

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**TUESDAY, 19 JULY 1910**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 19 JULY, 1910.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (W. D. Armstrong, Esq., *Lockyer*) took the chair at half-past 3 o'clock.

APPROPRIATION BILL No. 1.

ASSENT.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER announced the receipt of a message from His Excellency the Governor intimating his assent to this Bill.

DEATH OF KING EDWARD VII.,  
AND ACCESSION OF KING  
GEORGE V.

PRESENTATION OF ADDRESS TO THE  
GOVERNOR.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that I this day presented to the Governor the Address to the Crown on the Death of King Edward VII., agreed to by the House on the 13th instant, and that His Excellency was pleased to make the following reply:—

“Government House,  
Brisbane.

“MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER AND GENTLEMEN  
OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF  
QUEENSLAND,—

“It has afforded me much pleasure to receive the resolution that you have agreed to in Parliament, which I shall not fail to transmit at the earliest possible date to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State, with the request that the same may be duly laid before His Most Gracious Majesty King George the Fifth.

“WM. MACGREGOR.

“19th July, 1910.”

PAPERS.

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

Return to an Order, relative to votes polled at the late Bible in State schools referendum, made by the House, on motion of Mr. Maughan, on 13th instant.  
Regulations under the Health Act of 1900.

PETITION.

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH, WICKHAM  
TERRACE, BILL.

Mr. MACARTNEY (*Brisbane North*) presented a petition from the trustees of the Lutheran Church, Wickham terrace, praying for leave to introduce a Bill to enable them to mortgage certain land and to apply the money so raised to the erection of buildings on the site for letting purposes.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS.

SURVEY OF BLAIR ATHOL RAILWAY.

Mr. WINSTANLEY (*Charters Towers*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

1. Has the survey promised by the Minister for Railways from Blair Athol to the Northern Railway been made?

2. What is the report concerning the route?

3. If not yet made, when is the survey to be made?

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

1 and 3. Examinations of the country between Central and the Great Northern Railways have been

made, but before deciding upon the route it is desired to compare the routes *via* Clermont to Ravenswood, Charters Towers and Pentland with those from Barcardine to Hughenden and Longreach to Winton, but there is no surveyor available for this work at present.

2. The reports so far are not favourable for close settlement, but they are not by any means definite as to cost of construction or settlement.

#### POLICE REGULATION No. 686.

Mr. THEODORE (*Woothakata*) asked the Home Secretary:—

Is it his intention to have repealed the Police Regulation known as General Order No. 686, relating to the obligations of police who reside out of barracks, and which denies to them the right to be absent from their homes after 10 p.m., or to at any time appear in public in plain clothes, unless they first obtain leave to do so from the officer or sub-officer in charge?

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. G. Appel, *Albert*) replied—

No.

#### PRICES FOR CANE, MOUNT BAUPLE MILL.

Mr. WALKER (*Wide Bay*) asked the Treasurer—

1. Is it a fact that the Mount Bauple Mill pays a higher price for cane bought from Pialba growers than for cane bought from Mount Bauple growers?
2. If so, what advantage, if any, accrues to the Mount Bauple cane-growers?

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

1. The price paid for Pialba cane is 12s. 6d. per ton in trucks on the Government railway line, and the price for Mount Bauple cane averages 12s. 4d. per ton.

2. Pialba cane was purchased in order that the Mount Bauple Mill might work as near its full capacity as was possible. It was necessary to have a large volume of cane to treat in order that the mill could be worked at a minimum cost and with more than a single shift, which makes the difference in cost of manufacture very considerable.

Pialba growers have to haul their cane to the railway line distances ranging up to 8 miles, which haulage they pay themselves, and owing to this the net value received by them for the cane must average very much less than the average for Mount Bauple cane. If Mount Bauple cane only were treated, a very considerable reduction would have to be made in the price paid to those growers.

#### COST, ETC., RENARD TRAIN.

Mr. BARBER (*Bundaberg*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

1. What was the total cost of the Renard train?
2. Where is it at present?
3. Is it of any practical utility?
4. What commissions (if any) were paid in connection with its purchase, and to whom?
5. What was the date on which it made its first journey from Ipswich to Brisbane?
6. What amount (if any) has the train earned?
7. What expenses have been incurred in connection with the train since it was made ready to travel in Queensland?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS replied—

1. £4,094 (including cost of erection and spare parts).
2. Ipswich.
3. Yes.
4. None.
5. 6th January, 1910.
6. Practically nothing, but £1 18s. 9d. has been received for carrying loads for test purposes.
7. £108 (including driver's wages).

Arrangements are now being made to place the road in order so as to run the Renard train between the Texas district and the Warwick-Gondiwindi Railway.

#### FORCING A CROWN PROSECUTOR TO FILE A BILL.

Mr. BARBER asked the Premier—

1. Has he seen it reported in the *Courier* of the 13th instant that the Crown Prosecutor in the District Court case against Ross, charged with false pretences, had stated that he had been forced to file a bill by the Department of Justice against his own judgment?

2. If that statement is correct, who is the officer or officers of the Department of Justice responsible for so directing that a bill should be filed?

The PREMIER (Hon. W. Kidston, *Rockhampton*) replied—

1. Yes.
2. The Attorney-General.

#### COST OF BIBLE IN STATE SCHOOLS REFERENDUM.

Mr. MAY asked the Home Secretary—

What was the total cost to the State in connection with taking the recent Bible in State schools referendum?

The HOME SECRETARY replied—  
£4,880 3s. 4d.

#### INCOME TAX REFERENDUM.

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

Will he, during the present session, make provision whereby a referendum may be taken at an early date to ascertain if the people of Queensland favour the abolition or reduction of the income tax?

The PREMIER replied—

Not this session.

#### SUPPLY OF FIREWOOD TO CENTRAL MILLS BY ASIATICS.

Mr. FERRICKS (*Bowen*) asked the Treasurer—

Will he take steps to prevent the use at Government central mills of firewood which has been procured by Asiatics, irrespective of such firewood being supplied by contractors who employ coloured labour or who sublet their contracts to coloured aliens?

The TREASURER replied—

No late information is available at the head office, but inquiries are being made as to the position at the mills.

#### PROPOSED STATE FARM AT ATHERTON.

Mr. MANN asked the Secretary for Agriculture—

Is he taking any steps to establish a State farm at Atherton in view of the promise of the Home Secretary that such farm would be established?

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

The advisability of starting a State farm in the North has not been lost sight of.

#### PORT ALMA RAILWAY.

Mr. BRESLIN (*Port Curtis*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

- (a) The estimated cost of building the Port Alma Railway when the Bill was before this House?
- (b) The total expenditure to date?
- (c) The amount of work done?
- (d) Has any work been done on the sandpans or mudflats?
- (e) Has the Railway Department any idea of the amount which such line, if completed, is now expected to cost?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS replied—

- (a) £70,000.
- (b) £26,000.
- (c) Earthworks complete to 8½ miles, more than half the distance.
- (d) Yes; over 5 miles of embankment made.
- (e) There is no reason to suppose that the parliamentary estimate will be exceeded.

## PORTERS ENGAGED AS SHUNTERS.

Mr. NEVITT (*Carpentaria*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

Is it true that porters are being asked to do shunting work at porters' wages—viz., 6s. per day?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS replied—

No; but a porter must necessarily try to qualify himself before he is eligible for promotion to the position of shunter.

## APPROACH TO GLADSTONE JETTY.

Mr. BRESLIN asked the Secretary for Railways—

(a) The cost of the approach built by the Railway Department at Gladstone Jetty?

(b) Who authorised this work, and at whose request was it undertaken?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS replied—

(a) £6,314 12s. 10d.

(b) The Treasurer. The work was carried out by the Commissioner for Railways at the request of the Treasurer.

## HYDRAULIC ENGINEER'S REPORT.

Mr. MANN, in the absence of Mr. Blair (*Ipswich*), asked the Treasurer—

When does he expect to be able to lay the report of the Hydraulic Engineer upon the table of the House?

The TREASURER replied—

Owing to retrenchment some years ago in the public service, the Hydraulic Engineer's staff was so reduced that it was necessary to discontinue the issue of annual reports. The staff has, however, lately been increased, and a summary report will be shortly issued. It is hoped that the usual detailed annual report will be issued from next year.

## GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY.

Mr. COYNE (*Warrego*), in the absence of Mr. J. M. Hunter, asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

In view of the fact that preliminary steps have been taken towards the construction of a grand trunk railway by the Government, and its intention to ask authority from this House to further prosecute the work, what action, if any, is the Government taking to protect the interests of the public by—

(a) The discontinuance of the sale of lands along the proposed route?

(b) The refusal to extend, renew, or grant leases of pastoral lands for lengthened periods?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. D. F. Denham, *Oxley*) replied—

Public interests are being fully conserved.

## FEES PAID TO BARRISTERS AND SOLICITORS.

On the motion of Mr. MURPHY (*Croydon*), it was formally resolved—

That there be laid on the table of the House a return showing the fees paid to barristers and solicitors since the last return was furnished to the House.

## ELECTORAL STATISTICS SINCE 1859.

On the motion of Mr. MAUGHAN (*Ipswich*), it was formally resolved—

That there be laid upon the table of the House a tabulated statement showing—

1. The division of the State into electorates for the purpose of the first elections to the Parliament of Queensland; indicating—

(a) The area of the electorates;

(b) The approximate number of electors in each electorate;

(c) The number of members representing each electorate.

2. The division of the State into electorates under the Additional Members Acts of 1864 and 1885 respectively; indicating—

(a) The area of the electorates;

(b) The approximate number of electors in each electorate;

(c) The number of members representing each electorate.

3. The division of the State into electorates under the Electoral Districts Acts of 1878, 1887, and 1892, respectively; indicating—

(a) The area of the electorates;

(b) The approximate number of electors in each electorate;

(c) The number of members representing each electorate.

4. The population and distribution of the population—

(a) At the date of separation;

(b) In 1864;

(c) In 1878;

(d) In 1885;

(e) In 1887;

(f) In 1892; and

(g) At the present date.

## ADDRESS IN REPLY.

## RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

HON. R. PHILP (*Townsville*), who was greeted with "Hear, hears!" said: I have very much pleasure in supporting the Address in Reply. I think the Government are to be congratulated on the splendid seasons we have had, and the splendid returns from all sources under their care. Since I have been in Queensland—that is a good many years—I have never known Queensland in such a prosperous state. Of course, I am not going to say that the Government deserve all the credit—(hear, hear!)—or the other side. I think the result is mainly due to the splendid seasons we have had, and the past actions of all Governments in making provision in good and bad times for opening up this great country. (Hear, hear!) In Queensland we have three big industries—agriculture, mining, and pastoral. We have not done much in manufacture—that will come, I hope. But mainly this country is depending on the prosperity of those three big industries, and I say that anything this House can do to further those industries is furthering the prosperity of this great country. (Hear, hear!) I think the Lands administration can be congratulated. I know there are men in this House, and outside, who will tell you that the Land Acts are not good—that they are too cumbersome and complicated—that nobody understands them, but to my knowledge the Land Acts of Queensland are the most progressive and most liberal of any Land Acts in Australia. (Hear, hear!) To wit, look at the enormous area of country now being taken up in Queensland. People are coming from all the other States—Victoria, New South Wales, and New Zealand—to take up land in Queensland. We do not ever hear of anyone in Queensland taking up land in New South Wales. I think I heard one member talk about a man going from Cairns to take up land in Canada, and I do not mind making the assertion that in a very short time that man will return from Canada to Queensland.

Mr. MANN: No. He just recently came from Scotland, but he could not get any land.

HON. R. PHILP: No matter how prosperous a State is, you will always meet some people who are not satisfied, and sometimes a big body of people. But at the present time there is no State in Australia where the

Land Acts are so much appreciated as in Queensland. I hope the proposed Land Bill will simplify a number of the onerous and ponderous means of getting land. I also want to point out that it would be a good thing if we could decentralise our land offices somewhat. (Hear, hear!) I think there should be a head office of the Lands Department in Townsville, and one also in Rockhampton, where, without reference to Brisbane, land might be taken up and settled. I would like to see land being thrown open without survey at all. (Hear, hear!) It was the case at one time in Queensland—selection without survey—and was a great success.

Mr. HAMILTON: It was open to abuse.

HON. R. PHILP: Every Act you have is open to abuse. There are many cases where we might open a certain area of land without survey if there was anyone willing to take it up. That was the case many years ago in Queensland. There might have been abuses, but it was certainly the means of settling people on the land quickly. I quite sympathise with the Minister with the slow means of getting land surveyed now. So far as I understand, all the surveyors available are engaged by the department, and every means possible taken to survey land quickly. Further than that, look at the enormous quantity of land taken up during the last six months—over 4,000,000 acres of land selected in Queensland during the last six months. Is there another State in Australia where there has been as much land taken up in twelve months? I do not think so. What I would like to see is more of the land selected being put under cultivation.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. R. PHILP: At one time it was said the squatter was a cormorant—that he took up more land than he required. I think now that 1,280 acres of land in agricultural districts is too much. It would be better if the area were reduced, and instead of one man getting 1,280 acres, two might get 640 acres each, or, perhaps, four 320 acres each, and a greater portion of that land would be put under cultivation. In fact, it would be a very good thing to make some provision whereby, in the event of land being selected, that so much shall be put under cultivation every year. It would lead to less land being taken up for speculation, and more land being put under cultivation. (Hear, hear!) Of course, I admit there is a dearth of farm labourers to cultivate land.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. R. PHILP: I know in some districts men are not to be had, and a number of men are giving up the dairying industry because they cannot get labour to milk the cows. (Hear, hear!) I must congratulate the Government on the vigorous immigration policy now being carried out, and I think it is time that there should be a further increase in the number of immigrants coming to Queensland. I understand not a single immigrant is available to-day, notwithstanding the thousands that have come to Queensland during this year. On the whole, I think we are getting a fair class of immigrants. I dare say you will find members in the House say some are not desirable. That may be, but on the whole I think we are getting as fine a class of men and women as ever we got. I hope the Government will bring out double the quantity of immigrants coming to Queensland at the present time. That is one of the crying wants in this fair

country. I regret mining is not so flourishing in Queensland as it has been. Why this is so is very difficult to say, and I would advise the mining members in this House—while I was sitting on the front bench as Minister for Mines, I advised them then to meet the Minister, and try to devise some means of improving the mining industry. I would like to see some of the old goldfields, such as Gympie and Charters Towers, tried in some way. We have now built more railways, and I have great hopes that the line built to the Etheridge will make that old field much more prosperous. We have vast mineral resources, but the low prices obtaining has retarded the copper industry. In several cases the mining industry has been the salvation of Queensland, and, strange to say, it always seems to be in bad times that mining seems to be in the ascendant. I would like to see it always in the ascendant. Taking it all in all, mining has done a great deal for Queensland; and with better

[4 p.m.] prices for copper and the baser metals I hope to see some of the fields that have been practically laid up flourishing again. I advise mining members to meet among themselves and to meet the Minister—who has shown himself willing to help them in every possible way—and see if they can propose something to revive the mining industry in Queensland. In agriculture in Queensland the biggest thing is the growth of sugar. There are plenty of members on this side, and on the other side, who will talk about wheat-growing and dairying. I know a little about sugar, and I want to supplement some of the remarks made by the hon. member for Herbert. Last year I said I thought the Government could well afford to build three new central mills—one at Ayr, one on the Johnstone, and one on the Mulgrave. Since last year I find there is no necessity for Government assistance as far as Ayr is concerned, because some of the planters there intend putting up a central mill on this side of the Burdekin sufficient to make 14,000 to 15,000 tons of sugar a year.

Mr. MURPHY: At Inkerman. It won't be any good to the Ayr side of the river.

