon. members on account of having a cold. I would like to reply to every interjection, and I can only ask hon. members to interject sufficiently loudly for me to hear what they say.

The SPEAKER : Order ! I hope the hon. member will refrain from making an invitation of that kind. It is clearly my duty, according to our Standing Orders and the practice of Parliament, to do everything in my power to discountenance interjections ; and I hope the House will support me in doing so.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS : Hear, hear !

The HOME SECRETARY : Let us contrast for a moment the platform which the leader of the Opposition represents with the policy placed before the country by the present Administration. And in that respect I am very glad that so distinguished a member—I do not say it in a tone of sarcasm—so intellectual a member of the party as the hon. member for Clermont—gave us such a clear exposition of the platform and the objective of the Socialistic party. It reminded me in a sense—I think it was Macaulay who spoke of it—of a certain manifesto issued by the Pretender, who, after being driven from the throne of Great Britain, was anxious to get back again. He issued a certain manifesto—

Mr. MANN interjected.

The HOME SECRETARY : I hope that in bringing this knowledge to the hon. member for Cairns he will endeavour to think. The Pretender issued different manifestoes ; but there was one—I believe it was the last one—which was of such a character that the party on the other side considered it good enough to print it and circulate it as showing the strength of their position. And I venture to say that the speech of the hon. member for Clermont, defining clearly as it does the platform, the objective, and the method by which that objective may be reached, is the best answer that we on this side of the House can give to the socialistic doctrines which hon. gentlemen opposite would like to see become law in the State of Queensland.

Mr. COYNE : In what way ?

The HOME SECRETARY : In the way of carrying it into effect. And what is the meaning of arriving at that objective ? The hon. gentleman clearly defined the position of the party opposite, which was that it was a class party.

Mr. LESINA : A first-class party !

The HOME SECRETARY : In deference to the hon. member, we will call it a first-class party.

Mr. LESINA : And as a consequence the party over there is the second-class party. (Opposition laughter.)

The HOME SECRETARY : I may assume that the hon. gentleman implies that it is the dress circle. (Government laughter.) I did not understand the Premier the other night when he spoke of addressing the dress circle. I understand it now, and I apologise to the Premier for misunderstanding him. The hon. member for Clermont informs us that the party opposite is the first-class party, and consequently it is the dress circle party in this House. (Laughter.) That party, according to the hon. member for Clermont, has for its object legislation for one particular party ; and it is also its object that that particular party shall have the government, the legislation for, and the administration of, all the parties in the State. We have that clearly indicated and defined as the policy of those hon. members who sit on that side of the House who have signed the platform, and those of them who are supporting and are prepared to support the party and their platform. Now we have the position clear. As the hon. member stated, the first-class party are prepared to assist those hon. members who are

Hon. J. G. Appel.]

sitting on the cross benches, as they decide, I assume, to occupy the Treasury benches wholly and solely, but on the condition that in black and white there is an agreement that they carry out the policy of the Socialistic party. It is well that this House, and, through this House, the electors of the State, should clearly realise the position of the gentlemen sitting on the Opposition benches, and of the gentlemen who are sitting on the Opposition cross benches. I assume that the gentlemen sitting on those benches are honest; and if they continue to sit there they will acquiesce in the proposition advanced by the hon. member for Clermont. Furthermore, we are informed that should the leader of the Labour party, in the event of the vote being adverse to this side of the House—in the event of that hon. gentleman accepting a Commission to form a Government, his party will hold a majority of the portfolios in that Government.

Mr. BOWMAN: Who informed you that?

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member for Clermont.

Mr. LESINA: I did not say that. I said our constitution provides that we will enter into no alliance unless we have a majority of the portfolios.

The HOME SECRETARY: Well, I assume that the hon. members will carry out their constitution. I assume that they are honest.

Mr. LESINA: If we do not, the organisations will call us to account.

The PREMIER: It is purely an assumption.

The HOME SECRETARY: I am not going to say anything about that; but I am willing to assume that the hon. members are honest, and that they will carry out their constitution, which provides that they must hold a majority of the portfolios in any Administration formed by the leader of the Opposition. That being so, it follows also that all members sitting on that side will support them.

Mr. KENNA: State socialists.

The HOME SECRETARY: I have several hon. members to deal with, but I am quite prepared to deal with that hon. member, too, if he wishes me to do so. This is an important matter, and it should be debated in all seriousness. From my point of view—whether that point of view be right or wrong—it is important because it marks out the line of demarcation which exists in this House and in the country between hon. members sitting on that side and hon. members who occupy seats on these benches. It is right that the electors of the State should have the position clearly defined to them—that, following out the constitution of the party opposite, however a Government may be formed by the leader of the Opposition, their objective must be carried out by all members opposite, whether they are in that Administration or whether they are supporting that Administration.

Mr. KENNA: What are you trying to prove?

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

The HOME SECRETARY: I am simply endeavouring to prove—and I am very sorry if hon. members are too dense to understand me—

The SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member will not notice interjections, but will continue the course of his argument.

The HOME SECRETARY: My misfortune is that I only hear part of the interjections owing to my temporary infirmity. I think it is only right that the position should be clearly defined, and that hon. members sitting on that

[Hon. J. G. Appel.

side of the House, who are either supported by the Socialist party or take part with the Socialist party in the formation of an Administration, if the constitution of the Socialist party is carried out, are bound to carry out that legislation and that administration which makes freehold property impossible by the imposition of a land tax—that they will impose such a land tax as practically to deprive the present owners of land of the whole of their interest and title in their land. I am taking the course which the *de facto* party in England took with respect to the last manifesto issued by the Pretender, and I think that is the best, the fairest, and the most intellectual way of placing the position of the leader of the Opposition and the party opposite before the electors of the State of Queensland.

Mr. BOWMAN: The electors of Queensland would like your definition of a State socialist.

The HOME SECRETARY: I am quite prepared to give my definition of a State socialist, and I propose to do so before I sit down, because it appears that a number of hon. members in this House do not know the distinction that exists between a socialist and a State socialist. We have been told that the objective of the Labour party is the nationalisation of all the means of production and the sources of wealth.

Mr. BOWMAN: By what means?

The HOME SECRETARY: By means of a land tax, in the first instance.

Mr. BOWMAN: You don't know the objective.

The HOME SECRETARY: It was clearly admitted by the hon. member for Clermont that the first step in bringing about the objective was the imposition of a land tax.

Mr. LESINA: A land value tax.

The HOME SECRETARY: I trust hon. members are not going to recede from the position they have taken up, because they represent the one party whose objective has been so clearly defined. Every member who has spoken on that side has practically claimed to represent the men who are not employers—the men who depend upon the wages which they earn for their daily sustenance; and the aim of hon. members opposite is to get at the men who have risen to become the employers of labour and the owners of freehold land in the State, however small their holdings may be.

Mr. LESINA: We want to tax monopolists.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is all very well for hon. members, who fear, when the position is clearly defined for the electors—

Mr. BARBER: They knew it years ago.

The HOME SECRETARY: I am not alluding to hon. members opposite, because they are honest. As the leader of the Opposition knows, I have never hesitated to say that I have no feud with the Labour party, because they are honest. They state plainly, "We are socialists. We propose to take from the man that has what he has."

Mr. LESINA: We do not.

The HOME SECRETARY: My understanding may not be clear at all times; but, so far as I can learn, their proposition is, by a land value tax, to deprive the owners of freehold land of that land.

Mr. LESINA: No—of the value of that land.

The HOME SECRETARY: Surely that is a distinction without a difference.

Mr. LESINA: They have no right to the value—the community makes it.

The HOME SECRETARY: I am thankful to the hon. member for assisting me. They

propose to take away the value. I would be glad to know what is the value of the land to the man who has sweated for it.

Mr. BOWMAN: Its producing capacity.

The HOME SECRETARY: What is the value of the land to him, if the value of the land is taxed from him?

Mr. BARBER: Its use purposes.

The HOME SECRETARY: What is its value to him when he has to pay a larger amount than he would have to pay under any other conditions? I venture to say that all those who are interested in freehold land, however small their holdings may be, will fail to see the subtle distinction which has been drawn by hon. members opposite. However, as I was observing, I have no quarrel with hon. members opposite. It is their business, if they are honest, to carry out the purpose for which they were placed in the positions they now occupy. And if they can gain and hold the government of the State, I have nothing to say against their doing so, because then they will represent the majority of the people of the State, and, as we all know, the majority must rule under any and all conditions. But let us make clear the position of those hon. members who apparently do not like the people of the State to know the policy they are prepared to support, provided they can gain something they have not got already. That is the whole position, and all I desire is to make clear the line of demarcation which exists between the party on this side of the House and the party on the other side of the House. I do not know by what name they should be called, but it has been suggested to me that they might be called "the dependent party," after the clear and explicit statement which has been made by the hon. member for Clermont as to the position that the party of which he is a member intend to take up, and have embodied in black and white, should they be able to control the government of this State. Every member of the Labour party has been perfectly honest so far as the advocacy of a land tax is concerned.

Mr. LESINA: We have never hidden our hand.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member exactly expresses my opinion of the party—they have never hidden their hand. They come out and fight in the open. We know their objective, and we know the reasons for their objective, and, although we may not agree with them, we can at least respect them for their honesty. We, on this side of the House, have endeavoured to put forward an equally honest policy.

Mr. KENNA: They cannot respect you for your honesty, though.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The HOME SECRETARY: I must confess that, while I have no objection to a certain class of interjections, I do not consider an interjection such as that which has come from the hon. member for Bowen worthy of reply, because I feel satisfied that the hon. member knew that he stated what in his heart he did not believe to be a fact. We on our side of the House have endeavoured to make our policy as clear and definite as the policy of hon. members who are sitting immediately opposite to us. We have endeavoured to make it abundantly clear that we are not in favour of the policy which they advocate. Hon. members opposite have been honest enough to say that they are opposed to an immigration scheme whereby this country may be populated by white people.

Mr. BOWMAN: We have not said that at all.

The HOME SECRETARY: They have been honest enough to endeavour to cut down the appropriation proposed by the Government for the purpose of carrying out their immigration scheme. They have been honest in that.

Mr. MANN: That is more than you have been.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member is probably thinking of those poor coloured men whose blood, he said, or admitted, had fertilised the ground in his own district.

Mr. MANN: Didn't you find employment for them?

The HOME SECRETARY: No.

Mr. MANN: Well, your wife.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member knows that the interjection which he has just made is not true. The hon. member knows that no member of my family was ever found employing kanakas or other coloured men, and the hon. member who prompted the interjection also knows that it was not correct.

Mr. KENNA: What was it?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The HOME SECRETARY: We know that the policy which must bind those hon. members who are associated with the Socialist party, but who have not signed the platform, is a policy which will restrict the immigration policy which we propose, and which we consider is absolutely necessary for the advancement and development of this great State. It is all very well for those hon. members to talk about bringing thousands of immigrants into this State every week, but they will be unable to do it. If they are not deceiving themselves in this matter, they are at least endeavouring to deceive the electors of the State, because under the conditions by which they are striving to obtain possession of the administration of the affairs of the State, they are as much bound by the platform of the Labour party as the Labour party themselves, while the Labour party continue to be in a majority on that side of the House. They are bound, as the hon. member for Clermont has clearly put it, to observe every plank in the platform of the Socialist party.

Mr. KENNA: Does that not apply on that side, too?

The HOME SECRETARY: Those hon. members prate of what they will do—"they" will do—but they have got to reckon with the masters—I use the word in the sense in which it was used in the observations of the hon. member for Clermont—they have got to reckon with the masters who hold the reins and apply the whip.

Mr. LESINA: And your masters.

The HOME SECRETARY: We undoubtedly have to look to our masters just as much as members of the Socialist party look to their masters, and are bound to obey our masters. We are bound to obey the masters who sent us here for the purpose of carrying out the policy which we have placed before this House and the people of the State. A great deal has been said about the reasons why certain hon. members left this side of the House, and are now seated on the other side. In whatever remarks I make on this matter I desire to say nothing of a personal nature or character. But oft-times it is necessary that a speaker should say something which may grate on and hurt the feelings of hon. members who are sitting opposite to him. I can only ask hon. members on this occasion to believe that whatever I may say will be said with regret.

Hon. J. G. Appel.]

I do not intend to indulge in ancient history—to speak of events that took place months ago, aye, years ago, or events that took place on a former occasion when an attempt was made to form a union of the two parties who subsequently formed a union. I only propose to speak of what is within my own knowledge—of the reasons and the causes for the union. And, without desiring to be personal, I may say this concerning myself: that on both occasions when I was before my electors I clearly laid down to them that the only thing that was possible, from my point of view, to make for the progress and advancement of the State was a union of the two parties who were not extremists, and who yet held progressive democratic views. I took that position up when I was opposed by the candidate who had been placed to contest the election with me by the present leader of the Government of which I am a member. And, furthermore, I might mention this, because it will crop up again: On every occasion I told my electors that, so far as a Trade Disputes Bill was concerned, I was prepared to give a Bill of that description my support. I clearly explained the object and purpose of a Trade Disputes Bill, and to-day I say the same thing. My electors are aware that I advocated it, and they plac'd me here for the purpose of endeavouring to get a Trade Disputes Bill placed on the statute-book.

Mr. LESINA: Members on the Government cross benches object to that.