HON. R. PHILP: If there is a bridge there it will be good for both sides.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: If!

HON. R. PHILP: With respect to the Johnstone River, this House, and more than one Government, made a pledge to provide a mill. I passed a Bill to borrow money for a mill on the Johnstone and a mill on the Mulgrave; but I am not going to weary the House by showing why it went no further. There is now a splendid opportunity for the Government to put up one large mill that will do for both the Johnstone River people and the Mulgrave people.

Mr. MANN: There is room for three.

HON. R. PHILP: There might be room for ten; but the Government would be justified in putting up a mill capable of turning out 15,000 tons that would serve both the Johnstone and the Mulgrave. There may have been reasons three or four years ago why no more central mills were required. Three years ago we exported sugar, because we had made more than Australia could consume; but two years ago we had to import 50,000 tons, and last year we imported 70,000 tons into Australia. I don't think we shall require to import so much this year, but notwithstanding this year's plentiful crop, and

*Hon. R. Philp.]*

the fact that every mill of any size will be occupied up to its limit, we shall still be short of sugar to supply Australia. That being so, I see no reason why the Government should not build this mill, which this House is practically pledged to build.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What about the policy of the Federal Government?

HON. R. PHILP: I do not think any Government, whether the present Federal Government or any other, will do anything to disturb the protective policy existing in Australia.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. R. PHILP: And so long as Australia is protected, they must protect sugar just as they protect flour or wine. I think there would be an indignant cry throughout Australia if any one industry was singled out for no protection; and unless sugar gets protection it cannot be made with white labour.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. R. PHILP: We can make sufficient sugar for Australia. Every child born and every individual brought to Australia consumes 1 cwt. of sugar per annum. I am glad to see that the population of Australia is growing. For a number of years it was stagnant. For five or six or seven years after federation there were no new people coming, but now the population is growing, and people are coming not only to Queensland but to the other States of Australia. Every steamer leaving London is full of passengers, so much so that every line is putting on more vessels to bring people to Australia. I think therefore it will take us all our time to overtake the wants of sugar consumers in Australia.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. R. PHILP: The Government are committed to a certain extent to build these mills, and there is less risk than the Government of which I was a member would have incurred in asking Parliament to authorise £500,000 for central mills. The experiment of building central mills has turned out very well; and but for that experiment it would not have been so easy to carry on the production of sugar by white labour. I think both sides will admit that the sugar industry is of vital importance to Queensland.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. R. PHILP: Now that we have undertaken to make sugar for Australia, we should not halt in doing it. Victoria made an attempt some time ago to grow sugar from beet-root; and if we cannot make sufficient sugar in Queensland the chances are that the Federal Government will try to make it some day in the Northern Territory, where there is suitable land. I say we have the whole of that business, and we ought to keep it. (Hear, hear!) It may be said that it is good enough for private enterprise, and I am glad the Ayr people are going to put up a mill. A promise was made that money would be advanced for a mill on the Johnstone, and, as there is no risk as far as I know in building this mill, I think the Government should advance the money. (Hear, hear!) I think they should advance sufficient to build a big mill, because the bigger the mill the cheaper you can make the sugar and the more you can afford to give the farmer for his cane. I think it would be one of the best possible investments for Queensland to advance sufficient to build

[*Hon. R. Philp.*]

a 15,000-ton mill for the Johnstone and the Mulgrave. I think I have said sufficient about the sugar industry, except that in the North we have an advantage over the South in the matter of growing sugar. I suppose on the Johnstone River there never was a failure of the crop yet; they have never been short of rain, and there has never been a frost. The home of the sugar-cane is that part of Queensland, and I hope the Government will reconsider their decision. And I hope they will see that there is not the slightest fear to be apprehended from Federal legislation.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. R. PHILP: Australia is pledged to protection, and we only seek such protection for sugar as is given to the products of other parts of Australia. Flour is protected £2 10s. a ton; wine is protected up to 6s. a gallon; and why should not sugar be protected?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Continue the bonus.

HON. R. PHILP: Whether it is a bonus or a protective duty it matters not—it is all protection. I hope the Government will ask the House this session to authorise sufficient money for the erection of such a mill as I have indicated. Now, the pastoral industry is also referred to; and I believe the Government intend asking the House this session to pass a Bill to cause the building of a transcontinental railway. I dare say there are fifty different opinions in this House about the route the line should take. Personally, I do not care what route is taken, so long as lines go out further west, and they open up the whole of this great country. I maintain that the lines now going to Charleville, to Longreach, and to Cloncurry, have opened up those parts of the country. Those living near those railways cannot complain about railway communication. It is those further west, and a great deal further west—which is no man's land at present—who want similar means of communication. Some of the country is taken up, and some not, beyond a few cattle stations in some places. From all I can learn—and I have also some little knowledge myself—there is just as much country fit for sheep and cattle west of those lines as there is east of them. (Hear, hear!) The squatter has been looked upon not with the best of favour in times past; but even now I say he has been a great pioneer in this country; and after all, what does he do? He simply uses the grass, which before he came there the blacks used to burn off every year. And when his time comes, he has to go further out; and you must remember that a great many small people own sheep and cattle, and they have just as much right to be considered as well as anybody else—as the miner or the farmer. We must remember that when the pastoral industry is flourishing, then generally the whole of the States are flourishing too, because it gives an immense amount of employment—first to the stockmen, then to the shearer and to the carrier, then to the railway men, and then to the wharf lumper. The big meatworks along our coast are also now giving a great deal of employment to a lot of men at good wages.

MR. O'SULLIVAN: Better wages than they used to be.

HON. R. PHILP: Everybody in Queensland are getting better wages than they used to get—everyone is getting good wages. We want industries to keep them going and to increase them if possible, and if this country at the

present time can carry 20,000,000 head of sheep and 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 head of cattle, I have no hesitation in stating that if we carry our lines west and north-west we can double the carrying capacity with regard to our stock in Queensland.

Mr. LAND: Find a market for them.

HON. R. PHILP: It is only last Thursday I was reading a Sydney paper, and I saw a letter from a contributor, "W. M. B.," headed "The Empty North: The Great Prairie Lands," of which I will read a portion. He says—

The prairie, or, as it is more generally called, the downs, of North Australia, is most extensive. This great prairie, lying between parallels 17 degrees to 21 degrees, extends through three States, namely Western Australia, the Northern Territory, and Queensland. The Kimberley and Victoria prairie is separated from the Barkley prairie by a stretch of semi-forest country, 170 miles wide, and the Barkley from the Blinders (Queensland) by the Mackinlay Range. With its regular rainfall and luxuriant fodders this prairie country should be the greatest sheepwalk in the world. I estimate that 50,000,000 sheep, besides other animals, could be depastured there. This is no idle boast; men long resident in the north are of the same opinion. At the present time the best beef in the Commonwealth is grown in this country. But this great area is practically empty, requiring railways to convert it into wool-growing instead of cattle-raising. The tablelands of the north are exceptionally suitable for the growth of good wool, wool-growing is a fine staple product, and when it comes to raising millions of sheep the value of this industrial wealth cannot be easily understood even by those who are accustomed to ponder over the future productivity of this continent. The difficulties do not appear greater than have been contended with, and overcome in America, where thousands of miles of railway are largely occupied in the transit of cattle, many days and nights being required for a journey. One establishment for shipping and canning meat has a slaughtering capacity annually of 400,000 cattle, and others bring up the grand total to about 2,500,000 head. In America stock are brought further than is necessary in Australia. It is generally admitted that Australian meat is better than American. Thousands of their cattle are sent to market from such cold regions that it may well appear surprising that they fatten at all. It is, therefore, absurd to suppose that with a climate more favourable to the raising of stock, and a pasturage producing a better quality of meat, Australia cannot compete with them. All you have to do is to produce more. The Barkley Tableland, an area of 40,000 square miles, is roughly estimated to carry 15,000,000 sheep, besides cattle, horses, and Angora goats. The back country of Queensland, the Georgina, Cooper, and Diamantina Rivers, should add another 25,000,000, the Victoria River a further 10,000,000. Looking now at these waste lands this may appear like an enthusiast's idle dream, but it is capable of realisation. Capital and railways are the levers to work this change. It should be the Australian policy to urge on the development of the Northern Territory, until it is intersected with railways and covered in sheep, cattle, and horses. The tablelands of North Australia are beautiful country, crying out for railways, which would open up great districts, carry millions of stock, and huge wool clips to market, besides saving drought-stricken areas in time of drought. Had this country been available during the last disastrous drought millions of stock would have been saved. It was then, and always is, waving in grass, and grass of the right and best description.

At the present time there is only one sheep station on the tablelands, viz., Avon Downs.

This gentleman may be an enthusiast, and he has a right to be, but I certainly believe we could easily carry 20,000,000 more sheep in Queensland, and 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 more head of cattle, if we had railways through the Western districts. It has been talked about for some years past that the Federal Government are going to build a transcontinental railway through Australia. Such a line through the Northern Territory won't help

Queensland at all—in fact, I do not think it will help Australia; but I say if we make our minds up and are determined to have a railway built to the border of Queensland, somewhere near the Barkley Tableland, we can fairly ask the Federal Government to carry the line from Pine Creek to join our line. Such a line would be the nearest route to Europe; it would go through splendid country in most cases, and I believe it would pay. If the line is carried from Oodnadatta, I say we should not stop; we should go on ourselves and build our line to the Northern Territory. Such a line would tap the traffic of the best of the Northern Territory country that lies alongside Queensland. That wool could be taken to some of the Gulf ports and some of the eastern ports, and such a line, I am satisfied, would not only help us to maintain double the population we have at the present time, but would make us prosperous enough to pay our own way when some day the Federal Government ceases to pay us the £1 5s. per head. We have the opportunity now to borrow money, but the time may come when we may have to go cap in hand to the Federal Government, and beg for permission to borrow money. But that time has not yet come, and I say that now we have the opportunity we should not cease to build railways, not only in our agricultural districts but right through the back parts of Queensland. Such a policy, to my mind, would make Queensland in a very short time not only the most prosperous, but the most populous State in the whole of Australia.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. R. PHILP: I am not going to weary the House very much longer.

Mr. BOWMAN: What would be the probable cost of such a railway?

HON. E. PHILP: I do not think it will cost a great deal of money.

Mr. HARDACRE: It will cost £5,000,000.

HON. R. PHILP: No, it will not cost £5,000,000. It is a railway that will be easily built, and it will not cost above £2,500 or £3,000 per mile.

Mr. HARDACRE: It will cost millions to cross some of the rivers. (Government laughter.)

HON. R. PHILP: Millions to cross the rivers! If you were going over some of the ranges that there are there, unless you were told that they were ranges you would not know that you were crossing them.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: He said rivers.

HON. R. PHILP: The rivers are all sand in nine cases out of ten in Western Queensland, and generally they are as dry as a bone. There is very little river there at all, except in flood times. There is a splendid crossing for Cooper's Creek, the biggest waterway which there is there—that is just near Windorah. The hon. member for Mitchell knows it well, and he knows that it is a splendid crossing for a railway. That is by far the biggest river in the West, and at times it is dry.

Mr. RYLAND: It is 11 miles wide sometimes.

HON. R. PHILP: That is nothing in flood time. I well remember when you could not get from Charters Towers to Townsville for weeks, owing to the flooded state of the river. We know that in the wet season there is no traffic at all. If we had to wait in Queensland until the Government built high-level bridges over all the rivers, and high railways all over Queensland, then we would not have had 1,000 miles of railway built to-day.

*Hon. R. Philp.]*

MR. MURPHY: Hear, hear! That is quite true.

HON. R. PHILP: The Burdekin, one of the finest rivers in Queensland, was provided for thirty years with only a low-level bridge for the railway traffic over it. Of course we can magnify and make mountains out of any difficulties. I am quite certain that if Western Queensland belonged to New South Wales or Victoria that it would not be allowed to lie as it is now. Members of this House may not know it, but there has not been a mile of railway built west of Charleville during the last twenty years. The extension to Longreach was about twenty years ago, and then there was the extension to Winton from Hughenden a few years later.

MR. BOWMAN: What about the line to Cunnamulla?

HON. R. PHILP: I call that going south. I referred to the extensions made to the Western country, as I consider that is the direction in which the extensions should be made. I would take all the railways further west, because I consider that there is some country further west of Charleville—and also west of Longreach and Winton—which is much better than a lot of country east of those places. I feel quite certain that the country west of those places will carry as much stock as is carried by the country to the east of them. Now, I am not going to abuse the Federal Government. (Hear, hear!) I can only say that I am pleased that they are going to give us £1 5s. per head, even for ten years. That is something, at any rate. At the rate they are going, we do not know what the expenditure will be soon. When we entered into the federation we were told that it would cost only 3s. or 4s. per head. One of the strongest advocates for federation at that time—Sir Samuel Griffith—stated that it would only cost 3s. or 4s. per head. But I find that under this new proposed arrangement Queensland is going to pay £1 8s. per head, New South Wales £1 6s. per head, and Victoria £1 per head. What we want to know is why Queensland should be made to suffer in this way. Why should Queensland pay so much more than the other States?

MR. FERRICKS: Because the Premiers arranged it for £1 5s. per capita.

HON. R. PHILP: But the people of Australia would not consent to that arrangement. (Labour laughter.) Queensland approved of it, but it was only because we thought it was going to be put into the Constitution. If we are going to be penalised to the extent of £1 8s. per capita we ought certainly to get some *quid pro quo*.

MR. COYNE: What did the Premiers provide in the shape of a *quid pro quo*?

HON. R. PHILP: They thought it would be put into the Constitution until the electors of Australia chose to alter it.

MR. COYNE: That is what you are getting now.

HON. R. PHILP: No. If you had put it into the Constitution it would have been very hard to get it out again. (Labour laughter.)

MR. LENNON: That is just what we told you.

HON. R. PHILP: If in the first ten years of federation the expenditure rose from 3s. per head to £1 8s., how much of it will be left at the end of another ten years' time? There are some members of the Federal House of Parliament who think that it is even too much

to give the States £1 5s. per capita. They want the whole of it for the Federal Parliament. We have Sir William Lyne, the celebrated financier, who said that the federation wanted the whole of it. You will find that by that time the positions of senators and members of the House of Representatives will be worth £1,000 a year. A salary of £600 a year will not be enough for them by then, and you cannot get that money out of Customs revenue. Now, in the meantime we want to do all we can to cover our country by railways. We want to make our country so much more valuable, and get a much larger revenue than we are getting at the present time, because in time to come our land revenue will have to take the place of the Customs revenue we have lost and which we are going to lose. The Federal Prime Minister is going to give us a Federal bank note issue, and we cannot complain. We have had a bank note issue in Queensland since 1893, and it has been fairly successful. If Mr. Fisher brought in an Act, as Sir Hugh Nelson did in 1893, then no one in Queensland would complain of it at all. But I do not think that Mr. Fisher understands Sir Hugh Nelson's Act. Mr. Fisher was in this House at the time that Act was passed, and he voted against it; he asked a few questions about it. I see that Mr. Fisher proposes to issue £4,000,000 worth of notes, and a reserve of £1,000,000 in coin will be held to meet them. Sir Hugh Nelson's Act never contemplated anything like that at all. Sir Hugh Nelson, before passing his Act, went to the banks in Queensland and said, "If your circulation is £300,000 of notes, give me one-third in coin. I will give you fixed deposit for the other £200,000 at 2 per cent." Only three banks took advantage of that offer—the Royal, the Queensland National, and the Bank of North Queensland. So far as I know, this arrangement has been observed ever since. All the other banks refused to have any of the Queensland notes on those terms, but just paid for the Queensland notes as they wanted them. They only took the Queensland notes as they required them. If Mr. Fisher is prepared to do as Sir Hugh Nelson did, he will find that he can get one-third of the gold to meet the note issue. He would certainly get a very handsome revenue from it at 2 per cent., because a great deal of that money is what the banks call "till money." The bank directors talked about the dishonesty of Queensland keeping the banks out of their "till money," and the agreement was only made with three banks. If Mr. Fisher carries an Act of that kind he will not have £3,000,000 of money to spend. It will be a serious thing for the institutions of Australia if Mr. Fisher forces a loan like that on them. I would suggest that as we are going to pay 2s. per head more for federation than New South Wales, 8s. per head more than Victoria, and so much more than South Australia, that we in return should be allowed to keep our own note issue.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. R. PHILP: That would only be a fair thing to do, as we would then get something out of federation, as at the present time we make £25,000 out of our own note issue. So far as I know, the Queensland note issue has been of very great service to Queensland. (Hear, hear!) Of course, you must remember that when that Act was passed eight banks out of the eleven in Queensland had stopped payment. It was established in a time of panic. We have not experienced anything like that since that time, and I hope that we shall not. (Hear, hear!) If the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth, in his wisdom,

[Hon. R. Philp.]

wishes to do a fair thing to his own State of Queensland—and we only want a fair thing—no special favours at all—if he is going to take 2s. per head more out of us, then we should get it back in some other way.