The HOME SECRETARY: I mention this incidentally in reference to what took place so far as I was concerned prior to the union which took place between the two parties who are now sitting, with a few exceptions, on this side of the House. I had the pleasure of visiting the Northern parts of the State, and during that visit had the opportunity of speaking in public on three occasions, when I, in common with other hon. members, who are not sitting with us now—being at that time the only member of the Opposition party present with the Government party—I advocated a union of the two parties, which would make for the advancement and progress of the State. At the joint meeting of the two parties, which was held after the individual parties had decided that the union was necessary, with one exception, and that only in connection with one portion of the programme, every member of that united party decided to support every item of what is known as the "Rockhampton Programme" which had not up to that time become the law of the State. The one exception was the hon. member for Fassfern, and the one portion was the Trade Disputes Bill. The hon. member said at that meeting that he was prepared to support all the items in the Rockhampton programme, with that one exception.

Mr. LESINA: He is the only member in the House who objects to a Trade Disputes Bill.

The HOME SECRETARY: What is the position of that hon. member? I speak of that hon. member with the greatest regret, because he is a man with whom I have been on terms of personal friendship—a man whose abilities I admire, a forceful man—yet to-day he is prepared, without apparent reason, to support that party whose principal planks are a Trade Disputes Bill and a measure for taxation of land values.

Mr. LESINA: The hon. member advocated that when he was first returned as a member for the Wide Bay electorate.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is with regret that I have to do it, but I think it is

[Hon. J. G. Appel.

only just that we, who consider we are representing a certain policy, should make clear, not alone our policy, but should make known to the constituents of hon. members the policy of the party opposite, and what the support of that policy by men who were returned by those who do not believe in that objective, means. That is the position. I regret to say, for some unfathomable reason—I am not going to cast any reflections upon hon. members by saying that it was not a matter, so far as their politics and policy was concerned, whether they received a portfolio or not.

Mr. LESINA: Do you think the hon. member for Fassfern would support a Trade Disputes Bill if he got a portfolio?

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member for Clermont has put a very difficult proposition to me. However, the position to-day is this: That although he is not prepared to support a Trade Disputes Bill, which is in the programme of this party, yet he is prepared to support the programme of a party on the other side which includes, not alone a Trade Disputes Bill, and, I venture to say, one that would make a Trade Disputes Bill on the lines of the English one blush; he is prepared to support that party which is pledged to bring in such a Trade Disputes Bill, and then, as a primary object on obtaining power, the imposition of a tax upon land values.

Mr. BOWMAN: Are you prepared to introduce a Bill on the lines of the English Act?

The HOME SECRETARY: I may say, without disclosing any Cabinet secrets, that the Trade Disputes Bill of this party will be founded on the English Act. (Opposition laughter.) It is all very well for hon. members on the other side to laugh. They may not be in earnest, and unfortunately earnest men in this State have been compelled to come to the conclusion that many hon. members now sitting in a certain portion of the House are not in earnest. However, I am in earnest, and I have no hesitation in saying that, so far as that particular measure is concerned, I intend to give it my support.

Mr. BOWMAN: And bring it up to date?

The HOME SECRETARY: Bring it right up to date. I simply wish to make clear the position that is occupied by those gentlemen who were members of this party, and yet to-day are prepared to wreck that party which they endeavoured and strove to build up—which they endeavoured to bring into life. Now, so far as the senior member for Ipswich is concerned, there is no doubt as to the position he has taken up—it is clear and definite. In connection with the hon. member for Fassfern, the position is not clear; we cannot understand it. The electors of the State cannot understand it. I venture to say that his own electors—and there are many of them small men, with little 40 and 80 acre scrub selections, which they have won by the sweat of their brows, the strength of their arms, and the stoutness of their hearts—when they hear of the position he occupies as their member, are they prepared for a policy such as he is bound to support? I can only say that I believe that their feeling will be one of regret—

Mr. BLAIR: Not at all.

The HOME SECRETARY: One of regret as to the position that their representative has taken up. Now, returning to the position of the senior member for Ipswich, he has made his position abundantly plain and clear, and I must say that I respect him for having done so. But

it is just as well that, in addition to what he has said of the reasons which induced him to take the action which he has done, members of this party should also make the position clear to the electors whom they represent. Now, we find that the hon. gentleman did all that he could to bring about the union. He has told us, in connection with a certain alleged constitutional offence, that he knew that the cry and the position taken up by the party to which he belonged was a bogus one.

Mr. BLAIR: In my opinion, yes.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yet he stood by that party, he fought for that party. Why, he came down in my own electorate, and at Southport he eulogised the Premier, and advised my electors to place in this House as their representative a member who would support the policy of the Premier. That was the policy which he himself supported, and strove to convince my electors at Southport was the only one which made for the advancement, development, and benefit of the people of the State.

Mr. BLAIR: I was a colleague of the Premier at that time.

The HOME SECRETARY: I am quite willing to quote what the hon. member has said. I am endeavouring to give as near as can be what he said.

Mr. BLAIR: Quote it.

The HOME SECRETARY: My regret in connection with the hon gentleman is this—I believe that he cannot be happy in it.

Mr. BLAIR: Cheer up!

The HOME SECRETARY: You, Mr. Speaker, are aware how at the time he was regarded as the most amiable member of this House. (Hear, hear!) In fact, I dare say if the hon. member for Herbert was describing him he would have referred to him as the amiable curled darling of society. (Laughter.) Really, he was a most amiable man.

Mr. BLAIR: I hope he has not lost the quality.

The HOME SECRETARY: I dare say hon. members will remember how the hon. member lectured them. He said, speaking in the House on the 21st June, 1904—

I am one of those who believe that nothing is gained by personal attack. I believe the cause of those who adopt methods of that kind is considerably weakened. It proves conclusively that the cause which has to rely upon methods of that kind, to rely on abuse—I use the word advisedly—is clearly a bad cause.

Mr. BLAIR: Do you agree with that?

The HOME SECRETARY: I do.

Mr. BLAIR: Then why go on with personal abuse?

The HOME SECRETARY: I absolutely agree with that proposition, and I can only venture to say that, if the hon. gentleman would think of what he has said at that time, he would realise that his indulgence in personal attack upon that one man who has stood by him—who was his friend—

Mr. BLAIR: Stood by me! God save me from my friend!

The HOME SECRETARY: Shows conclusively that he has a very bad case indeed. The hon. gentleman, as I say, has always been honest, because he has claimed in this House that he was entitled to a great reward for his patriotic services to his State as a member of this House and as the Attorney-General of the Administration.

Mr. KERR: Throw your chest out. (Laughter.)

The HOME SECRETARY: He has claimed that for that five years' service the country owes him a great reward—the blue ribbon of his profession. That has been his aim, his goal, his object. Now he has admitted, not alone in this House, but before his electors, that he left his chief, the Premier—

Mr. BLAIR: Why?

The HOME SECRETARY: Because he says that chief broke his pledge to him.

Mr. BLAIR: Exactly.

The HOME SECRETARY: Now, what was the pledge? The pledge of a judgeship! What does the hon. gentleman care for the State of Queensland; what did he care for the electors of this State?

Mr. KENNA: Rub it in. (Laughter.)

The HOME SECRETARY: His objective was a judgeship. (Opposition laughter.) And he was even prepared to take a District Court judgeship.

Mr. BLAIR: That is not so. You were challenged to produce any record at that very time.

Mr. KENNA: Give us the minutes of the Cabinet.

Mr. MURPHY: Read section 7. (Laughter.)

The HOME SECRETARY: I have here the *Queensland Times*, Tuesday, 17th November. (Opposition laughter.) The hon. gentleman said—

When Judge Mansfield died he told the Cabinet that the proper thing to do was to fill the vacancy.

Mr. BLAIR: Fill what vacancy?

The HOME SECRETARY—

And he also urged his claims to the position in the event of its being filled.

Mr. BLAIR: Read the preceding portion of that speech. There was a vacancy on the Supreme Court bench at that time. That is a misquotation.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is all very well for the hon. member to endeavour to get out of the position, but what I want to know is this: If he was not a candidate for that District Court judgeship, why did he submit his name when he placed the names of the candidates before the Cabinet to decide upon?

Mr. BLAIR: That is not so.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is absolutely correct, and the hon. gentleman knows that it is absolutely correct.

Mr. BLAIR: You know that it is not so.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. gentleman submitted his name with the others for the Cabinet to select a member of the profession to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Judge Mansfield.

Mr. BLAIR: You know that that is not so.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. gentleman admitted, as reported in this speech delivered by him in Ipswich, that the fetich which he placed before the electors of his native State—

Mr. BLAIR (*Ipswich*): Mr. Speaker,—I rise to a point of order. Is the Hon. the Minister in order in repeating a statement after I have given a denial of that statement to the House?

The SPEAKER: I think the proper course for the senior member for Ipswich to follow would be to ask permission to make a personal explanation.

Mr. BLAIR: I do so now.

The SPEAKER: It is usual if a member wishes to correct a statement for the hon.

Mr. Blair.]

member who is speaking to sit down, and then the hon. member can rise and ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Mr. BLAIR: With your permission I would like to make a personal explanation. (Hear, hear!) The Hon. the Minister has said to this House that I was a candidate for the District Court judgeship, and that I submitted my name with certain others to the Cabinet for that position. I give that the most emphatic denial of which I am capable.

Mr. KENNA: Hear, hear!

Mr. BLAIR: I assert that there is not a tittle—not a scintilla of truth in the statement.

Mr. KENNA: Hear, hear!

Mr. BLAIR: I would like to remind hon. members that when I spoke on this subject before, I made exactly the same statement, and I challenged the members who were in the Cabinet with me to produce any record of the statement that my name was ever submitted for this position, or evidence of any kind. There are members sitting on the Opposition side of the House with me to-night who were at that time sitting in the Cabinet with me, and they know that what I say is absolutely true.

Mr. MAXWELL interjected.

Interjections from Opposition members.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. MAXWELL again interjected.

Mr. BLAIR: Are you directing this matter?

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. BLAIR: The other point I wish to raise is this: When the Hon. the Minister was reading that quotation from the *Queensland Times*, I asked him, in common fairness, to read the preceding portion of what I said, and if that is read it will be found that the vacancy to which I alluded was the vacancy on the Supreme Court bench. If he goes on further he will find that the advice which I tendered at that time was that, as Judge Mansfield had died, the number of District Court judges having come down from four to three, the proper thing to do was to fill the Supreme Court vacancy, and I put in my claim. I thank you for the permission you have accorded me.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: The personal explanation of the hon. member virtually amounted to a speech. Anyhow, I spoke of facts.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: Your facts are not worth much.

The HOME SECRETARY: They must be like your commodities, then. The hon. senior member for Ipswich has given his explanation, but he has not denied the fact that his fetch, his aim, the whole object of his political existence, was the position of a judge. And he says that the reason of his leaving this party was because the promise of a judgeship was made to him, and had not been carried out.

Mr. KERR: There were too many lawyers in the Cabinet.

Mr. LESINA: If the promise was made, it should have been carried out.

The HOME SECRETARY: When the hon. member for Ipswich was addressing his constituents—I have the quotation here, and I stand to be corrected—the hon. gentleman said that he was still in accord with the Rockhampton programme, and was prepared to support it until it was carried through and became law.

Mr. BLAIR: Decidedly so.

[*Mr. Blair.*]

The HOME SECRETARY: But he says he left his leader because that leader broke the promise to give him that for which apparently he had entered public life—apparently that which was his goal, and his goal alone. Now, let us consider the position. He was offered a judgeship. He had the refusal of a judgeship once; and, speaking as a member of the profession, I can say that he had offered to him one of those blue ribbons of the profession, a position which any man in the profession might well be proud to attain to—(hear, hear!)—and which a member of that profession of the youth of the hon. gentleman might have still been more proud to fill. It is, from the view of those who are in the profession, one of the proudest things that a man can attain to—the position of Supreme Court judge in Queensland.

Mr. KEOGH: A position to which he would have done every justice.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: And a position which one of the most able men in the profession accepted, and I venture to say that he will fill the position with honour and credit.

Mr. BLAIR: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. gentleman had the refusal of a judgeship, but he insisted upon a condition—and it is a most extraordinary proposition to come from a native Queenslander—his condition was that it should not only be a Supreme Court judgeship but a Supreme Court judgeship in the metropolis of Brisbane. It must be a judgeship with a station in the metropolitan city. Now, to any layman the qualification of the location would not enter into his mind. To the layman it would have been a position of Supreme Court judge, with the station wherever the holder might be sent. So, even accepting the proposition of the hon. member for Ipswich, his leader carried out his pledge in so far that he offered him the position of that judgeship for which he had so eagerly longed. Now, apparently the hon. gentleman based the whole of his animosity from that time to the man who carried out his promise to him.

Mr. KENNA: He did not.

The HOME SECRETARY: He carried out his promise inasmuch that he offered him this high and honourable position; but because that leader did not pass over the head of a man who had, for nineteen years, I think, occupied a position in the Northern part of Queensland—

Mr. KENNA: Hurry up and get to the point.

The HOME SECRETARY: I wish the electors of the State to clearly understand the position. Did the hon. gentleman think his services were so great, or of such an illustrious character, that he was entitled not alone to a judgeship, but to pass over the head of a man who had done many years service to the State in the North?

Mr. KENNA: You'll be pulled up for tedious repetition if you don't get on.