Mr. COYNE: He took the same figure that the Premiers agreed to.

HON. R. PHILP: If the hon. gentleman got a job for a week for £1, would he think it was as good a job as another one at £1 a week which lasted for a year? Not likely. The Federal Government offered us the £1 5s. per head for ten years. We were prepared to take it so long as the amount was put into the Constitution, but the people of Australia said "No." I cannot understand to-day why this great democracy of Australia refused to control their own finances, but preferred to hand them over to someone else to control them.

Mr. FERRICKS: They now have the control of it themselves.

HON. R. PHILP: That is only my opinion. If Mr. Fisher wants to do justice to his own State and return this extra money that he is taking out of it, then he will leave us with our bank note issue to ourselves.

Mr. LENNON: Let us have a Commonwealth issue only.

HON. R. PHILP: Why should we have a Commonwealth issue?

Mr. LENNON: Because the Commonwealth has control of the currency under the Constitution.

HON. R. PHILP: Will the hon. member explain to us how we can get that 2s. back? How can Mr. Fisher justify taking from his own State 2s. per head more than he takes from any other State in the Commonwealth? South Australia is paying a great deal less than we are paying.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: They are paying only 18s. 8d. per head.

HON. R. PHILP: That is not equitable. That is not justice, and I say that as compensation for that injustice we should get something in return. I remember the proposal made at the first conference held in Sydney, and how Sir Thomas McIlwraith burst up the whole show when it was proposed that we should get so much per head irrespective of the amount paid into the Customs. Of course, under the Braddon section we got whatever was due to us—no more and no less; but under this new arrangement we shall be paying more per head towards the cost of federation than any other State. Why should we pay more? Can any member in this Chamber justify such an injustice to Queensland?

Mr. FERRICKS: You advocated it.

HON. R. PHILP: I advocated the Premiers' agreement as a settlement, be-  
[4.30 p.m.] cause I thought we were going to get 25s. per head for all time. We shall not get 25s. per head next year. We shall get only 25s. per head less our proportion of £450,000. Every State in Australia has to meet very heavy obligations on the 30th June and the 31st December in the shape of interest on debentures, and I am glad to say that I have never yet known any State to be behind in meeting its obligations. All the States have always honourably met their obligations to the debenture-holders. But we find that the Premier of the Commonwealth has failed to pay the money which was due to the several States on the 30th June last, though he was as much obliged to pay that money as the States are obliged to pay their

debts on the 30th June. The Commonwealth Premier failed to carry out the obligation imposed upon him by Act of Parliament. He had a deficiency of £450,000. Why did he not make it £800,000, and pay his debts to the States? The hon. gentleman made a boast that his deficiency was very small, but it was so small because he had not met his obligations to the States on the 30th June. He wanted to make the boast that he was more economical than his predecessors, but I contend that it would have been very much more to the honour of Australia and more to the honour of Mr. Fisher if he had paid the States the amounts due to them, even though in so doing he would have increased his deficiency. As it is, it is only a paper entry—some people call it "cooking" accounts—but I say it is only a paper entry, and his real deficit on the 30th June was £800,000. The withholding of the money due to the States did not make that deficiency any smaller. Mr. Fisher should have paid the States the money to which they were entitled. Some of the States might not have been in a position to pay interest on their loans without that money. Luckily, they all had balances and did not need it, but that position might very easily have been reversed. In any case there is no excuse for the Federal Treasurer in not meeting his obligations in the same way as the States have met theirs.

Mr. HARDACRE: He did meet his obligations.

HON. R. PHILP: Mr. Fisher said he would pay the money a fortnight later, but that is no justification for his action. What would be thought of Queensland if we cabled to the Agent-General in London stating that we had a deficiency this year and could not pay our interest till the 15th July? What reception would Queensland meet with under those circumstances when she wished to float another loan in the old country? Why, the money-lenders would say, "You are a defaulter, and we cannot offer you the same terms as we give to those States that have always paid their interest when it was due." What would the public servants say if the Government did not pay their salaries till the 15th July because there was a deficiency in the public accounts?

Mr. LESINA: There would be a gory riot.

HON. R. PHILP: Mr. Fisher is in exactly the same position as Mr. Kidston, or any other State Treasurer, who has to pay his debts when due. However, I think I have detained the House long enough.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: No, no! Go on.

HON. R. PHILP: I have said as much about the Address in Reply as I want to say. I only hope that members on both sides of the House will address themselves to business, and that much benefit will result from this session. Now is our opportunity to go in for a vigorous public works policy. We can carry out such a policy now, but ten years hence we may not be able to do it. The blow will come some day; it may come ten years hence. If we are sitting in this House ten years hence, we may find the Federal Government telling us that they want all the revenue from Customs and Excise. I say we want to make Queensland independent of the money we receive from Customs and Excise; we should do that now, and the only way in which we can do it is to go in for a vigorous policy of immigration and a vigorous public works policy. I have shown

*Hon. R. Philp.]*

you already what other people think of Queensland. We have the finest State in the Commonwealth, but we are not making the best use of it, and this House is as much to blame for that as anybody, and will be still more to blame if we do not insist upon railways being built wherever we have land that is suitable for occupation during the next ten years. During the last forty-five years we have spent something like £24,000,000 in building railways, and I say we should spend a similar sum during the next ten years. No doubt we have made some mistakes in the past, and we may make them in the future, but we know from experience what a benefit the building of railways has been to this State. The eyes of the whole of Australia are on Queensland. In almost every newspaper you take up you will find reference to the attractions of Queensland. Hundreds of people are coming here every week; indeed, the whole of Australia is now being attracted to Queensland. Let us make the most of our opportunity. We have an opportunity now of sending the State ahead; let us make the most of it. Let us give them the opportunity and inducement to come and invest their money in the State. Nothing that has been done in Queensland has benefited the State so much as the building of railways. I remember that when Sir Thomas Mcllwraith brought in his proposal to float a £3,000,000 loan for railway purposes people looked aghast at the proposal. He was asked where the railways were going to. He did not reply, but Sir Arthur Palmer replied, "Towards the setting sun." I contend that we should go on building railways "towards the setting sun." When the successor of Sir Thomas Mcllwraith came into office he asked for and obtained authority to float a loan of £10,000,000. I think the loan money of Queensland has been better spent than the loan money of any other State in the Commonwealth, even though we did make some mistakes in regard to that expenditure. But we cannot make a mistake in extending our railways into Western Queensland, in building railways in agricultural districts, and in running lines along our coast. We have overcome all the great difficulties of crossing ranges with railways. We have not now to build railways that will involve great expenditure. We have got over the range to Toowoomba. I believe it cost £17,000 a mile to build the line from Ipswich to Toowoomba. We know what the Cairns Railway cost. We know that all the coast lines were costly to build. But we have got over the coast ranges now, and we have to build on level country, where construction is easy. I think £2,500 or £3,000 a mile will build all the railways we need, and we ought to build them. We should also build a coast railway from Brisbane to Cairns. (Hear, hear!) Of course, portions of that line are being built by local authorities, but we should connect up all those lines. There is a great deal of good agricultural land along the coast, and it is on the coast we want to settle agriculturists, where there is a good rainfall. We should settle people there first. If that is done, then I predict a future for Queensland which I do not believe any hon. member of this House has yet dreamed of.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MAUGHAN (*Ipswich*): In common with hon. members who have already spoken. I cordially endorse the utterances which have been ventilated in this House with regard to the death of the late King. I also cor-

[*Hon. R. Philp.*

dially endorse all the remarks that have been made of the late King with regard to his peacemaking proclivities. At the same time, as a member of the Labour party, I should like to point out that, if there is any party in the world that has proclaimed from the housetops a desire to have peace with all nations, it is the Labour party. In every country the Labour party is fighting for great principles and for a great cause; but we go further than that. Our party throughout the world has always taken as the basis of its operations in international affairs peaceful methods. But we are not met here to-day to discuss that. In the short time that I have at my disposal this afternoon I should like to take advantage of the occasion as briefly as possible to refer to many of the matters which have been brought before the House through the agency of the Governor's Speech. We are told that it affords the Governor much pleasure to meet us at the opening of the second session of the eighteenth Parliament of Queensland. Well, we are reminded that time is getting on, and that last year we celebrated our jubilee—fifty years of responsible Government. Irrespective of the parties we belong to, it makes us reflect for a moment and wonder whether we are in the position we should have been in had the legislation of the past been as progressive and democratic as it should have been. My own opinion—and I think it is shared by pretty well every hon. member on this side—is that in fifty years Queensland has not made anything like the progress that she should have made had legislation been more progressive and democratic. To think that after fifty years of responsible Government by business men—business Ministers, Parliament after Parliament—we can only boast of a miserable population in this great territory of 560,000—a territory larger than France, Germany, and one or two subsidiary States in Europe lumped together. And to think that we have a population of 200,000 or 300,000 less than the cities of Belfast and Glasgow! That shows that there must be something radically wrong with the legislation of the past. There is no occasion for me to hurl these reflections necessarily at the present occupants of the Treasury bench. As a matter of fact, the whole system has been wrong. It is just as well sometimes to review the causes that have led to these results, and to some of those causes I shall do myself the honour to allude as time goes on. The Governor tells us that he has been greatly impressed with the magnificent variety of our resources. Well, that is a stereotyped statement that no doubt you, Sir, and many of us have heard periodically, and particularly on show occasions. We are always reminded of our great resources. The hon. gentleman, the candid friend of the Government, who has just resumed his seat, has also referred to the great resources of Queensland. He has told us all about the splendid seasons and—according to his ideas—the splendid prosperity that is prevailing throughout this land. There is no getting away from the fact that we have been blessed with remarkably fine seasons for many years past; and it is a singular coincidence that just as the Labour party has been growing in strength, power, and influence in the country, so the seasons have improved. Whatever the hon. gentleman's idea and interpretation of prosperity may be, hon. members on this side do not necessarily judge prosperity by the enormous banking reserves that are accumulated. Nor do they judge prosperity by the great exports that we see tabulated in

the Treasurer's tables. Rather do we judge prosperity as such by the well-being of the community as a whole.

LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MAUGHAN: If the condition of the people is what it should be, if the great mass of wealth-producers, who are producing this great volume of wealth that we are always prating about—if their condition is such as it should be, then we shall be in a position to indulge in heroics about our great and general prosperity. But until that occasion arises I cannot—with regret, as a member of the Labour party—subscribe to the idea that we are enjoying unbounded prosperity. Take any industry we like. Take the great pastoral industry, which every hon. member agrees is a great industry in Queensland. We find with regard to the workers in that industry—whether they be shearers, whether they be rouseabouts, or station hands generally—it matters not what—every little concession or increase of wages that they have obtained during years and years of trouble has been obtained only through the agency of united effort. Every little increase that these men have gained has practically been through the agency of unions. Had it not been for the union movement I dare say the condition of the men engaged in our pastoral industry would not have been even what it is to-day. And even the position to-day is nothing to “blow” about. We talk about the great success, and the great possibilities, and the sound financial standing of our pastoral industry. But how is it that, in spite of the prosperity of the industry from the employers' point of view, the men engaged in the industry are fighting inch by inch and yard by yard for necessary reforms that they have desired and demanded for years past?

Mr. BOWMAN: They have to fight for the retention of their present conditions.

Mr. MAUGHAN: And, as my friend the leader of the Opposition reminds me, they have to fight for the absolute retention of their present conditions. We know that there is now going on a certain agitation to improve the condition of the workers employed in that industry, and those men, through their unions, have been put to no end of expense in connection with fighting in the Federal Arbitration Court. What is the good of the hon. member for Townsville getting up and talking about the great prosperity which prevails throughout the pastoral industry if we find that the great masses of workers dependent upon that industry and making that industry the successful one it is—if we find those men in the condition that they find themselves in to-day? The same applies to the mining industry. I think that the hon. member for Townsville qualified his remarks somewhat about the mining industry; but at the same time it has been, and is, a particularly important industry to Queensland. We all recognise that, but, as anyone can tell me, the workers employed in that industry are receiving nothing like an adequate return for the amount of labour they put into the industry. It does not matter a toss of the button whether the industry has been flourishing or not, the conditions have generally been the same to the workers employed in that particular industry, more particularly in connection with the coal-mining industry, and I say any little concession that the coalminers of Queensland have gained, they have had to struggle for, year after year—for twenty years—even to get those little concessions, and they are still fighting to-day.

Mr. COYNE: And they have made big sacrifices.

Mr. MAUGHAN: I can assure you that had it not been for the trade union movement in connection with that particular industry the workers would not be enjoying the conditions they are enjoying to-day, and if there is any branch of the mining industry that can well afford to pay the very best of wages, it is the coal industry. It is an absolutely safe industry. Coal is a commodity that is always required. There is always a great demand for it, and I can only say that it is only a fair deduction to make, that men engaged in an industry of that character should receive, without having to fight tooth and nail for it, an adequate remuneration, not only for the services they perform, but for the great risk they incur to their lives in digging in the bowels of mother earth for the commodity they are engaged in bringing to the surface. The same applies to agriculture. We are reminded about the agricultural industry, and I appeal to hon. members, especially to my old friend the hon. member for Cunningham, who sits here as the friend of the farmers—who is here as the farmers' representative—I would like to remind him and other hon. members who represent farming districts, that while it is assumed, as a result of the excellent seasons we have enjoyed for years past, the farming industry, from the point of view of statistics as regards production, has gone ahead by leaps and bounds—

Mr. GRAYSON: Hear, hear!

Mr. MAUGHAN: My friend says “Hear, hear,” but I say, just as the pastoral workers and other workers have had a tremendous struggle to make both ends meet, so in thousands of cases the farmers of Queensland have also had a terrific struggle to carry on their business in the way it should be carried on. There are exceptions, I admit. In your own electorate, Sir—that old-settled electorate, where conditions have operated for the benefit of the settler by having an ample water supply, by having an excellent railway system running right through the middle of it, and by being in the closest possible proximity to a seaport—I say that farmers working under those conditions are in a most enviable position. But what shall I say of thousands of men on the land—whether in the scrub country, where the water supply is practically nil, where railway communication is either only contemplated or is not a very big advantage to the farmers living in that locality—what do I say of those people? I am just reminded here that the Secretary for Railways, the senior member for Gympie, the hon. member for Burnett, myself, and one or two others whose names I cannot recall for the moment, were participating recently in a very pleasant function at Kingaroy, which is in the midst of one of the most progressive farming districts, I suppose, in Queensland. The speeches made by the farmers at that particular function amounted simply to this: That unless the Government of the day took a more earnest and active interest in the well-being of the agriculturists generally than then there was going to be trouble. As a matter of fact, in many of the farming districts of Queensland we find men cultivating the soil and having to carry their produce miles upon miles to the nearest railway station. We are told by the hon. member for Townsville that there is great prosperity prevailing in the agricultural industry. That may be, but I say, as I have previously said, there is any amount of room for the most sympathetic improvement with regard to the

Mr. Maughan.]

administration of matters affecting the well-being of the farmers of Queensland. Some hon. members opposite appear to think they have a special mandate from the farmers, and the farmers only, to come and represent their interests in this Chamber. I can tell those hon. members that the Labour party have just as much sympathetic interest in the well-being of the farmers of Queensland as any hon. member in this House.