The HOME SECRETARY: I dare say the hon. member may consider it a good joke; but to my mind, and to the people of this State, it is a serious matter. What is the position? We find that the hon. gentleman, having refused this honour, upon reflection is even willing to go to Northern Queensland.

Mr. BLAIR: That is not so.

The HOME SECRETARY: Why the hon. gentleman should object in the first instance to go to the North I cannot conceive, because I can assure the hon. gentleman, as one who has resided in the North, that it is a portion of the State that any native of the State might well

be proud of—(hear, hear!)—and that the hon. gentleman, as a native of Queensland, should object to go to any portion of this State is, I must confess, a matter beyond my conception.

Mr. KENNA: Would you have gone?

The HOME SECRETARY: Like a shot. (Laughter.) The position is that the hon. gentleman, having repented, was anxious after all to gain the position, but it was too late.

Mr. KERR: Stonewalling!

The HOME SECRETARY: Let me tell you this: What occurred in Cabinet in connection with this matter has been made public already, so there is no revealing of any Cabinet secret. We all know that even then the Premier was only too anxious, if it was possible, that the hon. gentleman should have obtained the position. But even a Premier cannot override his colleagues on a matter of that kind, and the members of that Cabinet were not men who would allow themselves to be overridden in a matter in which they considered that justice was at stake. But let this House and the country know that the Premier did all he could to obtain the position for the hon. gentleman, and I cannot understand why the hon. gentleman should exhibit such an amount of bitterness and spleen and malice towards the man who gave him the chance of occupying that high and honourable position. We, as a Cabinet, realised that if we did not throw over the gentleman who occupies the position to-day, we would have to encounter the hostility of the senior hon. member for Ipswich. We have encountered it; but we considered that we owed a greater duty to the people of Queensland. We considered it our duty not to throw over a gentleman of the character and forensic ability of the present occupant, simply in order that we might render ourselves comfortable in our position as members of the Ministry.

Mr. KENNA: You are not very comfortable now.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is the history of the matter of the judgeship.

Mr. KENNA: It is ancient history.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member gave us a good deal of ancient history the other night. That is the history of the matter, but we know that there are some things which they don't like to hear.

Mr. BLAIR: A history which is largely a lie.

The HOME SECRETARY: I consider it my bounden duty to state to this House, and through this House to the country, actually what took place in connection with this matter; and to-day we have the hon. gentleman in this position: that because his particular ambition was not gratified, therefore, though he still agrees with the programme, he is trying to cast the party overboard—to do all he can to wreck that party which he strove to bring into existence. And it is as well that the country should know exactly what the ambitions and aspirations of the hon. member consist of. It is as well also that hon. members should know the reason the hon. member gave for his desire that the judgeship should be in the metropolis. It is a most extraordinary one, and one that very few members of the profession, even if they felt it, would have given voice to. It was that he desired the judgeship to be in the metropolis, in order that he would be able to consult his brother judges. I am not going to say what suggests itself to one's mind when a member of the profession wants to be where he can consult

his brother judges, but I leave it to hon. members and to the people of the State to form their own judgment.

Mr. BLAIR: The reason he wanted it was because it was promised.

Mr. LESINA: Do you think that Premiers ought to promise judgeships?

The HOME SECRETARY: I confess that I do not. But hon. members will recollect that the senior member for Ipswich has a most insinuating manner, and I think they are aware that during the time he occupied a seat on the Treasury bench he did not fail to insinuate himself into the good graces of the man who occupied the position of Premier.

Mr. BOWMAN: That same man said time after time that he would never get a judgeship. Your chief is not to be relied on.

Mr. BLAIR: Hear, hear! He was acting the hypocrite all the time.

The HOME SECRETARY: It simply shows what an insinuating manner the hon. member for Ipswich must have when he [8.30 p.m.] succeeded in inducing the Premier to give him a position which the hon. gentleman had refused to give him on a previous occasion. The hon. the senior member for Ipswich, as leader of a party, gave us his programme; and I quite admit that, as an oratorical effort, it was worthy of the hon. member, who, I believe, won the prize for oratory in his college, and I compliment him upon it.

Mr. BLAIR: I regret to say that I was never at any college.

The HOME SECRETARY: I am very sorry if I have slandered the hon. member, but I have heard that he was at college. The hon. member's speech—like most of his speeches—consisted of aphorisms, innuendoes, catchy phrases, and flowers of oratory. But was there anything in it? To use the expression of the hon. member himself, was there any business in it? Absolutely none! Sift it, and what was there in it? Nothing! But there is one thing which I notice the hon. member was anxious to prove to hon. members of the Labour party, and that was how courteous he had always been to the members of that party. He was anxious to assure them that he had treated them like men. Are the members of the Labour party political dingoes that it is a special concession for a Cabinet Minister to treat them with the courtesy which is due to every representative in this House? To use a colonial expression, the hon. member was what the youngsters call "smoodging" to the Labour party. In high-flown phraseology the hon. member gave us his programme; but I venture to say that the lucid explanation of the hon. member for Clermont—to use a colloquial expression—knocked the bottom out of the high-sounding programme of the hon. member, because the programme of the hon. member must be the programme of the Socialistic Labour party if he expects to receive their assistance or to make use of them.

Mr. LESINA: Ours is an excellent programme.

The HOME SECRETARY: Undoubtedly, from the hon. member's point of view. So do I consider the programme and policy of this side of the House an excellent one, and one which makes for the progress of the State. We have another hon. member on the other side who, I confess, I was rather sorry to see depart from this side, because there is no doubt that he was mainly instrumental, from his side of the House, in bringing about the union which has resulted. He has likewise an extraordinary excuse to offer for leaving this side of the House. I allude to the senior member for Toowoomba. His reason is that, in the first instance, he was deceived,

Hon. J. G. Appel.]

and, in the second instance, because he was afraid he would be conservatised if he continued to sit on this side.

Mr. LESINA : He did the right thing in coming over here.

The HOME SECRETARY : If he felt it, undoubtedly. Still it seems a singular thing that his reasons are so extraordinary. However, we must accept them. I am quite prepared to admit that the hon. member was honest in doing what he did, and my object in alluding to him is to show the electors of the State the present position of the hon. member, and to show them that he also is bound to support a Trade Disputes Bill—I believe he was prepared to do that—and that he must also support a tax on land values.

Mr. LESINA : Hear, hear ! I hope he will. We want it badly.

The HOME SECRETARY : We wish the electors to understand the position clearly. The position is simply this : That prior to the formation of the union which took place, the necessity existed for the union of the democrats and progressive liberals in this State.

Mr. HARDACRE : Hear, hear !—here they are.

The HOME SECRETARY : Just as the necessity existed then, so it exists to-day, if the democratic legislation we forecast in our programme is to be placed upon the statute-book ; and we trust that hon. members on the other side will assist us in placing it there. I can only say, in conclusion—

Mr. BOWMAN : Don't forget you promised to give us your definition of State socialism.

The HOME SECRETARY : Well, I have no objection to doing that. The hon. member for Toowoomba spoke of what has been done in Germany in the way of legislation for the benefit of the workers. In the Empire of Germany they have the most advanced legislation for the benefit of the workers. It is the object lesson in State socialism—how it can advance the welfare of the individual unit in the State. That is a policy which has been made law and carried out by one of the most Conservative Governments which exist in Europe. The policy of State socialism is a policy which improves the condition of the individual unit of society, as opposed to the policy of socialism which simply makes for collectivism. The policy of State socialism is a policy which assists the individual in the State to make the best of his opportunities—a policy which gives him technical education and other education at the smallest cost, or free, so as to qualify him to discharge his duty effectively in his particular walk of life. Such a policy includes wages boards, compensation, insurance of wages during times of non-employment. All these things are forms of State socialism, and so is the policy which levies a tax on dairymen for the purpose of providing funds from which loans may be advanced for the erection of butter factories. The advancement of money for the erection of central sugar-mills is also a form of State socialism.

Mr. JONES : Why not assist the miner in the same way ?

The HOME SECRETARY : If miners are prepared to do as dairymen or sugar-growers have done, there is no reason why they should not be assisted in the same way. Sugar-growers have hypothecated or mortgaged their deeds to the State for the purpose of obtaining money to erect central mills.

Mr. JONES : But miners have no funds or land.

The HOME SECRETARY : Then why should they be placed in the same position as sugar-growers and dairymen ? Let the miners

[Hon. J. G. Appel.

submit to a levy being made upon them for the purpose of providing a fund from which advances can be made, then the same thing can be done for them as has been done for dairymen and sugar-growers.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER : Are you going to stonewall all night ?

The HOME SECRETARY : It seems to me that some hon. members opposite do not care to hear the truth. However, I will conclude my remarks by quoting a few lines from a speech which was delivered in 1894 by Lord Rosebery when he was predicting the future of Mr. Lloyd-George, the present Chancellor of the Exchequer in Great Britain. The extract, which is, I think, applicable to the present position in this House, is as follows :—

A plague on both your Houses ; a plague on all your parties ; a plague on all your policies ; a plague on your endless discussions which yield so little fruit.

LABOUR MEMBERS : Hear, hear ! and laughter. Have done with this unending talk—

LABOUR MEMBERS : Hear, hear ! and renewed laughter.

and do something for the people.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS : Hear, hear !

Mr. MANN (*Cairns*) : Judging from the length of the speeches which have been made by hon. members opposite, they evidently dread the division which is going to take place on this amendment. Last night the Minister for Mines spoke for about three hours and forty minutes, and this evening the Home Secretary has given us a very lengthy disquisition. The Home Secretary wasted a great deal of time telling us about the conditions prevailing in the West. If he would only go and live there, members of this House would not be sorry. The Premier apparently felt disgusted at the bare-faced manner in which his colleagues were hanging on to office, and when he returned to the Chamber, after a short absence, he gave the Home Secretary a hint to sit down. The hon. gentleman was so wound up, so intoxicated with his own verbosity, if I may use the term, that if he had not been requested to resume his seat he would have kept going till the small hours of the morning. At the outset, I wish to congratulate, as other hon. members have congratulated, you, Sir, upon the position to which you have attained, though I am afraid that neither this House nor the country can congratulate you upon the manner in which you obtained the position. Your first impulse which led you to leave the Chamber and take your place in the lobby when your name was mentioned for the office of Speaker, was, I think, a noble one. But I noticed that the Premier and another hon. member rushed out to you, and—

The SPEAKER : Order ! I am obliged to the hon. member for his congratulations, but I am afraid the remarks he is now making are out of order.

Mr. MANN : I do not wish to be out of order, but I think the country should understand that you tried to do the right thing, but were compelled by the Premier, and other members on that side, to come back into the House and record your vote in your own favour. The Premier, when speaking the other night, asked how members could claim that the Government were becoming conservatised, and I said it was easily seen by the company he was keeping. The hon. gentleman then twitted me with the fact that so many of my old comrades were sitting behind him and helping to put in operation the platform he put before the country at that memorable election in 1907. I wish the House and the country to understand, when the Premier claims that the present Government is the same Government

which has been in power since the Morgan-Browne coalition, that thirty-three of the democrats who supported that Government have left him and are now sitting on this side of the House, and that he is now supported by twenty-five Constitution wreckers, who went to the country at the last election and tried to reduce Queensland to the status of a Crown colony. I further wish to draw attention to this fact: that every member of the old Labour party, save and except four, have left him and are now sitting on this side of the House. I further wish to point out that two out of those four are bound to him not because of his democratic programme but because of the shackles of office. The hon. member for Burke and the hon. member for Kennedy are bound to this Government not because they believe it is a democratic one or that it is going to pass legislation in the interest of the worker, but because they are bound to the Premier by the shackles of office.

Mr. MAXWELL: Do you think he is a skin-flint like yourself?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MANN: I do not wish to reply to interjections from the hon. member, but I say that if he had not received office or a bribe from the Premier, he would not now be supporting him.

Mr. MAXWELL: I rise to a point of order. Is it in order for the hon. member to accuse another hon. member of being bribed?

The SPEAKER: Order, order! Obviously the use of such an expression on the part of the hon. member for Cairns is quite out of order, and I must ask the hon. member to withdraw it. At the same time I must say that the hon. member for Burke used an expression that is not strictly parliamentary, as applied to the hon. member for Cairns.

Mr. KERR: He is the most disorderly member in the House.

The SPEAKER: Order, order! I must ask the hon. member for Cairns to withdraw the expression.

Mr. MANN: I may say, Sir, that the hon. member for Burke used an unparliamentary expression too. I may have been out of order; but I used that expression in retort to the expression he used towards me. I now withdraw it, and hope the hon. member will not offend again. There are other two members of the old Labour party who are still following the Premier—one is his own colleague, and the other is the hon. member for Fitzroy—two men coming from the same district as himself, and who have been for years entirely dominated by the Premier until they have become known practically as two poodles who follow their master wherever he seeks to lead them.

The SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. member must understand that he must proceed with his speech in a recognised parliamentary way, and that he must refer to hon. members, no matter where they sit, in becoming parliamentary language.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MANN: I am simply pointing out the fidelity of those two hon. members to their leader. (Laughter.) If I used an expression which is not quite parliamentary I am sorry and withdraw my remarks. However, I was going to say that the Hon. the Premier's colleague at times has excursions into the realms of independence. The other day, speaking at a meeting, he said this Government were hanging on by the skin of their teeth—an expression which shows that the hon. member is sometimes permitted to think for himself; but I have been told that he was summoned to the Cabinet

carpet and reprimanded for making use of such an expression. He looks worried over the matter. In fact, he has looked worried for a very long time, and he says his worry is due to the fact that members on this side of the House have been chasing him with a portfolio. Now, whoever has been dangling a portfolio before the hon. member, I would advise him to desist, because there is not the slightest hope of taking the hon. member away from his present leader. He proclaims often, perhaps with justice, that he gets more kicks than half-pence for sitting over there. But judging by his fidelity, I say the hon. member who has been dangling a portfolio before him, has a task which is not likely to be successful. There are other hon. members following the Premier who claim to be democratic. There is, for example, the hon. member for Toowoong, who got up in this House the other evening and said at least 70 per cent. of the men who returned him to Parliament were Labour men. While that hon. member was fighting the battle on behalf of the democrats of Queensland, he claimed that there was a great need for the Rockhampton programme—that it contained much-needed legislation; there was a great wealth of democratic legislation to be reaped if a sufficient number of democratic representatives were returned to the House to support the Premier. But the other night, when speaking, he claimed that we had had enough of legislation. He did not wish to see any more legislation passed, because we might very well rest on our oars and see what the effect of the legislation already passed would be to the country, in spite of the fact that the only reason that hon. member can give for still following the Premier is the fact that the Premier says he is going to pass the Rockhampton programme. And I noticed a curious fact: that on that side of the House members who were once democratic—the men who pledged themselves to support a democratic policy—are now trying to convince this House and the country that they are conservative. The hon. member for Toowoong is one, and the hon. member for Kennedy is another. And this curious fact is also noted: that men who have been known in this House and the country as the most conservative members in the House are getting up and informing the House that they have always been staunch democrats—staunch radicals—and always willing to pass legislation for the benefit of the country. For example, we have the hon. member for Cunningham, who gave us the other evening a list of democratic measures that he had voted for. I have been in the House ever since the hon. member took his seat here—we came here in the same year—and I have always noticed that on every Bill brought in by the Government and every measure proposed by the Morgan-Kidston Government—on any vital point we considered was for the benefit of the people outside—that hon. member always left his seat on the Government benches and came over and voted with the enemy. He moved an amendment in this House to exclude the farm labourers from the benefits of the Workers' Compensation Act, and now he gets up in his place and tells us how radical and how democratic he is. He also indulged in a great deal of praise of his nominal leader—the Premier—and when I asked what reason he gave for leaving that hon. gentleman, as you will remember, the only reason he gave was that the Premier had in his programme a Trade Disputes Bill. There is at least one hon. member on that side of the House—I am referring to the hon. member for Woollongabba—who says his sole reason for sticking to that coalition is the fact that the Premier has in his programme a Trade Disputes Bill.

Mr. D. HUNTER: When did I say that?

Mr. Mann.]

Mr. MANN: He says he is sticking to the Government to get a good Trade Disputes Bill.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Quote what I said.

Mr. MANN: You have said it times out of number, as every hon. member knows. So here you have the amusing spectacle of one hon. member who says he left the Premier because there is a Trade Disputes Bill in the programme, and another hon. member who says he is only sticking to him because there is a Trade Disputes Bill in his programme. Another point I might mention is this: That the hon. member for Albert goes out to the country and stoutly proclaims that he wishes—in fact demands—this Government to go on with a democratic programme. When we see those hon. members who have been known as rabid conservatives urging this Government on the road to progress, the country and this House can fairly well gauge how far that progress will go. Another hon. member that rather amused me the other evening got up—I refer to the hon. member for Mackay, Mr. Swayne—and took the hon. member for Cook to task because in that hon. member's speech he used the term "Anglo-Saxon" in his reference to immigrants—"that he wished to see the Anglo-Saxon race come out to this country." The hon. member for Mackay was quite indignant and asked why did not the hon. member for Cook include the Irish and Scotch? I remember the time—it is not very ancient history; I think it was in the year 1905—the hon. member for Mackay came up to Cairns as a thick-and-thin advocate of kanaka labour. He came up to the Cairns conference—the present Minister for Lands was at that conference—and he urged with all the vigour in his power in favour of keeping the kanakas here in order to allow the sugar industry to be carried on. He moved a motion in favour of having New Guinea natives brought here to work in the canefields, and to-day he gets up and alleges unless we get white men, this country is in danger of falling into the hands of the Asiatics. When we look back over the history of the black labour party, we see their present leader, the hon. member for Townsville, said he would be a traitor to his country—he would carry the matter home to the Home Government—he would fight to retain the kanaka. He urged at Cairns that the farmers there should get Chinese when the kanakas were gone. We can just imagine what advocacy these hon. members will make in the future in regard to peopling this country with a white population. Now, I leave the hon. member for Cunningham and the junior member for Mackay, and turn my attention to another member—an equally shifty politician with the hon. member for Cunningham—the junior member for Toowoomba.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must not use the term "shifty."

Mr. MANN: We will say he is not shifty, Mr. Speaker, but you never know where to find him. (Laughter.) That hon. mem-

[9 p.m.] ber was at one time a member of the Central Political Executive, and I can remember on the occasion when the Parliamentary Labour party and the Central Political Executive were rather at loggerheads, that a deputation from the Parliamentary Labour party waited on the Central Political Executive to see if an equitable arrangement could not be come to. At that meeting the junior member for Toowoomba—he was not a member at that time—abused the members of the Labour party in no unmeasured terms. He attacked them, and asked were they going to scab, were they going to "rat" on the platform, and later on he said, at a meeting of

[Mr. Mann.

his own Workers' Political Organisation at Toowoomba, that he did not believe in seeing a single acre of the land of Queensland alienated. Later on, the hon. member, over his steak one morning, was suddenly converted from a strong Labourite to a Kidstonite. He is now a Philpote, and possibly, like a comet that makes a circuit round the stars, he may come back again to be in time a straight Labour man. (Laughter.)

Mr. BARBER: Never!

Mr. MANN: Now, there is another democrat in this Chamber—the member for Rockhampton North—a member for whom I have a great deal of respect. There is no member in this Chamber, I believe, who had harder things to say about that coalition before it came off than the hon. member for Rockhampton North. I can remember reading the speeches he delivered at Rockhampton during the memorable campaign of 1908, and some of them made my pulses tingle. (Laughter.) He condemned the Governor in no unmeasured terms. He said he wished to wipe out the Upper House, and in every way showed himself a true democrat. Before this coalition was brought about, no man denounced it more strongly than the hon. member; but to-day—and when they know the ties which hold him hon. members will understand the position he takes up—he is sitting over there among those reactionaries. He is among them, but not of them. I am certain he would rather be over here, with his scathing eloquence ringing through the Chamber, denouncing the men who went back on them, and betrayed the people's trust by joining the Philp party. (Laughter.)

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: You are a leg-puller, all right.

Mr. MANN: I shall come to another hon. member—he is here looking for it, and he shall have it. The hon. member for Woolloongabba, when speaking, took occasion to refer to me. Now, I do not wish to blame the hon. member so much for that, because I believe it was unpremeditated. His speech was prepared by another individual—

Mr. D. HUNTER: No fear.

Mr. MANN: And the allusion to me was entirely unpremeditated. If he had gone carefully into the matter himself, he would never have made the allegation against me that he did. He twitted me with trimming to the Labour party—of voting with them on one occasion in this House. Now, I entirely deny that. During the passage of those Railway Bills, I never on one occasion voted for any amendment moved by the Labour party. The Labour party voted with us once, because the amendment I supported was one moved by my colleague, the hon. member for Woothakata. He moved that on that railway the current rate of wages ruling in the district should be paid. The hon. member for Woolloongabba forgot to mention that he also voted with us on that occasion. Was he trimming?

Mr. D. HUNTER: No; I was playing the game. (Laughter.)

Mr. MANN: I was trimming, but the hon. gentleman was playing the game.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Of course I was.

Mr. MANN: I also wish to go back a little further to another division when it was moved that the rate of 10s. a day should be paid on these railways.

Mr. D. HUNTER: I voted.

Mr. MANN: I find the hon. member for Woolloongabba trimming again with the Labour party—playing the game. He came over to this

side and voted for the Labour party, and he told me he always believed in seeing the best possible wages paid on all Government work.

Mr. D. HUNTER: I do yet.

Mr. MANN: What is the hon. gentleman doing to-day?

Mr. KERR: He is playing the game. (Laughter.)

Mr. MANN: He is sitting on that side of the House, the darling of the morning Press. Not a curled darling by any means, because Nature had a rough graving tool when it carved the hon. member. With the turn of the wheel of fortune he finds himself, like his leader, speaking to the dress circle. (Laughter.) He has forgotten the people in the pit, whose company he recently left—forgotten his old trade union companions—and we find him over there the buttress and bulwark of a Government which is paying low wages on the railways.

Mr. D. HUNTER: When were you a unionist?

Mr. MANN: I have been a unionist, and—which is more than the hon. member does—I stick to unionism. I do not go back at the behest of the *Courier* and turn my back on my mates.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Were you when you employed black labour?

Mr. MANN: The hon. member is supporting a Government that are and were paying carpenters in the Cairns railway yard 9s. 6d. a day.

Mr. D. HUNTER: What did they pay when you were here?

Mr. MANN: More than that.

Mr. D. HUNTER: The same amount.

Mr. MANN: Listen for a moment—

The SPEAKER: Order! I shall be glad if the hon. member will address his remarks through the Chair.

Mr. MANN: I am telling the House through you, Sir, that this work which carpenters get 9s. 6d. a day from is a casual job—the erection of the railway sheds in the Cairns railway yard—and on that job the carpenters were paid the lowest wage—9s. 6d. a day. The highest wages were 11s. 6d. a day, while the current rate in Cairns is 12s. and 13s. That democratic Government, some years ago I believe, put a regulation in force that every contractor who had got work from the Government should pay the ruling rate of wages. Now, what is the use of the Government putting a regulation like that on their books if they themselves break it? What is the use of saying to a contractor in Cairns: If you get a contract you must pay 12s. and 13s. a day? The contractor can simply turn round and say: There are men employed in the railway yards that you pay 9s. 6d. and 11s. 6d. to. Of course, the Railway Department urge that these men get other privileges; but that is not so. They are living in the town of Cairns, they buy their rations in the town, and they get no holidays or any other concession. I sincerely hope that every working man in Woolloongabba will understand that the Government is kept in power by that hon. member, in spite of the fact that they pay such a low rate of wages in the Cairns railway yard.

Mr. D. HUNTER: And were when you were here.

Mr. MANN: That is not true. Now, there is another hon. member of whom I wish to say a word or two—not on the other side of the House, but upon this—I am referring to the

hon. member for Clermont, who is the apostle of democracy, and also the friend of the Philp party, and an advocate of the land tax.

Mr. LESINA: I am not a member of the non-descript party.

Mr. MANN: And yet he fights against charging the squatter fair rents for his holding. A member who is pledged to prohibition, and is yet the friend of Bung; a man who wears a sweater in Clermont, but comes here arrayed in the purple and fine linen of the bloated capitalists.

Mr. LESINA: Who wrote this that you are reading?

Mr. MANN: I wrote it myself. He was a member of the Prohibition party, who was yet in the pay of Bung; he was a preacher of the gospel of the proletariat, and the blessings of poverty, but during his trip to New Zealand had put up at first-class hotels so as not to put his lordly employer, Bung, to the blush.

Mr. LESINA: You are getting quite humorous. That is Scotch humour.

Mr. MANN: I wish to bring under your notice, Mr. Speaker, this fact: When you, as Minister for Lands, wanted to deal with the Land Court—to see that a fair rent should be paid for pastoral holdings—the man who made the greatest charges against you and the man who abused you, Sir, from one end of Queensland to the other—who issued the greatest indictment against you—was the hon. member for Clermont, just because you were trying to deal with the Land Court, and I wish the members of the Labour party to remember that fact.

Mr. LESINA: Hear, hear! I would do it again to-morrow. (Laughter.)

Mr. MANN: On looking back over the hon. member's record I dropped across this epigram, which I think aptly describes that hon. gentleman in the position he takes up. This is it—“Come, Joseph, tell us which dost most affect Labour's austere or Capital's fat sect?” Friend, 'tis my aim throughout this earthly hobble With these to gabble and with those to gobble.

(Pointing first to the Labour party and then to the Government benches.) (Laughter.)

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. MANN: I propose now to leave the small fry and deal for a few minutes with the hon. members on the front Treasury benches. The Minister I wish to deal with first—I do not see him in his place, and I hope the “Whip” will send for him—is the Secretary for Public Instruction, Mr. Barnes, the hon. member for Bulimba.

Mr. KERR: Leave him alone.

Mr. MANN: I wish to first say that the Premier, on being chided for bringing the hon. member for Bulimba into his Cabinet on account of that hon. member's recent abuse of him, said he must forget any personal abuse he may have received when he was bringing to his counsels the best men possible to get in this House. It is a remarkable fact that, if you turn to *Hansard* for 1908, page 161, you will see that the Premier, in discussing the purchase of the Maryvale Estate, claimed that the hon. member for Bulimba had exceeded his powers as Minister for Lands, and had done something that was totally irregular. This is what the Premier said, and it can be found in *Hansard*—

Here is the remarkable fact: that the hon. gentleman signed that document believing that he was exceeding his legal powers.