Mr. BOWMAN: More.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Yes, more; and the very fact of the various Labour conventions passing unanimously many resolutions of intense interest, material and otherwise, to the farming industry, shows quite well that what I say is absolutely correct. The hon. member for Townsville told the House, amongst other things, that we have the most liberal and progressive Land Acts of any in the States of Australia. But I think it will be admitted, even by the Secretary for Lands himself, that the land legislation in Queensland for many years has not been what it should have been. Nobody knows better than the Minister himself, and the responsible officers of the Lands Department, that one of the biggest difficulties to deal with in political matters in Queensland to-day is land legislation. If we were over on the other side now, we would be face to face with that difficulty, and I want to see, in common with other hon. members, very much more liberal land laws placed on the statute-book than has ever been the case before. As a matter of fact, we have hon. members in this House urging such reforms as free land and all that sort of thing—not necessarily members of my own party. We are not here to discuss that, but I do say we are here as representatives of the people to do our level best to make access to the land by the *bona fide* selector as easy as it is possible to be.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MAUGHAN: I go further—not only have we to realise that we have to face the problem of settling men on the land, but we have also to face the problem of keeping the men there when we get them on the land, and that can only be done by encouraging them in the way of giving them an ample water supply, by way of giving them a quick and cheap transport in the way of railways, and by lightening the burden of the toiler on the land in every possible way, and also in another manner, which is of equal importance, and that is in the way of disposing of his produce. The Labour party have for years

advocated the adoption of some [5 p.m.] system by which State storehouses shall be constructed in various parts of Queensland, to which the farmer can take his produce, and through the direct agency of the State receive advances. There is nothing new about this, and if it is a socialistic idea, I presume the Government would not be above tacking a little more socialism on to the socialistic ideas which they seem to possess, but, unfortunately, are somewhat slow in carrying out. I was very much interested in the remarks of the hon. member for Townsville in regard to the great sugar industry. I think, irrespective of party considerations, we all recognise that it would be nothing short of a calamity for Queensland to lose the sugar industry. It is manifest that such an industry as this must be not only conserved but greatly extended in its field of operations, and that can only be done by sympathetic administration. I was glad to hear the hon. member

[Mr. Maughan.]

for Townsville say he did not think there was any reason to fear any action on the part of the Federal Labour Government in regard to the sugar industry.

Mr. FERRICKS: The Government were only quibbling; they had no fears whatever.

Mr. MAUGHAN: I can only say that, as one member of the Labour party, if there is anything I can do to help forward the sugar industry by putting it on a firmer foundation, it will be my constant endeavour so to do. We have been pledged for years to change the whole labour conditions of the sugar industry. That pledge has been respected, and it has been backed up by the people of Australia, who have said that the industry shall be worked by white people in future; and because of that fact, if for no other reason, it is to the interest of the Labour party all over Australia to do everything we possibly can to put the industry on a solid foundation. Yet we have the Government during the last few weeks refusing the request of various deputations or communications from the North, and even from Rockhampton—refusing to recognise the claims of these particular districts to sugar-mills. If it is a matter of money, I am sure the Treasurer can dispose of a few thousands in connection with sugar-mills to much better advantage probably than a good deal of the money of which he is disposing. I suppose we shall see many items of expenditure in the Estimates on matters not half so important as the appropriation of money for the development of the great sugar industry. I was also interested to hear the remarks of the member for Townsville with reference to opening up the great North-west country; and I could not help going back in my mind to the time, a few years ago, when we were told by the party with which he was associated, both inside and outside the House, that that country could only be developed by coloured labour. Now we are told that it is an El Dorado, a land of Canaan, a Paradise flowing with milk and honey—or will be, if we get the transcontinental railway. We know quite well there is good country out there—I am speaking from information given to me by one in authority—there are hundreds of thousands of acres of magnificent country in the Cloncurry district capable of growing wheat; yet we were told when Flora Shaw came here that this country was ordained by Almighty God to be worked by coloured labour. We are now told that that condition of affairs does not operate to-day, that it is a magnificent country, and there is only one thing wanted to make it a great asset for Queensland and the Commonwealth, and that is to run the iron horse through it. In connection with that, I suppose we shall have this Railway Bill submitted, so there is no use in making second-reading speeches now, but I would like to say, while members may deem it expedient to link up our Western lines—there will no doubt be diversity of opinion as to the best method—I think there are other parts of Queensland which require railway communication just as much as the Western country.

Mr. LESINA: Every member has a railway in his pocket.

Mr. MAUGHAN: In reply to the interjection of the hon. member for Clermont, I may say that I had in my mind's eye the linking up of our coastal railways. I think the line from Rockhampton to Townsville and Cairns should be pushed forward without delay. I regard that coastal line not only from the

point of view of defence, but also from the point of view of running through country which can only be developed by such a line of railway.

Mr. COYNE: Do you think it more justifiable than the Port Alma line?

Mr. MAUGHAN: There are other lines in many of our great agricultural centres which I hope, when the proper time comes, hon. members who profess to be friends of the farmers will see are tabled in this House. In nearly every agricultural district there is room for further railway extension; and what applies to your own electorate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, applies with equal force to other districts in Queensland. More railway communication is required in the Bremer district, and more in the hon. member for Moreton's district. I want to see the Woodford line extended to Kilcoy—this session, too.

Mr. FORSYTH: Hear, hear!

Mr. MAUGHAN: If provision is not made for that, I hope the hon. member will assert himself and become a friend of the farmer. I want to see a line which will connect that magnificent territory known as the "border country," in which the hon. member for Carnarvon is concerned—I want to see a line which will make it possible for the producers in that district—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That means a big loan policy.

Mr. MAUGHAN: A line that will enable them to take their produce from Goondiwindi by the via recta to the port of Brisbane without having to go 100 miles round.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is our policy. Come over to this side.

Mr. MAUGHAN: I hope the hon. member for Carnarvon, and the hon. member for Cunningham and the hon. member for Warwick, who are equally interested, will, when the proper time comes, assert their claim and also become candid friends of the Government, if their particular railway appetites are not satisfied. (Laughter.) Now, the Minister for Lands said just now, "You should come over on this side." That reminds me that during the recess we had a good many functions in various parts of Queensland, and my friend the Minister for Railways, and particularly the Premier, were not at all backward in taking full credit for every line of railway that was passed by this House. They never for one moment thought it worth while to give hon. gentlemen on this side of the House the slightest credit for voting for pretty well every line that was tabled for years past, except the Port Alma line.

The PREMIER: There is no need to blow your trumpet; you can do it quite well yourself. (Laughter.)

Mr. MAUGHAN: But unfortunately hon. members on this side did not always get the opportunity to blow their trumpets at these particular banquets. I was pleased when the hon. member for Bulloo and myself had the honour to attend a certain banquet at the turning of the first sod of the Maryvale line, because we had an opportunity given to us then of explaining to a most appreciative audience that the Labour party are just as equally interested in the farmers' railways that are required as hon. gentlemen opposite.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Hear, hear! You helped us every time in the railway policy.

Mr. MAUGHAN: If hon. members occupying the Ministerial bench had an opportunity of giving the Opposition credit, they did not avail themselves of it. It was very unfair, and these are some of the little matters which will have to be inquired into in connection with the official statements further on. Now, with regard to a matter which has been occasioning a great deal of criticism during the recess, and previously—I refer now to the question of immigration. I will only refer briefly to the matter, because we shall have a good deal of this over again on the Estimates. This is more directly in connection with the man on the land, and I wish to say that I think it is absolutely unfair for any Government—it matters not to me what party it represents—for any Government to be responsible for bringing out farmers to Queensland unless they give them the very best land, and the most accessible to railways, to settle upon. More particularly do I speak on behalf of numbers of those people who come out to Queensland who are unable, being foreigners, to speak our own tongue.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Take Baffle Creek, for instance.

Mr. MAUGHAN: I have no desire at this stage to go into the question of Baffle Creek, nor—much as I would like—to touch in detail upon the Gayndah settlement. We shall hear more of that later on, but I think I am on fairly safe ground when I state that it would be a good thing on the part of the Government—not only a good thing but a humane thing—when large contingents of Germans, or other settlers from foreign nations, come out here, that every facility should be afforded to them to settle on the very best land available, with ample water supply, and in close proximity to a railway.

Mr. COYNE: And equal facilities should be given to our settlers here.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Quite so; I will deal with the other matter first. With regard to our own people here, I shall deal with that later on more in detail. I think, as was pointed out by many speakers at Kingaroy a few weeks ago, at the turning of the first sod there, and at which the Minister and others were present—I agreed with the farmers who spoke on that occasion—that far more sympathy should be demonstrated to our own Queenslanders than has been the case in the past. Of course, it is a great temptation to the Lands Department to attract people here from other States. It is a sort of emulation, I suppose, which is pardonable in some departments. At the same time, there is ample room for much more encouragement being given to our own Queenslanders to get on the land than is the case at the present time. And as I said a few moments ago, the problem is not only how to get people on the land, but how to keep them there. As one who covers a good deal of country, and comes in contact with a good many settlers on the land, wherever I go I find there is a general complaint with regard to the high price of land. We know quite well that an ordinary man settling on the land has quite enough to put up with by way of plunging his hands into his pockets, or making arrangements with some bank or firm to assist him with regard to the purchase of stock, implements, and other domestic and farming necessities, without being severely handicapped by having to pay a large price to the Crown for land. That is a thing which I think is manifest to every hon. member, and if we are to encourage our people to go on

*Mr. Maughan.*]

the land we must make it a *sine qua non* that he must not only buy good land, but it must be cheap land.

**THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS:** How do you account for it that whenever there is competition the opening price is very much exceeded?

**MR. COYNE:** Because you won't make sufficient land available.

**MR. LESINA:** You offer twenty lots to sixty applicants, and they compete with each other in a mad desire to get the land.

**THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS:** The principle of auction is not encouraged in the department except in exceptional cases.

**MR. MAUGHAN:** I can only say in reply to that, from certain evidence which we have in our possession, it goes to prove that many of the applicants for land are not *bonâ fide* applicants.

**MR. COYNE:** Hear, hear! Dummying is rampant in the State.

**THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS:** Can you cite a case?

**MR. MAUGHAN:** I do not make a statement without being able to back it up; I was not going to refer to that just now, but I will let you have a case in point. I will give a case of a sale in the Pilton Estate.

**THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS:** That was not a Crown estate?

**MR. MAUGHAN:** No; I am speaking generally of the high price of land; it does not matter to my argument whether it is a Crown sale or by a private individual.

**THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS:** I thought you were dealing with Crown land.

**MR. MAUGHAN:** I am speaking of land generally, I have no desire to misrepresent the department. The sale of Pilton Estate took place on 12th February, 1910, and I have in my hand a copy of the *Warwick Argus* giving details as to the purchase of the various blocks, and the criticism which follows the names of those who secured the land I think speaks for itself, and confirms every statement I have made this afternoon, and the interjection of my friend the hon. member for Warwick. It is this—

A striking feature of the sale, and obviously an undesirable feature, was the large quantity of land that was acquired by buyers whose operations it was openly whispered were conducted on behalf of speculating syndicates who will not allow the land to pass into the hands of the farmer until they have taken further toll and reaped the benefit of enhanced values.

As a matter of fact, my friend the hon. member for Bulloo and myself, when we were at Warwick during the Federal elections, on all sides heard about the scandalous state of things that existed in connection with the Pilton Estate.

**THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS:** That was not a Crown sale.

**MR. MAUGHAN:** That is so. I am talking about the prices the farmers have to pay to get on the land, and for my argument it does not trouble me whether it is a Crown sale or a private sale. The article goes on to say—

It represents the weakness of private subdivision as compared with Government subdivision, when no conditions as to *road fees* are asked or imposed. Comparatively few of the smaller men secured holdings.

**MR. ALLEN:** Only one or two.

**MR. MAUGHAN:**

And in almost all cases sales were not effected until bidding had carried values beyond reserves.

[*Mr. Maughan.*]

**MR. LESINA:** That is the result of competition.

**MR. MAUGHAN:**

It is a generally admitted fact that private dealers cannot handle the land on the specially advantageous terms that the Government can offer to selectors—

**THE HOME SECRETARY:** Ah! Hear, hear!

**MR. MAUGHAN:**

Nor are they expected to. But the speculation and juggling that the system involves, and which reacts so heavily on the man who must ultimately acquire and use the land, is an obnoxious feature that may be winked at or ridiculed, but is none the less real and apparent because of that. It is obvious from Wednesday's sales that substantial and excellent areas of the estate that have been disposed of will not get into the hands of the *bonâ fide* farmer except at enhanced values and on terms the reverse of liberal when compared with those offered by the Government or the original vendors.

In reply to the interjection just made by the Home Secretary, I say that under the system of private land sales the farmers are subjected to this kind of thing, but what about the hundreds of farmers who buy land from the Crown and who growl at the price they have to pay for it. That is anything but a satisfactory state of things.

**THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS:** What do you mean by Crown sales?

**MR. MAUGHAN:** Auction sales.

**THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS:** It is very rarely that they buy land by auction from the Crown.

**MR. LESINA:** Not lately, at any rate.

**MR. MAUGHAN:** Does the hon. gentleman say that very little land has been sold to the farmers by the Crown?

**THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS:** Very little by auction.

**MR. MAUGHAN:** It was disposed of to them?

**THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS:** Yes, in the ordinary way.

**MR. MAUGHAN:** Anyway I am strongly of the same opinion with regard to land settlement as I have always been, and that is that the Government cannot do too much to encourage land settlement in the direction of making land as cheap as possible.

**THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS AND HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. MAUGHAN:** Apart from the necessary conditions of railway communication and water supply.

**THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. COYNE:** But you are not carrying that out?

**THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS:** Yes, we are.

**MR. MAUGHAN:** Two years ago I heard a speech delivered by the present Home Secretary when he was sitting on the Opposition side of the House, practically reiterating the remarks I am making to-day. The hon. gentleman on that occasion said—

At the present time, owing to the high prices which have been put upon the Crown lands of the State, it is practically impossible for a poor man to obtain the land which he ought to have the right to acquire.

**THE HOME SECRETARY:** That has been amended since.

**MR. MAUGHAN:** How is it working? The hon. gentleman says that it has been amended, but does he not know that if you

go North, South, East, and West of Queensland you will find selectors complaining of this sort of thing.

Mr. COYNE: You will find land hunger everywhere.

Mr. MAUGHAN: It is perhaps difficult to anticipate what sort of Land Amendment Bill we are to have this session, but unless that Bill provides finally and absolutely for some more convenient system by which our people who desire access to the land can get on in the cheapest way and most expeditious way possible, then that Land Bill might as well go into the waste-paper basket. I was quoting, when I was interrupted, from a speech delivered by the present Home Secretary when he was sitting in Opposition. He went on to say—

Under our old homestead clauses it was possible for a selector to acquire 160 acres of land for 2s. 6d. per acre by performing the condition of residence and making certain improvements. That was one of the most desirable provisions in our Land Acts, and it is only right that a man should be able to acquire a homestead if he is prepared to fulfil these conditions.