What will the country think of that? What will the House think of the Premier after that? What will they think of the Premier deserting his friends, deserting his colleagues who sat on

Mr. Mann.]

the Treasury bench with him, when he takes into his Cabinet, at the behest of the hon. member for Townsville, the very man whom a few short months ago he said exceeded his powers as a Minister? What will the country think of the Premier for taking into his Ministry a Minister who, while he was Minister, betrayed the trust that was reposed in him, not by the people of Queensland, but by the Governor?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION : You know that is altogether wrong.

Mr. MANN : That is true. The Premier used that expression towards the hon. member for Bulimba. The accusation is not mine ; it is that of his nominal leader, the Premier.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS : Read it again.

Mr. MANN : For the benefit of the hon. member, who was not in the Chamber when I read it before, I will read it again. It is on page 161 of *Hansard* for 1908, if he wants to turn it up, and he will find that the Premier said there—

Mr. LESINA : Why don't you sing it?

Mr. MANN : The hon. member for Clermont has got a better voice than I have, and, as he is the member for "Bung," he will be able to get some whisky to make his voice more mellow and he should sing it. This is the quotation—

Here is a remarkable fact: that the hon. gentleman signed that document believing that he was exceeding his legal powers.

And yet the Premier took him into his Cabinet ! It was because of the way the hon. member abused the Premier that the Premier took him into the Cabinet, and that was what led him to coalesce with the Philp party.

Mr. LESINA : No ; it was not. The syndicate railways was the cause of the trouble.

Mr. MANN : That is not so. The hon. member for Bulimba abused the Premier worse than any other member in the House. The hon. member for Townsville abused the Premier's private character by saying that the hon. gentleman gave a concession to one of his own electors, and of the two men from whom the Premier received that abuse, one is his boss and the other has been taken in as a responsible Minister of the Cabinet. I have always claimed that the best way to reach the Premier's heart was to abuse him. The only weapon which the hon. gentleman has to protect himself with is abuse, and when anyone uses abuse towards him he looks on him as a good man, and he soon gets there.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION : You ought to get there at that rate.

Mr. AIREY : No ; the hon. member for Cairns never abused the Premier's private character. He will not get there until he does that.

Mr. MANN : No ; it is only those who abuse his private character. The hon. member for Townsville abused his private character, and now he is his chief adviser. The hon. member for Fassfern, Mr. Jenkinson, who used to call him "Betterment Bill," and who gave him all the abuse he possibly could, was called into his presence the other day and was told very gravely by the Premier, "Jenkinson, I have long recognised your ability to fill Cabinet rank." (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. D. HUNTER : Didn't you offer him a portfolio?

Mr. MANN : Although I have said a lot of hard things about the Premier, I know if I went back to him to-morrow he would fall on my bosom ; and, if the hon. member for Townsville would let him, he would put me into his Cabinet. Before passing away from the hon. member for Bulimba I want to refer to that obnoxious regulation which was introduced by his prede-

cessor in the Education Department. I refer to the regulation under which a school pupil must be sixteen years of age before he can sit for examination to become a pupil-teacher.

Mr. AIREY : In certain centres.

Mr. MANN : I was acting as a pupil-teacher myself at the age of twelve, and my friend, the hon. member for South Brisbane, was a pupil-teacher at the age of fourteen—

Mr. AIREY : Thirteen.

Mr. MANN : The whole position was ably summed up, not by a member of this House, not by a man who claimed to be a democrat. I refer to Mr. J. Tolmie, late member for Toowoomba, and he summed up the position in his paper in the worst possible way for the department by saying that hardly any pupil in the State schools could ever become a pupil-teacher under the present regulations.

Mr. KERR : Mr. Tolmie has been a teacher himself.

Mr. AIREY : Yes, and the son of a poor man.

Mr. MANN : Yes, Mr. Tolmie was a school teacher once. The Home Secretary to-night said that the Premier was speaking in jest when he said the Government were playing to the dress circle, but this regulation, to my mind, fairly shows that the Government are fighting all they can in the interests, not of the poor man, but of the rich man.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS : Hear, hear !

Mr. MANN : They are throwing into the hands of the Grammar schools all the appointments in the schools in the State, as there is hardly any poor man's child can become a pupil-teacher under that regulation.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION : You must know that that is not correct.

Mr. MANN : When the Secretary for Public Instruction replies I wish to know what was the reason when Mr. Platt, senior inspector, died, that two years were allowed to elapse before the name of his successor as senior inspector was announced.

Mr. AIREY : The prejudice of the late Minister for Public Instruction.

Mr. KERR : The answer is "Barlow."

Mr. MANN : I am glad to hear that answer, but I thought I would have got it from the Minister for Public Instruction, that it was Mr. Barlow who was the cause of it. There is a great deal of truth in the statement that it was Barlow's prejudice that prevented either Inspector Shirley or Inspector Kennedy from occupying the position, and also in connection with the appointment of Mr. Roe. My friends, the hon. members for South Brisbane and Barcoo, were his colleagues in the Cabinet, and they know that that was so.

Mr. LESINA : Did they know when they were in the Cabinet that Barlow was prejudiced? If they did, they should have denounced him at the time.

Mr. D. HUNTER : Hear, hear !

Mr. MANN : When the hon. member for Clermont ceases his noisy chatter I will turn my attention for a few moments to the hon. member for Kennedy. I always had the greatest respect for the hon. member for Kennedy, yet last night he called me a deserter and said I was elected to follow Kidston.

The SPEAKER : Order, order !

Mr. MANN : I am quoting the hon. member's words. He said I was a deserter and I was elected to follow the Premier, Mr. Kidston. I know that the hon. member for Kennedy is a

[*Mr. Mann.*]

keen student of the *Courier*. He surely remembers that the *Courier* at the last election said distinctly that the member for Woothakata and myself had left the Premier, and if he will turn up *Pugh's Almanac* he will find that I am duly labelled there as a Labour member. Does the hon. member mean to say that the *Courier* was lying?

Mr. MURPHY: No, never. (Laughter.)

Mr. MANN: The hon. member is silent. Silence gives consent. I believe the hon. member for Kennedy thinks that the *Courier* was lying?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I read all the papers I can.

Mr. MANN: I thought he must have noticed that. Was the *Courier* lying?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I did not notice that.

Mr. MANN: That's very strange. I may point out, however, that I was elected to follow the Premier, and the *Courier* was lying. But I only chose to follow the Premier as long as he adhered to the Rockhampton programme. The first plank in that programme was "No coalition!"

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MANN: Like the hon. member for Kennedy, and like the hon. member for Woolloongabba, I pledged myself against any coalition with the Philp party; and the reason I left the Premier was because he had not the courage, the manliness to come to the House and face defeat. If the Labour party had turned him out I would have stuck to him.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Were they going to turn him out?

Mr. MANN: I don't think so. The hon. member for Woolloongabba claimed that at the caucus the senior member for Ipswich was an ardent advocate of the coalition; but the last words uttered by that hon. member were: "I do not believe for one moment that the Labour party would turn this Government out."

Mr. COTTELL: Didn't he advocate the coalition?

Mr. MANN: I will retort by asking the hon. gentleman didn't he vote against it? Didn't he say he did not believe it would be a good thing for the people—that it was a rotten thing? And if the hon. member for Toowong could get a promise of indemnity from the Labour party he would sit over here. There are members who are not game to go and put their case before the country. They are afraid of a three-cornered fight.

Mr. D. HUNTER: I fought a three-cornered fight.

Mr. MANN: So did I, and I am game to fight another. My duty is clear. If I do not believe in the policy on one side or the policy on the other side, I put my policy before the electors and I will be returned.

Mr. D. HUNTER: What is your policy?

Mr. MANN: My policy is the policy the Premier was returned to carry out, but his heart failed him.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: He funk'd.

Mr. MANN: Yes—that's the word. It may not be quite parliamentary, but the hon. gentleman funk'd the fight and is now sitting with the Philp party on the other side. The member for Kennedy claims that the Premier was very anxious to work with the Labour party. Of course he was—he sacrificed the hon. member for Kennedy in order to work with them. He was anxious to work with them because he was afraid that the coalition would not find favour with the people. Long before the Labour party fell

out with him, he was intriguing with the senior member for Townsville. He was intriguing before the House met, and would have formed the coalition then, but too many members of his party refused. One of the most ardent fighters against the coalition at that time was the hon. member for Fitzroy, who went up the hill to do all he could against the coalition, of which he is such an ardent supporter to-day. If we could turn back and see who was "the power behind the throne," members could understand why these one-time opponents of the Conservative party are now the most ardent advocates of the coalition. The hon. member for Kennedy last night, in a most dramatic fashion, produced deed papers, and offered them to members on this side. He was not always so kind. I remember when he tried to force the Government to buy his land.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: That is not correct.

Mr. MANN: The hon. member for Woothakata is here, and he went with me on a deputation to then Secretary for Agriculture, Mr. Denham, to see about getting a group settled at Atherton, and Mr. Denham informed us that the member for Kennedy wished the Government to take his land from him. I was also told by another Minister that the hon. member, before he became a Kidston candidate, asked the Premier to buy his land from him. If the hon. member denies it, I am bound to accept his denial, but the source of my information is a very good one.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I offered the land to the Government. They would not buy it, and I got a better price elsewhere.

Mr. MANN: The other price was later. It was put up to auction, and the highest bid was 10s. an acre, and after that he offered it to the Government. The fact remains that he was not always so kind as to offer land for nothing. Last session I claimed that the then Minister for Mines was not fit for the position, and suggested that the Premier should put in his place the member for Townsville or some other member with a knowledge of mining. He has taken my suggestion, and put a man there with a thorough knowledge of mining.

Mr. MULCAHY: Only crushing.

Mr. MANN: It may be said that the Minister for Mines, in attaining that position, has reached the acme of his ambition; but that is not so, for I am told that there is still a drop of bitterness in his cup. He wishes to get to the Home Department to put in force those rabid tectotal principles he holds. A temperance friend told me that the hon. gentleman is not in favour of a simple majority deciding a local option matter, but he wishes to handicap them by insisting on a three-fifths majority. I am told that he wants to help the friends of "Bung." I cannot believe that, because I believe he wishes to get to the Home Department to brandish his tomahawk over the head of "Bung," to scalp him like a red Indian, and then dance a temperance war dance round the prostrate body of "Bung." (Laughter.) But there is an obstacle in the way. The Premier says, "George, I quite understand your desire—"

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MANN: "To get to the Home Department. I quite understand that, if you got there, you would put up a big fight in the interests of temperance; but you must consider that by doing so we would lose our good friend, the hon. member for Moreton, who is a wine and spirit merchant; and we would lose the support of the Hon.

Mr. Mann.]

Peter Murphy in the other House, and the support of the Hon. Mr. Gray." And he says "George." (Laughter.)

THE SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MANN: I am speaking in a colloquial way, Mr. Speaker; I am saying what the Premier would say to the Minister for Mines. (Laughter.)

THE SPEAKER: Order! I hope the hon. member will understand that even by speaking in a colloquial way he cannot break the rules which requires that Ministers are to be referred to by their official titles.

Mr. MANN: Very well, Mr. Speaker. The Premier would say to the Minister for Mines, "Man, George, I canna alloo ye tae dae that. If ye hae nae regard for yer salary I hae. Man, I'm as fat as a Glesca baillie and can hardly walk. I maun stick to the motor-car, for the trams cost siller." (Loud laughter.) The Home Secretary plumes himself on the stoppage of liquor licenses along new railway [9:30 p.m.] lines, but it is a curious thing that, while the Government have refused to issue any more licenses along railways under construction, they make no attempt to stop sly grog-selling. A decent man cannot get a license, but sly grog-selling is rampant because the Government will not employ sufficient revenue officers or police to cope with the evil.

THE TREASURER: That is not true.

Mr. MANN: If the hon. gentleman will turn up the correspondence in the archives of the department, he will find a letter written by me some months ago asking for additional police protection on the line from Atherton to Herberton, and he will also find that my request met with a refusal. This stoppage of licenses was simply a sop to the temperance party, but it does not hurt the wholesale liquor houses, because these shanties perhaps buy more liquor than the licensed houses do. I venture to predict that the stoppage of licenses will not stop the amount of drinking in the least. Men will often go to one of these shanties when they will not go to a public-house, and I claim that a necessary corollary to refusing licenses is the employment of more revenue officers or police, otherwise the whole thing is a sham, so far as the stoppage of drinking on railways under construction is concerned. I now want to turn my attention to the Secretary for Agriculture. I am rather disappointed that the hon. gentleman has not been more of a success in that office. If there was one thing I thought the hon. gentleman understood better than another it is the cultivation of cane. Yet I found, when looking over the *Agricultural Journal*, issued by his department, in the April number, there are certain marvellous facts on pages 212 and 216—I do not know whether they are facts, but they are published as facts. I look to the *Agricultural Journal* for light in regard to agriculture, and I find it stated on page 212 that in the Southern districts they only require from 1,700 to 2,000 cane plants per acre. Turning to page 216, I find that in the Northern districts it takes from 4,000 to 5,000 plants per acre. Now, I have always been under the impression that the tropical districts of Queensland are the real home of sugar-cane, and yet the *Agricultural Journal* contains the remarkable information that it requires twice as many cane plants to plant an acre in North Queensland that it takes in Southern Queensland. This journal is run by a man who knows all about cane cultivation. It is seldom that we find anything about cane in it, and when we do find anything, at least it should be accurate. In dealing with this matter, I

[Mr. Mann.]

would just ask hon. members to cast their minds back to the pictures appearing in the Sydney *Bulletin* during the last few weeks. I asked a question in the House about the matter, and I was informed that the Government are paying £20 a week for that page in the *Bulletin*. I am a keen student of the *Bulletin*, and also a keen student of agriculture and of anything that tends to advance Queensland. I find in that journal various pictures setting out the Kamerunga State Nursery, which is situated in my electorate. The pictures in the *Bulletin* exactly describe in pictorial form the policy of this Government. Looking at those pictures, you will find the men living in miserable huts—they live in a place about 20 feet by 12 feet. The manager has a fairly decent residence, but the quarters of the men are a disgrace to Queensland. It is evident that the Government desire to run that nursery by Asiatic labour, because they stuck in a picture of a Malay or a Cingalee showing how to tap a rubber-tree.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Are you sure he was not a kanaka? You should know.