Mr. SWINER: And good land, too.

Mr. APPEL: And good land, too, because the man with no capital but a stout heart and strong hands must be prepared to go out into the scrub and to carve his home out of that scrub; and, in order to obtain the necessary capital for that purpose, has to be prepared to go out and work for every penny that he expends in the improvement of that property. It is the duty of the State to help such men.

Is the Hon. the Home Secretary of that opinion to-day? He goes on—

and I trust that when an amending Land Bill comes before the House those who have the interest of the poor man at heart will insist upon the addition of such a clause, so that the man whose only crime is his poverty may get an interest in the land.

What more does the hon. gentleman want? If I spoke here for six months I could not convey more accurately my idea with regard to land settlement than that conveyed by the hon. gentleman when sitting in Opposition.

Mr. LESINA: You cannot put a penniless man on the land. He must have capital of some kind.

Mr. MAUGHAN: The hon. member for Clermont is quite right. As I have just pointed out, it is of very little use putting a man on the land unless he is thoroughly equipped for going on the land, that is, unless he is equipped with implements and accoutrements to run his farm. What is the difficulty? There would be no difficulty if we had a liberal land policy and running along with it a liberal financial policy.

Mr. COYNE: State bank.

Mr. MAUGHAN: That would not only enable our settlers to get on the land but remain there, and that is why the Labour party have always been particularly strong on the question of cheap money for the producer through the agency of a State bank. The Secretary for Lands smiles.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: On quite another subject.

Mr. MAUGHAN: I apologise. I had heard the hon. gentleman on more than one occasion give utterance to almost similar sentiments. If only that could be done, from the point of view of convenience and cheap and good land, if that could be accomplished, then there would be no holding land settlement and production in Queensland. Apart from those in the country districts, I am absolutely certain that there are hundreds in

every town in Queensland who would be only too glad to go on to the land if they could get the opportunity. Now, with regard to the question of immigration, I touched on that briefly a few moments ago from the aspect of those men who come out to torrid countries and settle in the various farming districts. I have also touched on the importance of dealing with our Queensland people who are already here with the view of their settling on the land. This is why I want to direct attention to the fact that under present conditions the immigration system is carried on in the most unsatisfactory way. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that there are people who qualify as agricultural labourers in the old country and who come out here with that qualification, and immediately they land here they throw off the garb of agricultural labourer, and suddenly blossom into full-blown mechanics. That is not an honourable course to take.

Mr. HARDACRE: There were nearly 100 of them at the Eagle Farm Meatworks.

Mr. MAUGHAN: My old friend, the hon. member for Leichhardt, tells me that there were nearly 100 of them at the meatworks at Eagle Farm. There must be something wrong at the other end for that kind of thing to happen. In one case a man, in order to qualify as an agricultural labourer, went down to Kent hop-picking for a week or two, and then came back to London as a full-blown agricultural labourer, and was accepted by the immigration office in London as such.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Did you reprimand that man for fraud?

Mr. MAUGHAN: I did not. And if I did, the hon. gentleman would be the first to attack me for discouraging immigration.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Not at all.

Mr. MAUGHAN: As a matter of fact a few months ago a large number of Germans were brought out to Queensland—I forget the name of the vessel, but we will hear it again on the Estimates—and out of that number a fair proportion of them were mechanics. I came in contact with some of [5.30 p.m.] those men. For one or two of them I got passes on the railway to Blackbutt, and through an interpreter I discovered that they had been told there was a great opening for mechanics in Queensland. They were not only told that in Germany, but they were also told it at the Queensland headquarters in London—so they informed me.

The HOME SECRETARY: Isn't it a fact that there is an opening for mechanics?

Mr. MAUGHAN: There is no opening for mechanics in Queensland, as far as I know.

The HOME SECRETARY: In my electorate you cannot get them.

Mr. MAUGHAN: If the Minister will go to the office of the Secretary for Railways tomorrow and ask the staff clerk to turn up his staff book, he will find that quite a large number of men are waiting to get into the various workshops.

The HOME SECRETARY: Private employers I am talking about.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Well, I will ask the hon. gentleman to go to the secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The railway service is very seductive.

*Mr. Maughan.]*

Mr. MAUGHAN: Let the hon. gentleman go to the secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers at the Trades Hall, and he will be told by that official that there is no dearth of employment—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: "No dearth of employment"—that is right.

Mr. MAUGHAN: He will be told that there is no dearth of employment, but, not only that, he will also be told that there are a number of unemployed mechanics knocking about doing nothing. I know that such is the case in my own electorate. It is also a fact that there are numbers of men knocking about Queensland at the present time doing nothing.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Are they unemployed, or unemployable?

The HOME SECRETARY: I can assure the hon. member, if he is referring to carpenters, that they can go into my electorate and get any amount of work.

Mr. MAUGHAN: I am not possessed of information with regard to that particular trade. I am referring to mechanics, a term which is always applied to men working in the iron trade. It is generally admitted that the system carried out in the old country in connection with the shipping of immigrants to Queensland is manifestly an unfair system. Only the other day I came across a report in the Brisbane *Telegraph* headed "Immigration. Work for Newcomers. Ministers' Decision." The paragraph is a report of proceedings at a meeting of the Brisbane Presbytery, in the course of which ministers took the Government to task for their action in connection with immigration. The report says—

The Rev. S. Martin, in the course of the discussion, said he thought they might well approach the Government with a view to having the truth told about Queensland. (Hear, hear!) Literature was put into the hands of inhabitants of the old land, painting Queensland in glowing colours, and inducing them to leave decent jobs to come out here to be stranded. (Applause.) One man had told him that he had read such a paper to the effect that he would receive free as much land as he wanted, and the Government would teach him how to work it for a year.

I will not weary the House with long extracts of this sort. There you have a responsible minister speaking at a convention in very clear and explicit language. Another clergyman, the Rev. J. M. R. Dale, said—

They are not doing their duty; they are not doing their duty to the people when they come here. They do not help them once they see them in the Immigration Depot.

We know quite well that, unfortunately, the Government are compelled to assist a great many of these people, because they find themselves stranded when they come here. The Labour party has never objected to immigration, and they do not object now to immigrants coming to Queensland, provided they are brought here under proper conditions and are able to procure work on arrival without entering into undue competition with those who are already struggling for an existence. That is a fair proposition, and I simply repeat that statement to-day. Personally, I have never objected to people coming to Queensland, whether they were mechanics or agricultural labourers, provided that there was work for them when they arrived, and provided they were not attracted to Queensland by misstatements which are a disgrace to the State and to the House which passed the money for immigration. I notice a reference in the Speech to "anomalies in our electoral

law, the principal of which is the unequal distribution of parliamentary representation." We hear a great deal from the head of the Government about his democratic ideals. We are persistently being told by the hon. gentleman that he is democratic, and that he believes in reform "in our time," and yet here, in the year of grace 1910, we have a reference made to "anomalies in our electoral law, the principal of which is the unequal distribution of parliamentary representation." Not a single reference is found to a proposal to reform our whole parliamentary institution. I think the time has come when a Government which professes to be democratic should be bold enough to come down to the House with a proposal to deal effectively with the other Chamber. The great democrat to whom I have referred spoke on this subject to a meeting held at Toowoomba in January, 1908, at which the *Toowoomba Chronicle* says there were over 5,000 people present, and at which the enthusiasm was unbounded. According to the report in the *Toowoomba Chronicle*, this is what the hon. gentleman said on this question—

There are two great aspects to this question: That is the question of the Upper House and the question of the right of your representatives to control the executive government. The question of the Upper House is neither a new one nor is it peculiar to Queensland. The Government in Britain have just the same difficulty with their Upper House. It always happens, after a long spell of conservatism, a progressive Government comes into office, that the Conservatives fall back on this inertia of the Upper House as the last safeguard, as the last means of checking the work of reform. Just the other day at the close of the crisis in Queensland, Lord Tweedmouth, First Lord of the Admiralty, speaking above all other places at the town of Chelmsford, referred to the Upper House, and said it was ridiculous that men simply by right of birth could be able to control and keep in check the elected representatives of a free people. (Applause.) But they have not the right to prevent the elected representatives of the people from carrying out the wishes of the people in Queensland in the government of the country. (Applause.) We were not two months in office when the Upper House commenced to obstruct the work of reform.

There is no occasion for me to read any more of that extract. I have read sufficient to show the change in an hon. gentleman who little more than two short years ago professed such democratic ideals in regard to what was then called "the reform of Parliament." I want to know what is the opinion, not only of the hon. gentleman, but of the Government generally, in this particular respect at the present time. I have no desire to make any unnecessary attack on the other branch of Parliament, because I know quite well that if I did so under existing conditions I should be called to order. But I also know that the difficulty of hon. members of the Legislative Assembly is that legislation that is passed by this Chamber—legislation that is introduced in this Chamber—has practically always to be framed in such a way as to make it acceptable to the other end of this building. The leader of the Government brings down a programme, many provisions of which are very attractive, but what is the good of our wasting hour after hour, day after day, and week after week, over measures that, when we send them to the other end of the building, are going to be smashed to atoms so far as the retention of democratic principles are concerned? It is simply a burlesque. We are simply wasting our time. We might as well close up this building and go home and raise an agitation all over the

[Mr. Maughan.]

country for a referendum to deal with the matter. Hon. members may say that the Bills will be coloured sufficiently and made sufficiently presentable to attract the members of the other branch of Parliament. That simply means the surrender of democratic rights by the members of this Assembly; and I think the time has come when, as the Premier said on that great historic occasion when he sat over here, we should have "government of the people by the people and for the people." I think that time has now arrived, and I trust that before very long we shall have a Government sitting over there who will not only be sincere on this question but will be brave enough and strong enough to deal with the cumbersome institution to which I have referred. We are told, too, that there is going to be a comprehensive Bill dealing with the general question of the liquor traffic, and we are also told by the leader of the Government that it is going to be a non-party measure. We have been told that one or two other Bills to which reference has been made, including the Bible in State Schools Bill, are to be non-party measures. Well, with regard to the Licensing Bill—which we have not yet had the privilege of seeing—I can simply say that anything I can do that will tend to make the people of Queensland a more sober people I shall be most happy to do. I do not say for a moment that they are a drunken people, because according to the evidence compiled in our statistics, according even to the details submitted by the Comptroller-General of Prisons and the Commissioner for Police—which hon. members found in their boxes this morning—we must come to the conclusion that crime in Queensland is practically on the decrease.

Mr. LESINA: All over Australasia, except New Zealand.

Mr. MAUGHAN: That is a subject for great congratulation. (Hear, hear!) At the same time a very urgent requirement in Queensland is to pass reform legislation dealing with the liquor drunk—providing pure liquor for the people. (Hear, hear!) So far as I am personally concerned, it does not trouble me very much. Not that I am a Rechabite or a Blue Ribbonite, although I have every respect for the people belonging to those bodies. At the same time, from evidence in my possession, I say that the quality of the liquor dispensed in hundreds of hotels in Queensland to-day is a disgrace to the administration responsible for the administration of the Food and Drugs Act and of the Health Act.

The HOME SECRETARY: I do not admit that.

Mr. MAUGHAN: The hon. gentleman may think that I am making a personal attack on him, but I can assure him that nothing is further from my thoughts. I am simply dealing with the matter in its broadest sense, and I say that even Dr. Ham, our late Commissioner for Public Health, has drawn attention to this matter in most graphic and glowing terms. For years before he left for Melbourne he urged that something drastic should be done with regard to the adulteration of food and liquor.

Mr. LESINA: Particularly in regard to temperance drinks. (Laughter.)

Mr. FERRICKS: The worst adulterated of the lot.

Mr. MAUGHAN: I do not admit that. But I do sincerely say that if the proposed legislation will do anything to effect reform

in that particular direction I shall be only too pleased to welcome it. (Hear, hear!) Another thing that I hope this legislation will provide for is for a greater controlling influence over the people who run the hotels of Queensland.

The HOME SECRETARY: Hear, hear!

Mr. MAUGHAN: A large number of the people who conduct hotels in Queensland are absolutely unfit to cater for the public requirements.

Mr. LESINA: Hear, hear!

Mr. MAUGHAN: I think I am right in saying that it is very largely the action of these irresponsible people who are put into hotels and told to run them on what are called commercial lines that is responsible for the tremendous agitation against the trade generally.

Mr. LENNON: The "tied house" men.

Mr. MAUGHAN: I wish I was more familiar with the inner business relations which operate in regard to what are known as "tied houses." It is a matter that I have not much experience of, and I can only speak from hearsay; but I come in contact—as no doubt we all do when we are travelling about the country—with members of the Commercial Travellers' Association—men who, like ourselves, have to travel a great deal about the country and sleep in all sorts of places. In speaking to a prominent member of that association the other day he gave me a lot of valuable information. He told me that the Commercial Travellers' Association of Queensland has for years been agitating all over the State for better conditions regarding hotels. As a matter of fact, the association is doing lots of things that even the Government do not do. Let me give an example of the work it is doing for the benefit of people who have to put up at hotels. Every year the association appoints certain of its members as inspectors. It is the duty of these inspectors, when they visit a place in the course of their business, to inspect the various hotels which are registered at the association. They inspect the bedrooms; they inspect the dining-rooms; and they inspect the sanitary arrangements; and if these men find anything which is not in keeping with good taste and common decency, it is their business to report to the headquarters of the Commercial Travellers' Association, and immediate action is taken. I think that is a most excellent idea. Why is it that the Home Department have not similar power? Why is it they have no inspectors of hotels? I think an inspector of hotels is just as important as an inspector of railways.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member knows that hotels are thoroughly inspected.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Will the hon. gentleman tell me that this police inspection as carried on—that the so-called inspection of hotels, is effective?

The HOME SECRETARY: I know many licensed victuallers object to the inspection.

Mr. MAUGHAN: It is not a question of whether the licensed victuallers object to inspection. It is a question whether the inspection carried on by the police authorities is effective.

The HOME SECRETARY: Undoubtedly, so far as we are able under the present Act, and that is the reason of the amendment.

Mr. MAUGHAN: That is what I want to draw out of the hon. gentleman. If the new

*Mr. Maughan.]*

Licensing Bill is going to provide for the more effective inspection of the hotels, then I say it will be a good thing, and the public will welcome it.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes, I think the hon. member will be perfectly satisfied with it.

Mr. MAUGHAN: It is a serious matter. I have no desire to go into details; but every person who has to travel about the country, either on public or private business, and has to take advantage of hotel life, and stay here and there, knows quite well that there are scores of licensed hotels in Queensland that are not fit for dogs to sleep in, let alone human beings.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member knows perfectly well that the licensing bench has power to refuse to grant or renew a license.

Mr. MAUGHAN: We know in many respects the licensing bench is simply a delusion and a snare.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member has put his finger on the whole trouble.

Mr. MAUGHAN: I am very glad the hon. gentleman is affording us a little information—just a little here and there as to what we may expect in connection with this Bill. Another matter in connection with the Licensing Bill—I am not sure whether it will be included, but still I just make passing reference to it, and that is, I hope some provision will be made in the Bill with regard to sly grog-shanties that are allowed to operate to the disaster of many navvies engaged on our railway construction works.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member knows that the Administration has taken action.

Mr. MAUGHAN: I am glad to hear it.

The HOME SECRETARY: They took action at least eighteen months ago.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Why, within the last three days three of the most disgraceful shanties in Queensland were found on the Blackbutt works.

The HOME SECRETARY: Well, they were there before the proclamation was issued.

Mr. MAUGHAN: I submit, whether they were there before the proclamation was issued or not, they are an evil to the community, and they are a danger and a menace to the men on those railway works, and not only that, they are a disgrace to our civilisation. As a matter of fact, I know from my own knowledge that there have been men—strong built men—who have been working on that line reduced to total physical wrecks within a very few weeks' time. Of course some people will say, "Why don't they have sufficient reserve force behind them to prevent them doing this?" We all know what happens on railway construction works, and it is sometimes impossible to repress a man of that sort. At the same time it is in the power of the Government to prevent the cause which produces that result. That is exactly the point I am making.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member is incorrect in saying that. At the present time the Government have no power. If the licensing bench grant a license, the Government has no power to prohibit it.

Mr. MAUGHAN: I am talking about a place where there is no license at all. Those are sly grog-shanties being conducted on rail-

[*Mr. Maughan.*]

way construction works. I want to know whether the police or the Government will tolerate the continuance of that evil.

The HOME SECRETARY: The information in the hands of the hon. member with regard to sly grog-selling has only been placed in the possession of the police within the past few days. The hon. member may be satisfied that action will be taken.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Very likely between now and the next few days the hon. gentleman will be good enough to make inquiries as to whether there are at the present time more than one notorious sly grog-shanty being conducted on the Blackbutt Railway construction works.

The HOME SECRETARY: I will cause the necessary inquiries to be made, and if any hon. member will give me information on the subject he may rest satisfied that action will be taken.

Mr. MAUGHAN: In the interests of the men concerned I feel it my duty, although it is not in my own electorate—that does not concern me—I think if in any part of Queensland there are men being done to death by the terrible results of association with sly grog-shanties, I feel it my duty to ventilate the matter on the floor of this House. Reference has also been made to a question that has caused a good deal of anxiety in Queensland for some time past in regard to the proposed change in our State school system of education. It is not my intention on the Address in Reply, especially owing to the fact that we will have the Bill before the House shortly, to dwell at any length on this matter, but I would just like to briefly say that I regret most sincerely that this is not a matter on which every member of this House is agreed upon. I regret very much to think that all the work done in years gone by by men like Sir Samuel Griffith, Sir Charles Lilley, and the old pioneers of our State secular education system, should be destroyed practically at the instigation of a number of gentlemen who have hardly been in Queensland more than a few years. That is really the position. The matter of pressure by this clergyman or that does not weigh with me one atom. As a matter of fact, I suppose every member of this House is subject to that sort of thing just now. Anyway, I am. I say to every clergyman who asks me to interfere with the existing system of secular education in Queensland—I tell him to mind his own business, as I am not sent to Parliament by any particular class or by any particular creed or church—I am sent to Parliament by the people, and I am here to do my best as a result of giving my pledge on the Labour platform in connection with education—I am here to do my best to maintain the present system intact. Another thing I would just like to briefly say that history—we need not go back to history—we need only look across 16,000 miles to the United Kingdom to discover the evil effects that exist in any relationship between the State on the one hand and the Church on the other. It is that broad question of the relationship between the Church on the one hand and the State as an institution on the other, that I hope, when the Bill comes on, to address myself to. I am very sorry indeed to think that Queensland should be held up by many of its people who are taking a deep interest in this question—that the children of Queensland should have been regarded, and denounced practically, as being irreligious or as godless children. I trust when this Bill is presented

to Parliament—and I am very glad it is not made a party question—there will be a majority of members who will fire it out. We have quite enough important business without Bills of this character. I should like, in concluding my brief refer-

[7 p.m.] ence to the proposed alteration in connection with subjects to be taught to State school children in Queensland, to say that in matters religious it is not right that the majority should exercise power over the minority; and I object most emphatically to the democratic principle of majority rule being applied to any religious matter whatever. With regard to the Police Offences Bill, we shall have plenty of opportunity to speak on that particular measure, so I will leave it for the present. I will just say, however, that it will be a surprise to me if the Bill in its present form receives the assent of this House.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Have you had time to look it through?

Mr. MAUGHAN: I have not carefully reviewed the Bill; but a cursory glance at page 1—the Table of Contents—enabled me to see that the matters dealt with are such as will require ample consideration. There is a paragraph in the Speech which deals with a very important matter—that is, the unsatisfactory condition of the eyes of the children in some of our State schools. That trouble, I may say, is not confined to our State schools, but is of very general application in the Western country. If any credit is due for ventilating that subject in this House, it belongs to the hon. member for Gregory, Mr. Hamilton, the hon. member for Flinders, Mr. May, the hon. member for Carpentaria, Mr. Nevitt, and other Western members who have taken an intense interest in this matter for years past. This is not likely to be a party question. We know quite well that in New South Wales the authorities have found the evil growing to such an extent that they had to cope with it; and I would like to quote a paragraph from a Sydney newspaper giving the result of medical examination and inspection of children attending State schools there. The departmental report was based on the medical inspection made in 1908 and 1909—

The report states that ninety-eight schools in the metropolitan and Newcastle districts were visited for purposes of medical inspection. Of a total enrolment of 66,000 pupils, 14,360 or 21.7 per cent. were presented for medical examination, as suffering from some physical defect likely to interfere with their physical development and progress in school work. No fewer than 57 per cent. were found to have defective vision, 49 per cent. post-nasal growths, and 24 per cent. throat trouble.

If the position is that bad in New South Wales it is more than likely that in Queensland, where there is such a large area of country with a tropical climate, the trouble will be accentuated; and members on this side will endorse any practical proposal that may lead to the alleviation of the physical troubles from which hundreds and hundreds of our children are suffering—not only ophthalmic diseases, but many other disorders resulting from impoverishment of the blood through bad food, improper food, or insufficient food. I trust the examination will not be confined to a few schools in the West, but that a comprehensive examination will be made of the schools in Queensland, irrespective of locality. I now come to a clause in the Governor's Speech which has attracted a good deal of attention on the part of a good many hon. members; and I presume that the hon. gentleman who is responsible for the inclusion of this clause

in the Speech is the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government. It reads as follows:—

I regret that the financial relations between the Commonwealth and the States are not so satisfactory as could be desired. In the conference on the matter held last year the representatives of Queensland accepted a settlement which they did not consider quite equitable to the States, but they knew the occasion called for compromise, and felt that permanency justified some sacrifice. The scheme was submitted to the people of Australia, and, though carried by a substantial majority in Queensland, failed to secure elsewhere the majorities required by the Constitution.

Last year in the Governor's Speech he made a similar declaration when he said—

I am happy to say that an important step has been taken towards securing a satisfactory readjustment of the financial relations between the Commonwealth and the States. No public question in Australia at the present time is of so much importance. On the wise and equitable settlement of it depend the continuance of the Federal system, the financial stability of the States, and the permanence of local self-government in Australia.

We were led to believe by the hon. gentleman and by many supporting him, both outside and inside, that if certain things were not done in accordance with the hon. gentleman's wishes the country was going to the dogs, metaphorically. There was to be a most unseemly and regrettable dislocation of the State finances, and the Treasurer was to be placed in a particularly awkward position. Now, I would just like to make a few passing references to the last Federal election, especially bearing on the financial relations as affecting the States and the Commonwealth. But before doing so I would like to take the opportunity of expressing my astonishment—I won't say disgust—that the hon. gentleman should have so forgotten his high position as Premier of the State as to go round assisting Deakinite candidates, and wherever he went taking advantage of his office as Chief Minister of the Crown by receiving deputations galore and making all sorts of promises to the electors—

Mr. NEVITT: Practically bribery.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Of making all sorts of impossible promises to the electors, both in the North, South, East, and West, which he knew quite well could not be respected when the proper time came to have them fulfilled. At Toowoomba, Allora, Boonah, and many other places, particularly in the farming districts, these promises were made, and I strongly object to any Minister of the Crown usurping his functions of office in the direction indicated. It think it is most unseemly, and it is a thing that ought to be absolutely stopped. Not only that, but we find the hon. gentleman going about and telling the people what would happen if certain things did not take place. Now, the Home Secretary, and the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, also caught the alarm. He went up North and told the people that if certain things did not eventuate, calamity would overtake the country. I have before me an extract from the *Courier* of 27th March, when the hon. gentleman met the electors of Cairns at the Shire Hall, and gave a lucid address—and surely it would be a lucid address—

The HOME SECRETARY: Hear, hear!

Mr. MAUGHAN: On the Federal position. This is what the *Courier* said—

Replying to a deputation from the town council, in regard to the request for a loan for sanitary work, Mr. Appel stated that the possible cause why

*Mr. Maughan.]*

no reply was received from the Treasury was the present unsettled state of financial conditions, which would remain so until the financial agreement with the Commonwealth had been settled. Should the latter be unassented to the finances of the State would be in an absolutely disorganised condition.

The HOME SECRETARY: Hear, hear!

Mr. MAUGHAN: Are they in an absolutely disorganised condition?

The TREASURER: They will be considerably worse by our £1 5s. arrangement.

Mr. MAUGHAN: It will not be difficult to prove, when the Budget is before the House, that the finances of Queensland, not only during the period of the Federal elections, but also on the 30th June this year are really in a more healthy position now than they were before, and at the very time the Premier of Australia, Mr. Kidston, Mr. Wade, Mr. Murray, and the ex-Premier of Australia and the Premier of Tasmania were, with one voice, bewailing and bemoaning the financial conditions which would result if certain conditions did not eventuate, the State Treasurers issued to the public of Australia some of the most tempting looking balance-sheets that were ever presented to the people.

The TREASURER: Wait till we get £300,000 or £400,000 less this next year than we have done before.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Does the hon. gentleman imply that our means of raising revenue are exhausted.

The TREASURER: I tell you we shall get so much less from the Commonwealth.

Mr. MAUGHAN: If he does, I tell him that we have only scratched on the surface in raising revenue in Queensland.

The HOME SECRETARY: What does the hon. gentleman suggest?

Mr. MAUGHAN: The hon. gentleman will get his answer on the Budget Speech. So far as I am concerned I shall be only too glad to give him what little information I have at my command on that subject, but I have something else to deal with just now. To proceed, still quoting the Home Secretary at Cairns—

The matter at the present time is one of the keenest anxiety to the Government as to what the future would bring forth. "I can tell you candidly," he said, "that if the agreement is not carried into effect it will mean that the Government will have to impose additional taxation."

The HOME SECRETARY: Very likely, too.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Are we to understand that the Cabinet are contemplating increased taxation? One of the astonishing things about the present Governor's Speech is the fact that the Cabinet are absolutely silent on the question of a remission of a large amount of taxation that ought to be remitted to the people. Just about the same time, we find the organ of the Government—the *Courier*—in its notes which it used to issue daily to the people of Queensland, making use of the following statement. No doubt these particular election notes were inspired, probably by the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government. Let me quote one or two—

If the financial agreement is not ratified the Queensland Government will have to reconsider its policy of railway construction.

Has it been reconsidered? They are going in for more railway construction than, I suppose, any Government ever contemplated during the annals of Queensland history. Are we to understand that the Government have become lukewarm on that pet subject of theirs—immigration? Are we to understand that the land

[Mr. Maughan.

settlement question is now a thing of the past as regards the Kidston Cabinet? Then it goes on—

For a policy involving heavy expenditure cannot be undertaken while the solvency of the State depends on the whim of the Federal Treasurer.

Now, summarised, those were the opinions expressed by the various Ministers and their supporters throughout Queensland at the last election. Another paragraph is—

Mr. Kidston has warned the people of Queensland that the financial agreement is the most important question ever submitted to them. Do the people wish to see the railway programme cut down, and do they desire to see the increases in the pay of public servants stopped?

And yet, two months afterwards, we find Ministers going about—even the Minister for Railways—and I heard him with my own ears, and other hon. members did the same—going about promising—

Mr. COYNE: After the agreement was thrown out.

Mr. MAUGHAN: After the agreement was thrown out by the people of Australia, we find the Minister for Railways—with hardly time to be in his office from one week to another—going about the country, north, south, east, and west, promising railways wholesale.

The HOME SECRETARY: Don't you get the credit for it?

Mr. MAUGHAN: I want to show the inconsistency of hon. gentlemen during the election compared with the attitude they have taken up since the election.

Mr. COYNE: Instead of cutting down the railway men's wages they have increased them.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Of course. Now, the very best guarantee that Queensland will receive fair play as regards the finances is the fact that the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth is a Queenslanders himself.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MAUGHAN: There is no more influential man in Australian politics to-day than Mr. Andrew Fisher, and he is backed up by a party that is most desirous and anxious to do well, not only by the Commonwealth, but by the various States that have sent their majority in.

The TREASURER: Then he will remove the anomaly that Queensland has to pay 2s. more than any other State.

Mr. FERRICKS: You agreed to it.

Mr. MAUGHAN: We find the hon. gentleman, when replying to the leader of the Opposition, still bemoaning the financial conditions which would eventuate in Queensland, and yet only a few days previously he had cabled home a special message to be read at a Queensland dinner in London, as follows:—

Sir Thomas Robinson read the following message from the Queensland Premier (Hon. W. Kidston), as follows:—

The whole State is enjoying unprecedented prosperity, a continuance of which is assured by the present copious rains. Railways opening up timber and mineral country, and making available large areas suitable for agricultural settlement, are being constructed rapidly. A preliminary examination of the route of the proposed transcontinental railway, from a point south-west of Charleville to the State border near Camooweal, is now proceeding. Land settlement is increasing rapidly and finances are satisfactory, and the financial year will close with a surplus.

The finances are satisfactory. That is what he said in his cablegram, and yet the hon. gentleman—

The TREASURER: He was referring to the last financial year.

Mr. MAUGHAN: The hon. gentleman knows quite well that when the Premier sent that cablegram he was referring to the position which Queensland occupied on that very day.

Mr. COYNE: And its prospects.

The TREASURER: He was referring to the last financial year.

Mr. MAUGHAN: He said in his cablegram—

Land settlement is increasing rapidly. The finances are satisfactory.

And so also says the Treasurer. Then why all this bewailing and calamity howling? And he concludes the cablegram with the words—

The financial year will close with a surplus.

The TREASURER: That shows that he was referring to last year.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Then where is the argument of the head of the Government? After all this everlasting reference to the unfriendly and unbusiness-like relations between the Commonwealth and the States with regard to the finances—

The TREASURER: You overlook the fact that we are only getting £730,000 instead of over £1,000,000.

Mr. MAUGHAN: What I am doing is to show the absolute inconsistency in the statements of Ministers and others during the Federal election compared with the actual position which Queensland is enjoying at the present time, as laid down by the Premier's own cablegram sent to London.

The HOME SECRETARY: What would be the effect of our getting a bad season?

Mr. MAUGHAN: I hope the hon. gentleman is not going to ask me to assume the rôle of Jeremiah. As a matter of fact, what with the utterances made by the Premier, the Home Secretary, the junior member for Brisbane North, and others during the last Federal election, I do not wonder that people were frightened. We find the Chief Secretary Speaking at Allora on behalf of the hon. member for Cunningham, and during that speech he referred to the question of State debts. This was on the 23rd of March, and the Premier said—

In referring to the State debts question, Mr. Kidston said he thought that there was too much importance paid to it, as it really could not operate for about thirty years. It would not, as some people thought, interfere with the working of the State Parliament or their power of borrowing, or of carrying on public works. If he thought it would, he surely would not be there to ask them to vote "Yes" on the question. In the matter of the State debts, it was preferable to have one Commonwealth stock instead of five or six different State stocks, and if carried out properly the conversion of the State stocks into one Australian stock would result in advantage. The amendment they were asked to sanction had nothing to do with the States borrowing for public works whenever they wanted to. The taking over of the State debts did not loose them for their responsibility, and it did not mean the taking over of the railways. The only practical way of taking over the State debts was to take them as they fell due. Therefore, as he had said, it would be a long time before the matter would operate. But he asked them to believe that their voting "Yes" in the matter would be a step in the right direction.