Mr. MANN: Well, I should say, judging by the facial expression of the hon. member for Woorloongabba, that, if he were tarred, he would pass for a kanaka.

THE SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. MANN: The Secretary for Agriculture should do something to put this nursery on a better footing. His predecessor in office, Mr. O'Sullivan, said the place ought to be shut up, after he had looked over it, and I am sorry the hon. member for Cambooya is not here to bear out my statement, for we went all over the nursery. I claim that a bigger scandal or a bigger waste of public money on a small scale will not be found in Queensland. The overseer was a gardener and a botanist. He was there for ten years, and I claim he knew more about the work than the Instructor in Tropical Agriculture. Yet the overseer was dismissed without any notice. He was told to take three weeks' leave, but he need not come back to his work, and he never received any explanation as to why he had been dismissed. He was an enthusiast in the matter of raising cane seedlings. He brought the matter under my notice on several occasions, and I brought it up in the House. The Secretary for Agriculture, who has knowledge of cane cultivation, should keep a man there who at least had the interests of the industry at heart, and who was urging all the time that the propagation of cane seedlings should be carried on at the nursery. There is not a single vegetable raised at the nursery for the use of the men. There is only one man at the nursery who receives a decent wage. I think the clerk receives £2 a week, and he acts as overseer, and the only man who is decently paid is the Instructor in Tropical Agriculture; and, with all due respect to that gentleman, I may say that I went round the district during the recess asking various settlers what they thought of his capabilities as an instructor, and the only thing I heard he was any good at was pruning coffee trees. In fact, some of the settlers complained that he told them to plant the coffee trees with an easterly aspect, and that they followed his advice, and that the first heavy frost killed the trees; and I claim that to the Instructor in Tropical Agriculture is largely due the failure of the coffee plantations in the Cairns district.

Mr. AIREY: The place is a joke in North Queensland.

Mr. MANN: Yes. We had a tobacco experiment there.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: When was that?

Mr. MANN: It was during the last two seasons.

Mr. D. HUNTER: While you were over here.

Mr. MANN: One crop was taken off while the present Secretary for Agriculture was in office, and one during the time his predecessor was in office.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Didn't you mention the matter last session or the session before that?

Mr. MANN: No. I tried to mention it, but I was gagged by members on the other side. At the time we visited the nursery the tobacco crop was almost ripe, and any child of ten years of age could have gauged how much tobacco leaf would be got. The shed to receive the tobacco leaf was not built at that time, but a little bit of a grass-thatched shed would have held all the tobacco that was got off this plot. I think there have been two cuttings, and the total amount of tobacco leaf cut was 75 lb. weight. I noticed the *Courier*, when I asked the question in the House, tried to mislead the country by putting down £75 worth of tobacco had been taken off this small plot. I wish the House and the country clearly to understand that, for an expenditure of £366 9s. 9d., 75 lb. weight of tobacco was produced. That is enough to prevent any other settler trying to grow tobacco, although tobacco can be grown in the district successfully. I guarantee that you would get better results for an expenditure of £40 under the late overseer, who was dismissed, without any reason, after ten years' faithful service, than was obtained by the expenditure of that £366 9s. 9d. Just to show what the Instructor in Tropical Agriculture knows about agriculture, I may mention that a canegrower wrote to him, asking him what he should do in a case in which some cane had not struck, and the answer he received was that he should carefully plant another row of cane beside the one which did not strike, and that if both grew he would have two rows of cane. (Laughter.) That is a fact. When the overseer was dismissed I wired to the Minister for Agriculture telling him that the Kamerunga State Nursery was not the slightest bit of good to the Cairns district. As a matter of fact, the nursery does harm to the district, because if that nursery was not there and was not such a howling failure, we should have a chance of getting a State farm at Atherton. I claim that that nursery is the laughing stock of all North Queensland. It costs £1,650 a year to keep up, and there is not a bit of cabbage or lettuce or other vegetable grown on the place. It is a sweating shop. The only man who gets a decent wage is the manager. The ploughman, I think, got a rise of 2s. 6d. a week when the overseer was dismissed. I claim that if anyone should have been dismissed it is the man who was responsible for that howling failure in tobacco cultivation, because he will not make a success of anything which can be of use to the settlers in the district.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Did you not report to the Government that he was responsible for all this?

Mr. MANN: I have always condemned the way in which the nursery was managed. I have always asked that something should be done in the way of propagating cane seedlings there. In that work the overseer was an expert, and he ought to have been kept on, but instead of that he was dismissed, without any alleged reason, after ten years' faithful service in the department. The hon. member for Cambooya can bear out what I say with regard to the condition of that nursery and its management, because he visited the place and saw things for himself. If

a State farm were managed in the same way on the Downs, we should soon hear about it, and see a change.

Mr. AIREY: He said it ought to be thrown into the Townsville Harbour.

Mr. MANN: I do not wish to say anything harsh of the present Minister for Agriculture, because the hon. member for Mackay is one of the most courteous members in the House, and I have the most friendly feeling towards him, but I claim that as Minister for Agriculture he is a failure. The hon. gentleman is not so much responsible for the administration of the Railway Department, but curiously enough the Premier claimed credit for the good work the Government were doing in that department. He stated that £170,000 more was earned this year than last year, but he forgot entirely to mention that, to earn that sum, an increased expenditure of £165,000 was incurred, and that if they had not knocked off a number of men in June, and cut down the stores, they would have had a deficit rather than a surplus. I am not a railway expert, but I have been told, on what I claim to be the very best authority, that all the brakes on the Cairns Railway are defective; that the Westinghouse brakes are mostly cut out, and that some day there will be a smash on that line. Does the Minister intend to face that fact, or will he go into the matter?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You make your statement, and we will very soon find out what are the facts.

Mr. MANN: That has been told to me, and I believe it is true. I have also been told that two engines which were ordered from the old country for the Cairns Railway were sent to Townsville, and that two engines which had been working on the Townsville Railway were sent to Cairns in their place.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Has the hon. member reported that to the Commissioner?

Mr. MANN: I cannot go running round to the department about matters of this kind every five minutes. When the late Minister visited Cairns I took him to the goods-shed office where the clerks were working, and for the last two years I have been urging the Government to build a decent place for the accommodation of those officers. The office in which they have to work is a little old iron building 23 feet by 14 feet, and is not a fit place for any men to occupy. I got the health officer at Cairns, Dr. Baxter-Tyrie, to report on the place, and I believe he has done so. I have not seen his report, but I am satisfied that he reported strongly against the use of the building for its present purpose. It is not only unhealthy enough to destroy the health of clerks but to destroy the health of a rhinoceros. On my representing that matter to the department I got the usual stereotyped reply that the matter would be looked into. There has been an agitation by people living on the Mareeba-Atherton Railway for a siding at a place called Rocky Creek. I interviewed the Minister on the subject, and presented to him a petition from the residents of the place, and received the usual stereotyped reply that the matter would be looked into. Why, the matter has been before the Commissioner for two years.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The matter is being attended to.

Mr. MANN: Is the thing being done?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Yes.

Mr. MANN: Why not have informed me of the fact? (Laughter.) However, I am glad to have that information from the Minister. Now,

Mr. Mann.]

I will go back to the appointment of the hon. gentleman as Minister for Agriculture, and ask him can he give this House a satisfactory reason for appointing Mr. Paddle to Dr. Maxwell's position?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: That is not in my department.

The TREASURER: I am responsible for that appointment.

Mr. MANN: Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that he has at last plucked up courage to do something on his own initiative? All I can say is that the Minister for Agriculture might advance some reason for Mr. Paddle being appointed, but the Treasurer knows as much about agriculture as he knows about finance.

The TREASURER: As you know about politics.

Mr. MANN: I don't want my wife to put me into Parliament, at any rate.

The TREASURER: You are a nigger-driver.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. MANN: I am a canegrower, and naturally take a keen interest in the man who is appointed to do this work, and I say here on the floor of this House that I do not know Mr. Paddle, except by repute, and from what I have heard his reputation is not a good one. I know, as a matter of fact, that he was at the Mosman Mill for one season, and that he was a rank failure. When he went there first it was Paddle here and Paddle there—Paddle was going to do great things—but at the end of the season they dispensed with his services, and the mill has been doing better ever since. Now, I am told that a gentleman named Desplace, a man whose name I have heard mentioned by the Premier and mentioned by other hon. members in the very highest terms—I believe he did good work—I am informed Dr. Maxwell recommended that Desplace be put in his place. I am told that he wrote to the Cabinet to that effect, and I would like to know if that letter came before the Cabinet—if the Cabinet dealt with it. According to what the Treasurer says, he appointed Paddle on his own responsibility. I claim that such a serious appointment as this should only be made after most careful consideration.

The TREASURER: So it was.

Mr. MANN: And that the Secretary for Agriculture should have been consulted. I claim that it requires two men for that position. It requires a man to give the farmers instruction on the cultivation of their crops, as well as a man to attend to the manufacturing department. That is the only way you can get satisfaction out of running the mills for the Government. It is no use having the best possible engineer, or man to manage in the mills, unless the farmers can grow something to be crushed by those mills, and I claim that the Secretary for Agriculture should have been consulted. I find that the Treasurer is to blame for that appointment, and the Secretary for Agriculture has not been allowed to do what he likes and put a man there. We want a man to instruct the farmers in growing cane, as well as a man to manage the mills. I will now leave the Secretary for Agriculture and turn to the Minister for Lands, who told the hon. member for Burnett last night—

Mr. MURPHY: You must be going right along the front Treasury bench.

Mr. MANN: I have dealt with the small fry, and I am now dealing with the people who were the small fry once, but who are now the big potatoes. (Laughter.) However, I will deal

[Mr. Mann.]

with the Minister for Lands. Last night he told the hon. member for Burnett that he did not know what was going on in his own district. He told me the same thing last year. He told me I did not know what the Lands Department was doing for the canecutters in my district. I asked him what they were doing, and he said they were surveying certain blocks for the canecutters, and on my asking him where, he said near the Mulgrave Mill. I say there is not a bit of land fit for agricultural purposes near the Mulgrave Mill other than privately-owned land. The Secretary for Lands asked me to go round and see the papers, and I went round and saw the reports. If the Lands Department had known their business at all they might at least have dropped me a note asking my opinion as to the quality of the land, because I think every hon. member in this House should know what is being done in his electorate, and as this land is within 8 miles of my home, I should know it as well as anyone in my district. And I told the Minister then, and I tell him now, the land is unsuitable. There was a surveyor there for four months, doing work that is absolutely of no use, while there is a lack of surveyors in the Atherton district, where men are waiting to get on the land. I do not know how many applications have been made for this land, but I was told by a local resident that possibly three blocks might be applied for because they were above flood-mark, but he said the balance of the blocks were of very poor country, liable to flood, and altogether valueless for agricultural purposes.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Where is this?

Mr. MANN: Near the Mulgrave Mill. It is poor useless country not fit for the purpose, and I suppose the Secretary for Lands will get up and say he surveyed so many blocks for canecutters, and the people do not want them. The conditions were so bad that nobody would take them up, and I may safely say this: Not one single canecutter will ever establish a home there, because the land is not fit for him to go on. Perhaps, at the outside, three residents of the town of Nelson may make application for the blocks which are above flood mark, and are of red volcanic soil. Can the hon. gentleman tell me how many applications were made for the land?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: No; I cannot.

Mr. MANN: I am quite satisfied that 95 per cent. of those allotments will never be applied for, because they are utterly unsuitable. The strictures of the hon. member for Fassifern on the Lands Department were, I believe, justifiable. You, Sir, will remember my asking a question in the House last year as to the number of people in the State who had registered their names on the books of the Lands Department for Atherton lands, and I believe there were something like 500 names down at that time, although I have been informed there are people up there already ten deep waiting to get on the land. Yet, in spite of that fact, there has been barely anything done in the matter; 125 letters were sent out by the department lately to those men who registered their names in the books, and twenty-seven replies were received.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: 446 portions were taken up last year in the Herberton and Atherton districts.

Mr. MANN: I am only dealing with Atherton. I received a letter from a member of a group the other day who says it is two years since he applied for that group, and he cannot tell yet how much land he is going to get, nor when he is going to get it; and I have been

further informed by a man whose word I can creditably believe, that the timber on some of those selections was valued before ever the land was surveyed or designed. That is, whoever valued that timber went on to it and said there was so much pine and so much cedar on those selections, and the unfortunate selector is charged accordingly.

Mr. KENNA: Whether it is there or whether it is not.