Then Mr. E. H. Macartney, speaking in the Alliance Hall, Woolloongabba, on the 2nd March, said—

There was ample evidence that the Labour party leaned strongly towards unification, and he doubted

very much if Queensland's experience of federation had been such as to warrant her extending the Federal powers. It was imperative that they preserve to the States every right they possessed, for it was a matter of bread and butter. In regard to the States debts referendum, Mr. Macartney held that it was inadvisable to further extend the powers of the Commonwealth in this direction, and he pointed out the great importance of preserving her borrowing powers to a State like Queensland, where so much required to be done in the way of railway construction and development. (Applause.)

Then we find the Premier at Toowoomba making use of the following statement, on the 1st of April of this year:—

If they wanted to make a socialistic experiment in Australia, let them send the Labour party back to power.

Mr. COYNE: Hear, hear! They took his advice.

Mr. MAUGHAN:

If they wanted the policy which Mr. Deakin had placed before them given a fair chance to be carried out, send the Deakin party back to power. But don't, in the name of common sense, vote for a man of one party and vote for a man of the other. Let them have one or the other. He would rather see the Labour party in power—"hear, hear," and applause from the back)—than a mixture of parties in the Federal Parliament, which made the real power of Government impossible.

Mr. RYLAND: That is what they have done.

Mr. MAUGHAN: That is just what they have done.

The HOME SECRETARY: Is not that reasonable?

Mr. MAUGHAN: Absolutely reasonable.

The HOME SECRETARY: Then what are you complaining of?

Mr. FERRIGES: Because your Premier has been crying ever since.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Because the Premier's remarks the other night, and on every conceivable occasion, even in addressing the Chamber of Commerce, show that he is one of the most inconsistent politicians that we have in Australia at the present time, to use the mildest possible word. If Queensland is suffering from any disabilities as a result of federation, it is the fault of those statesmen who in years gone by failed to see that Queensland was represented at the various conventions, and who absolutely ignored Queensland's best interests when the Constitution was being framed. That is the view which I hold, and it is the view held by many hon. members in this House and in the Federal Parliament representing this party. It is interesting to know the views expressed by the great "Thunderer," the old Conservative organ *The Times*. What the hon. the Premier of Queensland would not do, it was left to an old influential Conservative newspaper in London to do, one of the oldest papers in the British Empire, and that was, to give credit to the Fisher Government in the following terms:—

London, 9th July.

The *Times*, in discussing the new Commonwealth Ministry, remarks that it seems to have gained the public confidence in an unusual degree, which is greatly due to Mr. Fisher and his colleagues avoiding the unusual things which the critics predicted they would introduce.

What did these critics anticipate? They knew quite well it would not be done, but they said during the Federal election that if the Labour party were returned to the Federal Parliament with sufficient strength, a wholesale period of confiscation would commence, and it would end in a general devastation setting in all over the land. There would be absolute

*Mr. Maughan.]*

ruin. All industries would suffer, and as a consequence there would be in every part of Australia serious industrial and commercial trouble. I quoted an extract from a speech by the Premier with regard to unification. If there is any body of men who are out-and-out unificationists it was the State Premiers of Australia themselves. As a matter of fact, the agreement is worth quoting to refresh the memory of hon. members. Let me quote one or two clauses—

1. That to fulfil the intention of the Constitution by providing for the consolidation and transfer of State debts, and in order to ensure the most profitable management of future loans by the establishment of one Australian stock, a complete investigation of this most important subject shall be undertaken forthwith by the Governments of the Commonwealth and the States.

This investigation shall include the question of the actual cost to the States of transferred properties as defrayed out of loan or revenue moneys.

As a matter of fact, the more one reads the speeches made, the more one reads the financial agreement which was concocted and agreed to by the State Premiers, the more one must come to the conclusion that those gentlemen were the most dangerous unificationists, in disguise, that we had in the States. Now, what is the Premier's real trouble?

Mr. COYNE: Fisher and his party are in power.

Mr. MAUGHAN: It is not because the financial agreement was rejected. That does not trouble the hon. gentleman. [7.30 p.m.] It is not because of the Federal note issue. That does not trouble the hon. gentleman. It is not that the Federal Government used the trust funds for a few paltry days. That does not trouble the hon. gentleman. The real trouble is that there is a strong Labour Government at present ruling the destinies of Australia, and ruling in such a way as to bring the greatest credit on every man in that Ministry and every member concerned in that party. That is the Premier's real trouble. The real trouble is that the Liberal party were annihilated. And even the ex-Prime Minister himself had one of the narrowest escapes from defeat of anybody throughout the whole Commonwealth at the last Federal election. These are details that are troubling the State Premiers of the various Australian States, who exerted their utmost influence to try to capture the Australian Parliament for the purpose of running that great institution on Conservative lines. During the last election it was frequently said by Ministers and other members opposite that the labour question had been practically settled. One Federal candidate, Mr. Macrossan, said it was "as dead as Julius Cæsar." While we have practically seen the end of the Polynesian traffic, I should like to point out to hon. members that there are other labour troubles besides the Polynesian labour trouble—that there are other coloured alien labour questions which will attract attention in Australia before very long. In a newspaper, a Labour newspaper published at Mackay, called "The Pioneer," there is a report of a speech delivered by the Hon. Mr. Bamford, the Labour candidate for the Herbert. That gentleman quotes from a speech delivered by Mr. Swayne, the junior member for Mackay, at a certain conference held at Cairns some little time ago, when the hon. member is reported to have said that 35,000 men should be brought from New Guinea or the South Sea Islands to work the sugar industry in the North. Does that look as if

[Mr. Maughan.

the coloured labour question is permanently settled—that it is "as dead as Julius Cæsar"?

The TREASURER: When was that said?

Mr. MAUGHAN: It is mentioned in the report of a speech delivered by Mr. Bamford on the 7th January, 1910.

The TREASURER: But when was it said by Mr. Swayne?

Mr. MAUGHAN: I mention this fact as a warning to Ministers, because it is no use, ostrich-like, hiding our heads in the sand and saying that there is no coloured labour question in Queensland at the present time. According to Mr. Bamford, coloured aliens are employed at the following mills:—

Mossman ... 2	Muirgrave ... 3	*Hambledon ... 43
Bonna ... 6	*Goondi ... 21	Mima ... 9
Sunaysia ... 7	*Maciade ... 32	Mourilyan ... 42
Steiglitz ... 1	*Victoria ... 28	Jagan & Albert ... 4
Pioneer ... 36	Pemberton ... 10	Kaamia ... 31
Waterloo ... 6	Playstowe ... 1	Windermere ... 8
Rossvale ... 10	Farleigh ... 37	*Homebush ... 31
Palms ... 13	N. S. Wales ... 14	Cattle Creek ... 7
Grand total, 402.		

\* C.S.E. Co.'s mills.

Farleigh was in one of the premier positions. There were fifteen Japs and a conglomeration of half a dozen other "esc," which was a pretty mixture.

I am not attempting to go deeply into this subject. I simply mention these facts with the one object of reminding the House, and through the House the country, that it is not a bit of good for the Premier and his supporters to jump to the conclusion that this great coloured labour problem is settled. As a matter of fact, we have a powerful party in Australia at the present time who, if they had sufficient power, would reintroduce the Polynesian traffic into Australia, and would work the industries of our vast Northern territory with coloured labour. Consequently, it is to be expected that the Labour party and the Federal Labour Government will maintain its prestige by keeping at the top of its platform the maintenance of a white Australia. I am very sorry to notice that there is no reference in the Governor's Speech to the very important question of hospital reform. Some two or three years ago, I think, a promise was given that this matter would be dealt with; in fact, a Bill was introduced dealing with the reorganisation of the hospital system, more especially in Brisbane. I hope that the Government, if ever they bring in a Bill to deal with this question, will introduce a measure to nationalise our hospitals. The hon. member for Brisbane North, Mr. Forrest, and other hon. members, are keenly interested in hospital management. Only a few months ago, when numbers of members of our party were in Townsville, a general desire was expressed by men of all shades of opinion that the sooner our hospitals were nationalised the better it would be, not only for the country, but also for the patients treated in the hospitals. The Brisbane Hospital is the most important hospital in the State, and what do we find with regard to it? On the 14th September last year the medical officer reported that the accommodation at the institution was inadequate to meet the demands made upon it, and I suppose the medical men would say that that remark applies to the hospital at the present time. Here is an extract from the *Telegraph* on the subject—

The medical superintendent of the Brisbane Hospital desires to notify the public that until there is some abatement of the pressure upon the accommodation of the hospital, only the most urgent cases can be admitted. For more than twelve months past the demand upon the hospital has been excessive, but now it has reached a point

that strains the resources to the utmost. Yesterday there were 274 patients under treatment. The absence of a properly equipped hospital for infectious diseases is rendering the strain greater than it otherwise would be. It is impossible, under the present conditions, to isolate these cases effectively.

What is the position of the hospital at Toowoomba? This is what the *Darling Downs Gazette*, a newspaper in which the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba, Mr. Tolmie, is very much interested, said on the 13th July, 1910—

The report of the visiting committee as presented at the meeting through Mr. Godsall discloses such a state of things that the wonder is the committee have so long allowed the condition to exist. In speaking of the nurses' quarters, Mr. Godsall said: "The accommodation given to the nurses was a disgrace to the hospital and Toowoomba. There were at the present time twenty-one nurses in the institution, fourteen of whom were sleeping in seven rooms, the largest of which was 13 feet by 12 feet; two nurses in a small room off the medical ward in the main building; two in one room, 13 feet by 8 feet, in the infectious hospital; and one in the servant's room there, and at times the night nurses, coming off duty at 6 a.m., had to go into the bed just vacated by a nurse going on day duty, and *vice versa*. During the past twelve months no less than fourteen nurses had been off duty ill for longer than a week at a time, and in many instances up to eight weeks, no less than four having contracted typhoid and one diphtheria, and, in his opinion, a good deal of the sickness amongst the nurses could have been avoided or at least lessened if proper accommodation and rest so necessary had been supplied to them.

That is not from a Labour paper, but from a recognised Conservative newspaper which circulates in the city of Toowoomba. Much as I favour the establishment of a University—much as I believe that University will do good—yet I consider that the question of establishing the hospitals of the State on a solid foundation, and on some system commensurate with humaneness and up-to-dateness, is of more urgent importance than even the establishment of a University, or a good many other things that we shall be asked to discuss during the present session. I trust that even at this late hour the Government will see their way clear to introduce a Bill which will have the effect of placing our hospitals in such a position that they shall meet with modern requirements. I also notice a paragraph in the Speech dealing with the safety of workmen in our mines. Representing a coal-mining district, as I do, this reference affords me a great deal of satisfaction. If the Bill is of such a character as will appeal to me and to hon. members sitting on this side, then I wish it may pass, because anybody who takes sufficient interest to examine the reports of the Under Secretary for Mines and the mining inspectors—and I trust hon. members will read the report for this year—will be simply alarmed at the large number of accidents that take place in our mines during the year. If we were at war with any country and half a dozen of our soldiers were killed by the enemy, we should have big headlines in the papers bemoaning the fact that a few of our soldiers had been killed. But week after week brings with it its victims in the shape of miners mangled, or, if not mangled, they are sent out of the workings almost corpses with all sorts of diseases, the result of bad ventilation and that sort of thing. The time is ripe for some drastic legislation which will have the effect of making the conditions of the men engaged in our mines much better than they have been in the past. Reference is also made in the Speech to the fact that—

The Estimates for the current year, framed with due regard to economy and to the requirements of

the public service, will shortly be laid before you. It will be found that liberal provision has been made for improving the position of a large number of the lower-salaried employees.

We have had that before, and, sometimes while the statements may have been made by responsible Ministers that due provision has been made for the low-paid employees, yet in the administration of the votes the men who have been supposed to get increases have not got them. I hope that when Parliament passes the votes in the current Estimates the specific sums voted for certain works and services will be properly expended, and that the permanent officials will carry out the wishes of Parliament. I suppose that hon. members on both sides have for years heard complaints from men in the Railway Department and in other branches of the Public Service which show that the men have well-founded grievances—that they have been promised their classification rises, that they have received communications from the heads of their departments to the effect that their cases would be considered when the Estimates were passed, and yet, in spite of those promises, there was nothing in them—they were simply so much smoke. I have no desire to go into details with regard to matters affecting my own district, as I shall have an opportunity of doing that in detail on the Estimates. I can honestly say that if the state of things with regard to unfulfilled promises which operates in my district also operates in the districts of other hon. members, then we shall have to cast a good deal of doubt upon that paragraph in the Speech until we discover that the promise there made has been really carried out. If there is any branch of the service that can well afford to pay suitable remuneration to the workers employed in it, it is the Railway Department. According to published returns, we find that out of a total revenue for the year just closed of £5,100,000, the Railway Department was responsible for no less than £2,318,000, or nearly one-half of the total revenue of the State. I suppose this statement emanates from the Minister who supplied the information—

In the Treasury returns published in yesterday's issue, the total revenue for the State for the year ended 30th June is set down at £5,119,254. Of this sum the Railway Department contributed £2,318,523, or nearly one-half. The tremendous increase in the revenue of this department may be realised better by comparisons than by actual figures. According to the annual returns of the Treasury for the year ended 30th June, 1904, the revenue of the Railway Department for that year was £1,296,960. These figures show that in six years the revenue of the department has increased by no less a sum than £1,021,622, or by nearly 100 per cent. For the twelve months ended 30th June of this year, a sum of nearly £5,000,000, included in revenue, expenditure, and loan money, must have passed through the Railway Department. This sum is nearly equal to the whole revenue of the State.

And yet we have this miserly policy being pursued. I am sure that it is one of the hardest experiences of hon. members to have to go to some of the permanent heads of the Railway Department and beseech them to give the workers in the service the miserable dole of 6d. a day more. The trouble is that if the Government discover that an employee has broken a regulation they are mighty quick in bringing him up with a round turn, although unfortunately many of our State departments do not stick to their regulations with regard to the classification increases which should be given to employees. However, we shall hear more

*Mr. Maughan.]*

of that later on I hope that all these black headlines that we see in the newspapers—"Increases of Salaries to Government Employees—over £100,000 absorbed"—will turn out to be true this time. If we pass the money in this Chamber, that money should go to the men for whom it is intended, and not find its way into other votes, as has been the case in the past. Another thing I am surprised at, after the Premier's cable to the Agent-General in London the other day about the glorious seasons, the increased revenue, and the general prosperity, and the revenue surplus, is that there is no indication in the Speech that we are going to have any remission of taxation. The hon. member for Cunningham, the hon. member for Fassifern, the hon. member for Rosewood, the hon. member for Aubigny, and other hon. members profess to represent the farmers.

Mr. THORN: What is wrong with them? You were trying to do something in my district the other day, weren't you?

Mr. MAUGHAN: I did something.

Mr. THORN: You told a lot of lies.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Unfortunately I had the temerity to visit a place called Crow's Nest, and I must say that I also had the temerity to form an industrial union there, and I can assure hon. members that the conditions prevailing amongst the timber-workers in that great wealth-producing district were a disgrace to any part of Queensland. If it is a lie to tell those people that the Labour party were behind them to a man to try and improve their conditions, by legislation if we can do it—if that is telling lies, I do not know what the hon. member means.

Mr. THORN: I do not mean in that respect—I mean in other respects. I'll let you know.

Mr. MAUGHAN: I shall be very glad to hear. Now, I want to know what hon. members representing farming districts are going to do with the Treasurer in regard to this remission of taxation. There is nothing in the Speech about remitting all those obnoxious forms of taxation so worrying to the farmers. The hon. member for Fassifern knows quite well, and the hon. member for Rosewood knows quite well, that in their electorates there is one continual cry on the part of the farmers against all this iniquitous and pin-pricking taxation.

The TREASURER: Would it not be well to wait for the Financial Statement?