Mr. MANN: Yes. I would just like to read to the House a letter I received the other day from the Atherton Chamber of Commerce. It has been asked why I am opposing this Government, and I think this letter will let the people outside understand why I could not conscientiously support this Government, or any other Government that would do the same thing. The letter is dated 21st June, 1909, and reads—

By direction of the Atherton Chamber of Commerce, I have the honour of informing you that my chamber are strenuously advocating the reduction of high values placed on Crown lands in the Atherton district, and ask for your assistance in the matter. At present the value placed on land is £3 10s. per acre, whereas land better situated and timbered was only £2 per acre previously.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I said when I opened my remarks that I did not think the country was to be congratulated upon your removal from the Lands Department into the Home Department, and from that to the Speaker's chair. If members turn up *Hansard* for 1906, page 1862, they will find this—

Mr. MANN: Now that the Railways Bill had gone through, and it was proposed to build a line from Tolga to Lake Eacham on the guarantee system, he should like to know what would be the upset price of the land which had been surveyed in that district, and whether the price would not be lessened in consequence of the passage of the Railways Bill?

And you, Mr. Speaker, who were then Secretary for Lands, replied to this effect—

The Secretary for Public Lands hoped the hon. member would not pin him down to the precise price, but he could assure the hon. member that the passage of the Railways Bill—as was announced when it was before the Chamber—would bring about a reduction in the price of Crown lands.

That is the promise made by you, Mr. Speaker, when Minister for Lands, and I believe you intended to keep that promise, and would have kept it only the Premier insisted on his pound of flesh. The Premier wishes apparently to wring out of the unfortunate settlers every shilling that he can.

Mr. D. HUNTER: He is a Scotchman, you know.

Mr. MANN: Yes. He was up there the other day and a deputation told him the troubles and trials and hardships they had to get on to their places, and to take their stock and implements there. One settler told him that he had to carry his cream separator 9 miles along a blazed track through the scrub.

It used to take that settler a whole [10 p.m.] day to come into Allumbah, get his rations, and go back again. The people up there applied to the Minister for Lands for a grant to make a road through that scrub, and, in spite of the fact that the Lands Department jumped up the land from £2 to £3 10s. per acre, they refused to give these settlers any grants to make roads. Further than that, they are charged with the price of timber they cannot sell, and which, judging from information which I have received, is not even on the selection. Does the Minister for Lands expect to get successful settlement if he penalises his selectors in that way? You, Sir, promised that the price of the land should be reduced,

in view of the fact that these settlers have to guarantee interest on the Tolga-Johnstone railway, but that promise has been kept by the price of the land being raised from £2 to £3 10s. per acre, a difference of £1 10s. Surely there is enough in that difference to permit this Government to give a grant to these settlers to build the roads. I should think the aim and object of a Government who proclaim themselves to be the friends of the farmers is to see the settler is successful when he goes on his land. They say that members over here advocate a land tax. I have always advocated a land tax to break up land monopoly, to pave the way for effective occupation, but I have always gone against any land tax being put on the struggling settler. This Government, which is declaiming against a land tax, penalises these settlers by raising the price of the land upon them. When I first entered this Chamber, you could get good land at Atherton, only a few miles away from the railway, at £1 an acre. The price has now gone up enormously—up to £4 an acre, which the Government is charging for scrub land—and no grant will be made to help these settlers to make a success of their selections by giving them access to market.

Mr. KENNA: What does it cost to clear?

Mr. MANN: Anything up to £4 or £5 an acre to fell and clear. These men are handicapped from the very outset. They cannot find a market for the timber, because the market is glutted. Owing to the regulations they are not allowed to sell it. I have seen logs lying along the roadside, which a settler had felled and dragged out, and he told me that he was not allowed to sell it by the regulations, while the borers were eating it and making it valueless.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: He could burn it.

Mr. MANN: He could burn it, but he is charged by the Government for that timber, and he cannot sell it. He has got to burn it. They won't give him a grant for roads, and apparently they wish the settlement to be a failure. Hundreds of settlers have gone away, and still the Government boast about settling people on the country. They are issuing pamphlets telling what land will be available in Atherton for settlement. They do not mention that men are waiting ten deep, and some of them for over two years, and judging from the progress of the Lands Department they will wait for another two. Now, Sir, as showing the feeling in the country, I have got a letter here from a settler. You know him as an old pioneer, who has done a lot of work in Queensland, and he says this—

The biggest question before Queenslanders (besides the bursting up of the Kidston-Philp coalition) is the prickly pear trouble. All other matters are insignificant compared to it, for it is night and day eating into the vitals of the country. Already we have—

10 million acres ruined, depreciated at least to the extent of 15s. per acre=£75,000,000.

10 million acres partially infected and depreciated, 7s. 6d. per acre=£3,750,000. Total, £11,250,000.

This is the legacy left by the continuous Philp push, for, I am afraid, all time. If the people of Queensland could only grasp the terrible results of the Philp rule in this respect they would never want any more Philp, for future generations of Queenslanders will curse the name of Philp, and in getting rid of the present unholy combine we are aiming to prevent Philp and his crowd further ruining this State. It is quite patent that W. Kidston is at present merely a gramophone for the Philp-tory crowd, who would scruple at nothing to keep the running of the affairs of this State in their hands. For the future they should be called the prickly pear party.

(Laughter.) I suppose we can call them "the Mr. Mann.]

prickly pear party," because they have been a scourge and a pest to Queensland. Perhaps you know the country I am going to mention. I have here a map of a big area of country all infested with prickly pear. My informant tells me that if this land was free of pear it would fetch £1 10s. an acre at any time. The line from Roma to Brisbane runs through it. This land is known as Dulacca, and the late continuous Government left the lessee in possession of that with the pear growing on it, until it got too bad to keep any longer. Then it was thrown up, and they have that land today practically ruined. Some of it is fit for nothing. That is a legacy of the continuous Government.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: It has formed the subject of inquiry.

Mr. MANN: I am sorry to come back to the small fry again, but I wish to ask the Treasurer if he caused any inquiry to be made into a matter I brought under his notice when we were discussing the amendment of the Harbour Boards Act. The Treasurer told me then that at Atherton some residents thought that an official of the Lands Department had been mixing himself up in the local election. I ask him if he made any inquiry into it? He is afraid.

The TREASURER: Afraid of you?

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must address the Chair.

Mr. MANN: The hon. member is afraid to cope in any shape or form with the corruption in the different departments. I have never asked for much from the hon. gentleman, but I may say I wrote a few months ago about the matter of establishing a Savings Bank at Tolga. There are six hotels there, but there is not a Savings Bank.

Mr. D. HUNTER: They don't want a Savings Bank there.

Mr. MANN: I have applied for a Savings Bank, and I have been refused, unless the people petitioned for it. Now, why should the people petition for such a necessary thing as a Savings Bank? The Tolga-Johnstone Railway is passing there, and surely it is not too much to ask, when there is sufficient population to support six hotels, there should be a Savings Bank established. Now, leaving the small fry again, and coming to the Premier, I must again congratulate him upon wiring to the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth, Mr. Deakin, in the manner that he did. While the Premier was at Atherton a deputation waited on him in regard to the timber industry. They laid certain facts and figures before the Premier, and fairly showed that, no matter what reductions were made in the railway freights, unless proper protection was given to the timber industry against outside competition, there must be a big slump indeed in a very large industry in North Queensland, and in South Queensland, too.

Mr. D. HUNTER: It is time there was a slump.

Mr. MANN: That may be the hon. member's opinion, but these men up there all know their business. There are timber-getters, saw millers, teamsters, and settlers dependent on it, and these men laid the case before the Premier in the clearest possible terms, and said that they must get protection in order to protect the industry and allow a living wage to be paid to the men who fall and mill.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Timber is higher than ever.

[Mr. Mann.

Mr. MANN: The Premier, replying to that deputation, said it was not his place to interfere with the Federal Government. Yet he formed a coalition to fight the Federal Government—the Federal Labour party.

—OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MANN: The reason that the Premier did not interfere, as I pointed out to these timber men afterwards, was that the Premier at the next Federal election might be running three freetrade candidates in the interests of the tory party sitting over there. The Minister for Mines, in speaking last night, clearly laid it down that this Government, so far as he was concerned, had no sympathy with protection. The hon. gentleman was always a freetrader, and he has a right to his opinions; but, as a Queenslander, I object to any party being in power in the Commonwealth Parliament unless they are prepared to protect Queensland industries.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I did not connect it with the election.

Mr. MANN: But the hon. gentleman is a limb of the Government, and his opinions might carry considerable weight with his colleagues. In fact, he will have a hand in the choosing of the three senators himself. He might select the candidates, and I know that if he selected them there would be no protection for the timber industry.

Mr. D. HUNTER: I hope there will not be.

Mr. MANN: When the Premier of Queensland sent that wire to Deakin, if he had a spark of patriotic feeling in him, he would have wired to Deakin asking him what he intended to do for the sugar industry, and did he intend to keep on the protection granted to that industry. But he never thought it as worth while to see whether the sugar industry, or the timber industry, was properly protected or not. It is the same thing in connection with the banana industry. Had I time, I would deal fully with that industry also.

Mr. AIREY: Go ahead.

Mr. MANN: I would point out to the people of Queensland that there is no hope for any Queensland industry so long as the present Federal Government is in power, and so long as we find the Government sitting on the Treasury benches here are willing to keep that Federal Government in power by sending down more freetraders to blast the industries of Queensland. It may be alleged that the Queensland senators who were returned at the last election have voted for protection for Queensland. I admit that they did do so. (Hear, hear!) But they voted for freetrade for New South Wales and Victoria, and the people of New South Wales and Victoria will be saying, "If these Queensland members vote protection for themselves, but vote to give us freetrade, we will give them a dose of their own sauce." If the Premier does not take the warning given him by the hon. member for Nundah the other night, and fight the freetrade party and support the Labour party at the coming Federal elections, then the sugar industry will be wiped out so far as this State is concerned.

Mr. D. HUNTER: How will it save it by supporting the Labour party?

Mr. MANN: The natural corollary of being a Labour man is being a protectionist. The man who believes in short hours and pays good wages must be protected to enable him to do so. (Hear, hear!) Men like Page and McDonald, both of whom are freetrade members

of the Labour party in the Federal Parliament, voted consistently to support the protection of the sugar industry. After that deputation which had waited on the Premier, if he had been a true Queenslander, he would have laid it down in his wire to Deakin, "Unless you protect our timber, sugar, and banana industries, this Government is going to do all it can to return to the Federal Parliament members opposed to the Deakin-Cook coalition." But he asked for no sureties at all with regard to Queensland. He was satisfied so long as he saw the Labour party downed. He did not mind the Labour party once, as he agreed with their policy, yet he wired to Deakin congratulating him for putting the Labour party out of office. But it was due to Queensland for the Premier to ask Deakin what he was going to do for Queensland.

Mr. GRANT: What did you go down to Melbourne to interview Deakin for?

Mr. MANN: I am glad that I have got that interjection, because it has been sent round the Chamber that I went down to Melbourne to interview Deakin in connection with the Federal elections. That is perfectly true. I went down at the request of the Kidston committee to interview Deakin. That was before the Kidston party coalesced with the Philp party.

Mr. GRANT: What committee do you refer to?

Mr. MANN: The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do.

Mr. GRANT: Give us some of their names?

Mr. MANN: I am not going to give the hon. member that satisfaction.

Mr. GRANT: They were the hon. members now sitting behind you.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. MANN: That is utterly incorrect. The motion was carried at a meeting of the party. There were ten members there.

Mr. AIREY: The hon. member for Rockhampton did not attend those meetings.

Mr. MANN: No. I went down at the request of that committee. I had a letter from the secretary to that committee asking me to see Deakin, and my mission to Deakin was to ask him what was his policy, and to ask him to put his policy before the country to see if we could accept it, and fight for him.

Mr. AIREY: A perfectly legitimate mission.

Mr. GRANT: To fight against the Labour party.

Mr. MANN: That is not true. I told the Federal Labour members when I was in Melbourne, and I suggested to them that it would be better for them if the Labour and Kidston parties fought the Queensland election together, as if we had the democratic and Labour parties fighting side by side we would sweep Queensland at the polls—we would win every seat in Queensland. I said that there could be two Labour senators and one Kidston senator, and Senator Stewart could fight the Capricornia electorate against Archer; and, if that were agreed to, we would sweep Queensland. I am not ashamed of that mission at all. I am not ashamed of my mission to Melbourne. The only thing that I am ashamed of is that democrats, with whom I was formerly associated—or, rather, a few of them—are now sitting over there supporting that sorry crowd.

Mr. GRANT: What did Deakin say?

Mr. MANN: I never saw Deakin on that matter. While I am dealing with the

Federal members, I might perhaps turn to the question of Federal and State finance. (Government laughter.) Before dealing with that, I will quote what the hon. member for Rockhampton, the present Premier, said about the hon. member for Carpentaria, Mr. Forsyth, who is the present member for Moreton. It will be found on page 310 of *Hansard* for 1903. The senior member for Rockhampton then said—

We all know the readiness of that hon. gentleman to advise on all matters under heaven on the shortest notice, and without stopping to think. He is ready to advise on any subject from the sharpening of a pencil to the floating of a loan. So it is possible he may have been advising the Government, and if this is so I would advise the Government to change their adviser.

That was the opinion held by the member for Rockhampton of the hon. member for Moreton in 1903. Of course, I could pick up equally sharp criticisms by the hon. member for Moreton on the Premier, but time will not permit. I would just like to quote further from a remark made by the Premier in the same *Hansard*, 1903, page 38, when he was condemning the financing of the Philp Administration—financing which was on the same lines as the financing now going on under his guidance.

Mr. AIREY: That is so.

Mr. MANN: This is what he said—

In the face of the appeals made to them they had no more control over the destinies of the people than a log floating on a torrent has power to guide the torrent.

And this will be found in the same *Hansard* at page 40—

No sane man can come to any other conclusion than that the extravagance and the incompetence of the present Ministry, or both, is responsible for the present condition of the Treasury.

I might use the Premier's words, and say the same thing about himself now. I mentioned how the Premier boasted about the increasing railway revenue, but he forgot to mention that the increasing expenditure had almost swallowed it up. He boasted when sitting on this side that he could cut down expenditure by £500,000 without hurting the departments, and he claimed that he would not do it by lowering wages, which he considered to be false economy. This is very significant. The expenditure in 1907-8 was £4,373,196, and for 1908-9 it was £4,706,303. It was pointed out last year that expenditure had increased over revenue in the proportion of two to one. As there was a nominal surplus of £115,000, but a real surplus of £240,000, no great objection could be raised to increasing expenditure so long as the increase in revenue kept pace. I have no objection to expenditure increasing as long as it is warranted by increased revenue and healthy conditions; but this year, in spite of the fact that the revenue is the biggest in the history of Queensland, the surplus was less than £10,000. And there would have been no surplus but for the fact that necessary work was suspended for the time being. The increase in expenditure was £508,000, and adding to that the £500,000 which the Premier boasted he could cut down in expenditure, he has kept his promise to the tune of about £1,000,000 on the wrong side—that is to say, he is only about £1,000,000 out. As against that large increase in expenditure our revenue has only increased by £277,846. The increased expenditure of £508,000 represents nearly £1 per head for every man, woman, and child—to be actually correct, 18s. 5d. for every unit of our population—an almost unprecedented increase in Queensland's history. It will be remem

Mr. Mann.]

bered that in 1903 the Premier said that the expenditure on services might be reduced by £500,000, and the fulfilment of his promise is seen in the figures I have quoted. Nearly £1,500,000 of loan money was spent last year by way of booming revenue; yet we are within a stone's throw of a recurrence of deficits. We have a surplus of a little over £9,000, though the revenue is the biggest on record. It is evident that expenditure has been booming at a pace almost unprecedented. Victoria, South Australia, and New South Wales can say they were hampered by a declining revenue from the Commonwealth, but Queensland has received over £1,000,000 from that source, which is a larger amount than before, so that even the palliation of this poor excuse is entirely absent. With singular prudence and cunning the Premier got out of the Treasury himself, and is leaving some other unfortunate to get the blame.

The TREASURER: I am quite ready for it.

Mr. MANN: I believe the hon. gentleman is ready. He can see the flooding of the Treasury by a sea of deficits; and he stands, like a second Mrs. Partington, with broom in hand trying to sweep back the flood; but he hardly dares to lift the broom without consulting the Premier, who is, after all, the Treasurer. And, when there is a success, he takes credit for it; but when anything goes wrong he allows the blame to be put on somebody else. All the things that have met with favour during the past five years the present Government take credit for; but in the case of anything that has not met with favour they turn round and say, "Oh! Airey did that." When the hon. member for South Brisbane was Treasurer he got a return prepared showing the expenditure in establishing State farms, and the late Minister for Agriculture pointed out at Atherton how unwise it would be to establish any more State farms, seeing the unfortunate record, and when a murmur of dissent ran round the room, he said, "I am not responsible for this return, it was that terrible fellow, Mr. Airey."

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and laughter.

Mr. MANN: In 1903 the hon. member for Rockhampton made a special indictment against the Philp Government in connection with soft billets in the public service, which they seemed to regard as a sort of genteel Dunwich for their friends. The extravagant Philp made about 1,000 appointments in five or six years; but the same thing is going on now. If any man makes himself prominent in an electorate represented by a member on the Opposition side, and he can get the member to go over to the other side he can get a nice soft billet. That is what is said, and I believe it is true. The number of billets created in South Brisbane alone is sufficient to prove the statement.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Robinson did not get a Government billet.

Mr. MANN: Robinson got a billet as secretary to the People's Progressive League.

Mr. D. HUNTER: You don't know anything about it.

Mr. MANN: He got a billet on account of his influence. The hon. member for Woolloongabba was induced to support the Government, and Robinson was duly rewarded.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Do not make insinuations.

[Mr. Mann.

Mr. MANN: It is no insinuation at all. I just wish to say a word or two [10.30 p.m.] in regard to the Government programme. I shall not deal with it at any length, because I intend to speak again on the Address in Reply, when I can do it more fully; but I wish the House and the country to understand that no faith can be placed in the Premier. When he was at Cairns, a deputation waited on him and asked him, first, to bring forward this session a Bill to regulate the traffic in Cairns, as they wished to have it placed under the police. He goes to a town, he receives deputations, and makes lavish promises. I remember him saying in heartfelt tones, that almost pierced my heart, "I only hope I will be long enough in power to do something for Cairns." The hon. gentleman is in power now. Why has he not brought in that Bill? Then he promised an amendment of the Cairns Harbour Board Act. We are often taunted by members on the other side that we cannot agree on any one point in our programme. Now, on the other side are members who opposed the amendment moved by the hon. gentleman in the original Cairns Harbour Board Bill to give to one ratepayer one vote. The hon. gentleman's present friends will probably vote against a similar amendment if I or some other democratic member move to give one ratepayer one vote. Then we are always told that this Government want to expand the productive capacity of the country. Another deputation waited on the Premier in Cairns in regard to the matter of a loan for a butter factory. Has the Premier attended to that, or has he forgotten it? Because I may tell the hon. gentleman that I have been inquiring into the matter, and I find that apparently before a loan can be granted an enabling Bill must be passed, as the Act provides only for loans to factories manufacturing butter for export. Now the Cairns people are in the happy position of having a good local market, and they are handicapped owing to the short supplies of cream. They went to very considerable expense in erecting a factory, and all they ask now is for the Government to step in and allow them to redeem the loan that is held over their heads and give them a breathing space in order to allow them to pay a good price for cream and encourage more settlers to go in for dairying.

Mr. COTTELL: The Government to find the money?

Mr. MANN: No; the Government will have security for the money. The butter factory in Cairns—

Mr. MURPHY: They will give you some medals for the show.

Mr. MANN: The Premier was very kind. I sent in a letter pointing out that the Atherton people could not exhibit in Cairns owing to the fact that they would not risk their valuable dairy stock coming down the range on trains without Westinghouse brakes. The Acting Premier refused to give any medals because there were no more to be obtained. A gentleman came down from Atherton and saw the Premier, and the hon. gentleman told him he could have the medals after I had been refused. There were two reasons why those medals were given in that way. In the first place, the Premier wanted it clearly understood that he would do nothing through me, and that somebody else will have to apply for everything. The second reason was because the hon. member for Brisbane South brought up a little scandal in connection with these medals. They were manufactured by a certain firm without tenders

being called; and it is a curious thing that there is a gentleman named Kidston working for that firm, and the Premier knew very well that, if they did not get the medals, he would offend every district that did not believe in little games of that sort being played, and they would be found voting against his candidates owing to the scandal attaching to the manufacture of the medals. That is the second reason why this Atherton gentleman got the medals. There are working jewellers in this city besides this firm. I have known the same thing happen before. I know the manager of the Kamerunga Nursery used to get certain work done by a certain contractor without calling for tenders. I got that stopped, and I think this sort of thing should be stopped, too; and the Premier might at least have the courtesy to respond to the request made for information. The hon. gentleman used to complain bitterly in his early days in this House about people in Rockhampton sending requests to the Philp Government over his head, and of their being granted by the Government. He is playing the same trick himself now with me. I can win the seat without his paltry medals, and, if he had any sense, the fit and proper thing to do would be to grant requests made for some dairy stock to be given as prizes. I will get off that little business on to another little business that I wish the House clearly to understand. I could be much more nasty than I am in regard to certain remarks that fell from the Home Secretary with regard to certain members of the Ministry. The hon. gentleman alleged that I was leasing land at Atherton to Chinese. Now, I own no land at Atherton, but some other people I could mention do. I hold in my hand an extract from the *Courier* of 14th August, 1897, containing an account of certain police court proceedings in connection with a breach of the Pacific Islanders Act. This is the extract—

The case against James George Appel on a similar charge was gone on with. Mr. Blair, instructed by Mr. Price, appeared for the informant, and Mr. Sasche for the defendant.

Medin Mitchell, in his evidence, stated that on the 2nd August, whilst at the Hamilton, he saw a black boy lead a horse along the road to a blacksmith's shop and back again to defendant's residence.

The islander deposed that he was not in the employ of the defendant. Mrs. Appel had engaged him, and he had been in her employ for the last four months.

Mr. Sasche asked for a dismissal on the ground that the evidence disclosed no breach of the Act by the defendant.

The bench, without retiring, dismissed the case, but no costs were allowed.

The hon. gentleman was summoned, but he was not man enough to take the blame himself—he shoved it on to his wife. If the hon. gentleman believed what he said about the blood and sweat of kanakas manuring the fields of Northern Queensland, he sits on that side with members who have been a great deal worse than I have been. I have never made any attempt to deny the fact that I employed kanakas, because everybody in the sugar industry employed them, for the reason that the price we received for our cane was 11s. a ton, and we were charged 1s. 6d. a ton for rent or royalty. The average rate for cutting cane with white labour was about 6s. per ton, and at the price of 11s. a ton that would leave us about 3s. 6d. a ton for planting the cane, weeding it, and looking after it until it reached maturity. Under those circumstances, I make no apology for employing kanakas. I simply say that I had to pay £50 to the Colonial Sugar Refining Company to be allowed to break my agreement with them and to be allowed to

employ white labour. I paid the £50 cheerfully, and I can say that I was the first white man in the Hambleton district to register the whole of my farm for white labour, and the only man who went through with white labour from start to finish, when every other farmer belonging to the Colonial Sugar Refining Company was squeezed back into black labour.

Mr. AIREY: You employed them legally—not illegally.

Mr. MANN: Yes, I employed them legally.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Because they were cheap.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MANN: I have tried to explain, but I cannot make a wooden man like the hon. member understand.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the hon. member will not be turned aside by these interjections from the course of his speech.

Mr. MANN: I do not wish to delay hon. members any longer, as I see them looking at the clock, and I know that they wish to catch their trains. I may say that I am in thorough accord with the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition. Last night it was asserted on the floor of this House that I was afraid to announce, so that the *Hansard* reporters could hear, that I was in favour of a land tax. I am not the least bit afraid to let my views on the subject be known. I am not the least bit afraid of whatever Government takes the place of the present Government imposing a land tax which will not be just and equitable. I have always been in favour of a land tax, for this reason: that a large area of land which should be under cultivation is still lying waste, and is owned by men who pay nothing for it, while a man who cultivates his land or uses it in some practical way, and gets a crop of cane or other produce from it over the value of £200, has to pay income tax. I maintain that a land tax would be a fairer tax for the farmer than an income tax, as under a land tax a man who owns land but does not use it would be compelled to pay as much as or more than the man who does use it. I also hold that a special tax should be imposed on absentee landowners, and that a special tax should be imposed on big estates so as to compel the owners to break them up and sell to farmers at a reasonable rate. The hon. member for Bulloo pointed out this afternoon how the Government are imposing taxation on men who are now buying land by charging them as high as £14 an acre for the land they purchase. Though a farmer, I have long been an advocate of a land tax, for the reasons I have just given. I know land in my own district which was taken up as far back as 1890 or 1891, and which is still lying idle. That land was bought from the Government at £1 per acre, and if I went to buy it now I would have to pay £5 or £6 an acre for it, and that increase in price means far more than a land tax would amount to. The white settler who wishes to make a living on the land at Atherton has to go some miles from the railway, when, at the same time, there are thousands and thousands of acres of good land much nearer to the line, which are still lying idle, and the owners of which are waiting for the unearned increment. During the land boom some of that land was sold for as much as £8 and £10 an acre. The men who bought that land are paying a very much higher tax than a land tax would amount to, and they have to pay the whole sum in a very short time, instead of paying a little each year, as they would do under a land tax. I have been taxed

Mr. Mann.]

in that way myself, having had to pay £10 an acre for land which was bought for £2 an acre, and I had to pay that sum within seven years. I should not have felt an annual land tax half as badly as I felt the payment of that price for the land within seven years.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: But that land was cleared, wasn't it?

Mr. MANN: It is true that it was cleared, but the virgin fertility had been taken out of the land.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: How many years had it been cropped?

Mr. MANN: Fifteen years. I would rather have felled the scrub in the first place than have got the land after it had been cropped for some years. It would have been cheaper for me to have done so, and I should have got a much bigger crop of cane off it. For the reasons I have given I shall vote for the amendment moved by the hon. member for Fortitude Valley. It will be a good thing if the *Courier* Ministry, the Pastoral Association's Ministry, the squatter Ministry, and the bank and land monopoly Ministry is wiped out of existence, and a Ministry which has the interests of the people at heart is put into its place. (Government laughter.)

Mr. MULCAHY (*Gympie*): 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 Tuesday next.

The House adjourned at fifteen minutes to 11 o'clock.