Mr. MAUGHAN: May I ask the hon. member whether it is anticipated in the Budget? If so, I can assure the hon. gentleman I shall have the greatest pleasure in immediately passing to some other matter.

The TREASURER: How are you going to meet the drop in the Commonwealth returns if you remit taxation?

Mr. MAUGHAN: The hon. member is not going to draw me off the track. The farmers object to the tax under the Dairy Produce Act, the Diseases in Stock Act, Plants Act, high railway freights and high railway returns, and I would just like to read an extract from a newspaper that circulates amongst the farmers. This is a paper printed and published in Rosewood, and this extract is from an address delivered at a certain farmers' meeting held there not very long ago. It says—

It is also proposed to pass legislation repealing various taxation Bills now on the statute-book. These petty taxes are annoying and vexatious in

[Mr. Maughan.

their incidence, and very little revenue is derived from their imposition. They mostly concern our rural population, and consequently a considerable number of our inhabitants, who are property-owners or freeholders in the towns, escape from the provisions of these enactments that are sought to be repealed.

We know quite well that, in addition, there are a great many other equally irritating forms of taxation which we express the hope the hon. gentleman at the head of the Treasury will see his way clear to have eliminated from the statute-book of Queensland.

The TREASURER: What do you propose in their place?

Mr. MAUGHAN: I assume from that remark that the hon. gentleman admits that he has a difficulty in discovering where the extra revenue is to come from.

The TREASURER: We have to make up £300,000 or £400,000 which we will receive less from the Commonwealth.

Mr. MAUGHAN: If the hon. gentleman will repeat that interjection in his speech, or in the Budget debate, I have no doubt some hon. members on this side will be able to show him in what way we will be able to raise a good deal more revenue.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The TREASURER: There is no doubt about that.

Mr. KEOGH: Tax the absentee.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Is there no better remedy? A most drastic measure that would succeed in driving millions out of the country if it was adopted, would it? I do not think so. The Government state that if we taxed the absentee it would drive all the money back to London, to Paris, or to Berlin, or some other place. (Laughter.) It would never do to tax the poor struggling absentee. (Laughter.) As if Queensland was depending on the absentee. (Laughter.) As a matter of fact, Queensland is depending on the men and women who are engaged in building up the great industries we have heard so much about from the hon. member for Townsville this afternoon.

Mr. KEOGH: Tax the bachelors.

Mr. MAUGHAN: I am very glad to see the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba in his place, because I have to touch on a matter I think it just as well to discuss when he is in his place, more particularly in relation to the question of railway construction. The hon. member is very interested in railway construction, I presume. He was not too keen on the via recta proposal, but I know he is particularly warm on the matter of the Drayton deviation. I can assure the hon. member that the Drayton deviation question has played a very important part in the deliberations of this House, and on more than one occasion the Drayton deviation has almost settled the fate of the King's Government, and what is more, I believe it is going to settle the fate of the present Government unless they get it. (Government laughter.) That is not my opinion—that is the opinion of a newspaper of which the hon. member is owner, and was written on the 6th July, 1910. After referring to all the advantages to the State such a work would be, the *Darling Downs Gazette* winds up as follows:—

For the present we have done with the deputation. But attention must be given to the reply of the Minister.

I hope the Secretary for Railways is listening.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Oh, yes.

Mr. MAUGHAN: The article goes on—

It is vacillating, vague, indefinite. He has promised a survey along the route suggested by Mr. Bins. When pressed to say when that survey would be made he was most indefinite. The most information that could be elicited was that it would be carried out when a surveyor was available, which might be this year, next year, or never. That reply may be quite sufficient for the purposes of the deputationists, but it is not one that will commend itself to the electors of Drayton and Toowoomba, who are sick and tired of having this matter dangled before them, apparently for election purposes.

I appeal to the hon. member for Toowoomba—

It is a reply that will hardly be satisfactory to the Parliamentary representatives of the constituency, who are, by the act of the Minister, placed in an extremely invidious position.

Now here comes the rub—(laughter)—

If they do not press for the construction of this line they leave themselves open to the charges of dereliction of duty, and an absence of sincerity in their professions. If they do press for it a disagreeable situation may arise. The position the Government have created for their supporters is both awkward and unpleasant.

I take it that is a clear mandate to the Government to be up and doing. (Government laughter.) It is all very fine for hon. members to smile, but I can assure hon. members that the Drayton deviation is a matter of national importance. (Hear, hear!) If we are to judge by the article—an extract from which I have submitted to the House—if we are to judge from that we may expect some very interesting episodes before long. At any rate, I hope the hon. member whom I have named will insist upon the Drayton deviation taking precedence of the transcontinental railway.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Why not have them both?

Mr. MAUGHAN: Another matter I would just like to briefly touch upon is this: I want to see as much material for our local works, particularly as regards iron works, constructed in Queensland as is possible. I say the time has come when the Government should cease importing iron work that can be manufactured in Queensland.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MAUGHAN: On all sides we hear it asked by anxious parents—"What is to become of our boys?" And we know that as far as Queensland is concerned we

[3 p.m.] have merely scratched at the iron industry so far; and it appears to me, having regard to our great coal supply, and our excellent water supply so far as some of our larger towns are concerned, we are going to have a great iron industry. I hope we are; and I think it is the duty of the Government to encourage the building up of a great iron industry in Queensland. I cannot understand the attitude taken up by the Premier some time ago when it was understood that we were going to indent dredges that could easily be made in the State. It is on a par with the extraordinary action of the Government some time ago in importing locomotives involving a cost of £60,000, in connection with which the taxpayers had to find no less than £20,000 in freight, every penny of which could have been saved to the taxpayer by a little more sympathy on the part of the Administration. That magnificent structure, the Victoria Bridge, was manufactured in Queensland; the superstructures of the Indoo-roopilly Bridge, the Fitzroy Bridge, the Sadler's Crossing Bridge, are all standing monuments to the splendid work that can be done by our own artisans. And if they are capable

of turning out work of that character, surely we can build a few tin-pot dredges and locomotives. And what is more, it will have to be done.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: It is being done.

Mr. MAUGHAN: I heard a good deal of discussion in Townsville when I went there in connection with the Labour Convention, and it was my pleasure to come in contact with individuals who took a keen interest in the industries of the North; and I can say without fear of contradiction that there is a growing feeling in the North in favour of a much more up-to-date system of ocean mail steamer communication than exists at the present time. The hon. member for Townsville referred to decentralisation, and I think the time has come when there ought to be a good deal more decentralisation.

Hon. R. PHILP: We want the Ipswich workshops at Townsville.

Mr. MAUGHAN: If a proposal were made to have State workshops at Townsville and Rockhampton, here is a member who would vote for it. I would be only too glad to do so, because the present arrangement is absolutely absurd and involves the department in enormous unnecessary cost.

Hon. R. PHILP: Having the workshops at Ipswich?

Mr. MAUGHAN: Bless my life! we know quite well it was the settled policy of the Government of which the hon. member for Townsville was a member to establish State workshops at Ipswich, but I don't think any member ever expected that was going to be the only State workshop in Queensland. I hope the time is not far distant when a State workshop will be established in Townsville, and also in Rockhampton. I think it would be a business-like proposition, having regard to the large development of the Northern and Central districts. It was my first visit to the North, and I was impressed beyond measure with its wonderful capabilities.

Hon. R. PHILP: The impression does not last—that is the trouble.

Mr. MAUGHAN: I don't know why the hon. gentleman should say that. Here is a paragraph from the Townsville *Bulletin*—

The present "one way" service from London to Brisbane, calling at the North Queensland ports, is, no doubt, of some benefit to the trade and industry of this part of the State. But assuredly it does not provide more than a fraction of the benefit which North Queensland would receive if there were direct steamship communication to as well as from London. It is a success as an immigration service and as an import service. It would be a still greater success if it were also an export service.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It is only a question of cost, like everything else.

Mr. MAUGHAN: If it is a good business proposition, it is worthy of the consideration of the Government to see if they can meet the desires of the people.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Have they had any difficulty with their exports?

Hon. R. PHILP: No, none.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: None whatever.

Mr. MAUGHAN: I notice with regret that there is no reference in the Speech to a Trade Union Bill, and I think the need for industrial reform legislation is apparent to most hon. members. And having regard to the fact that some years ago we had a Bill

*Mr. Maughan.]*

promised, and passed in this House, dealing with trade disputes, why is it that the Bill is shelved? The Premier delivered a strong speech in its favour, and I cannot understand why it is shelved. Is it because hon. members anticipate trouble at the other end of this building? Why should the people interested in industrial unionism in Queensland be deprived of a measure which is manifestly fair and equitable? The unions are only asking for the adoption by this Parliament of a measure that has passed not only the British House of Commons, but one of the most conservative institutions in the British Empire—the House of Lords; yet we are told that it is not a convenient time to introduce it here.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: All things come to him who waits.

MR. MAUGHAN: The hon. member knows very well it is not introduced because there is a danger of it not being passed elsewhere; but I think the time has come when we, as representatives of the people, should demand that legislation of this kind should become law. A Trades Disputes Bill is not there, and an Eight Hour Day Bill is not there. I have already referred to the fact that the Nationalisation of the Hospitals Bill does not appear. Arbitration and conciliation is not there, and I do not think we have a Bill promised to secure pure food. Now, the meaning of it all is this: That if the State Parliaments of Australia, and Queensland in particular—which is behind a good many of the other States in regard to legislation of this character—are not a great deal quicker in bringing about industrial legislation in the direction I have indicated, there will be a public feeling aroused throughout the whole of Australia for the Federal Government to take over the whole of the industrial legislation of Australia. That is what it will come to, and personally—although I am by no means anxious that further powers should be given to the Federal Government at the present time in regard to this particular phase of legislation—yet if we are going on year after year in the way we have been going on, and these requests are not satisfied—then I shall certainly change my attitude, and be one of those who will most strongly urge that the Federal authorities should take over all our industrial legislation. I cannot understand the Premier's attitude in connection with this matter. Not very long ago I remember that the Treasurer, the leader of the Labour party and the Opposition, Mr. Bowman, myself and also the Premier, attended a very interesting function held in Queen-street, the occasion being the annual dinner of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers. As those hon. gentlemen will remember, the Premier made a very strong speech in connection with industrial unionism—I won't quote it just now, but the whole tone of his deliverance was absolutely in favour of such a Bill as I am talking about. He was most anxious, so he said, to put the unions of Queensland in a proper position. He was astonished, he said, to think that the Railway Department took a certain stand with regard to the payment of union rates of wages. He said that he would rectify these things, but I am sorry to say that these things are not rectified, and I can only venture to hope that Bills of the character I have referred to will yet find their place on the business-paper of this session. There is plenty of time to do the work.

[Mr. Maughan.]

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Not if we all make speeches as long as you.

MR. MAUGHAN: It is very rarely that I indulge in long speeches. The hon. gentleman, at any rate, may be good enough to give me credit for that. I rarely take up the time of the House very long, but, seeing that there were many matters which I consider to be of public importance on which I felt it my duty as a representative of the people to discuss, I hope the hon. gentleman will not think that I am unduly long.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Hear, hear!

MR. MAUGHAN: But I will say this: While there are no doubt a few Bills on the business-paper which is now before Parliament well worthy of discussion, yet I do say, in all sincerity, that the Bills which I have referred to to-night, more particularly the Hospitals Bill, and also the Pure Food Bill and the Trades Disputes Bill, are measures which could very easily have found their way on the business-paper we are considering at the present time.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FORSYTH (*Moreton*): We have listened to the very interesting speech of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, and no doubt a good deal of the matter he has discussed is well worthy of consideration. A good deal of what he has said I believe in, and a good deal I do not believe in. Before discussing any questions, however, I wish to congratulate you, Sir, on the position you now occupy as Deputy Speaker, and I am sure that while you are there you will be just and impartial to every member of this House. I sincerely hope that the Speaker, who is now on a bed of sickness, will soon be able to resume his duties in this House. I am also delighted to see my friend, the leader of the Opposition, so much better than he was at the end of last session, and I believe that I convey the sentiments of everyone in this House when I say that we hope that the gentleman will soon be in his accustomed robust health. I am very pleased indeed to see that he is getting better. I have also to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply on their excellent speeches. There was plenty of good sound stuff in them, and any quantity of sound common sense. I was glad to notice that the leader of the Opposition gave these gentlemen credit, although he could not agree with everything they had said. The hon. member for Ipswich appeared to be somewhat perturbed at a telegram which was sent by the Premier to the Agent-General in London in connection with a dinner held there, and he could not understand why he was complaining about the finances of the State, seeing that in that telegram he stated that everything was flourishing, that the State was in a most prosperous condition, and that he hoped to have a surplus—as he had. But, as was interjected by the Treasurer, that was not a question at all about the finances of last year—our trouble is how are we going to get on this year. I should have liked the hon. member to have given us some information as to how we are likely to be able to square our finances in the present year; or, perhaps, someone on that side will be able to tell us what we should do in connection with legislation. The only thing I have heard come from that side to assist the Government in regard to finance is a land tax.

MR. McJACHLAN: And you will get something in addition to that, too.

Mr. FORSYTH: But, if we had a land tax on to-morrow, it would not bring in anything like the amount of money that will be necessary to carry Queensland over this present year.

Mr. LESINA: It will bring something in.

Mr. HAMILTON: If we had a State one, you might not have a Federal one.

Mr. FORSYTH: We have one now, really. The only difference between Queensland and New South Wales, where they have a land tax, is that if there is land in New South Wales which is lying idle, and the unimproved value of which is £300, the people who own that land have to pay the tax—that is all the difference. If we have got land here lying idle we don't pay the tax; but if we have land that is utilised, and from which a rental is derivable, we pay a land tax just the same as they do in New South Wales, through the income tax.

Hon. R. PHILIP: We pay more.

Mr. FORSYTH: Yes, we pay more. On property, the income tax is 5 per cent. It is really more than the land tax. We profess to be the friends of the farmers, as my friend opposite says, and we think the farmers of Queensland are quite heavily taxed enough already through the local authorities. Many of these men have to pay a very stiff amount. There are farmers in Moreton who have to pay £18 or £20 a year in rates, yet hon. members on the other side, who are supposed to be the friends of the farmer, want to impose more taxation, so as to take more money out of the pockets of the farmer. Our friends opposite say the way to get it would be to put a land tax on so as to give them cheap land. That is the great cry of the Labour party.

Mr. LENNON: A very good cry, too.

Mr. FORSYTH: It is a splendid cry, but there is absolutely nothing in it. (Government laughter.) I am going to argue the matter in the hope that I will be able to convince men who are open to argument. Now, New Zealand has got the heaviest land tax of any country in the world, because she has really got two land taxes which at the present time bring in a revenue of between £600,000 and £700,000 a year. The cry of the Labour party in Queensland has been that if you put on a land tax it will bring about cheap land for the farmers. But what is the experience of New Zealand to-day? Her experience, with her two land taxes, is that land is too dear there, and the people are coming from there to Queensland to-day in order to get the cheaper land here.

Mr. LENNON: There is a scarcity of land in New Zealand, and they come to Queensland, where there is a bigger area.

Mr. FORSYTH: Of course, some members will always give a reason of some kind.

Mr. LESINA: But that is the reason.

Mr. FORSYTH: No; the reason is that a great many people who wanted to buy land for farms find that they cannot go in for farming with the price of land as it is. It would not pay them to do it, and they are leaving New Zealand and coming to Queensland.

Mr. LESINA: Land in New Zealand is too dear to devote to farming. There is also a lot of land in Queensland too dear for farming purposes.

Mr. FORSYTH: The fact remains that the people are flocking to Queensland.

Mr. NEVITT: You cannot give them the land.

Mr. FORSYTH: Of course, we are delighted to have these people coming here, because the land is cheap here and they settle down amongst us. If anyone will take the trouble to find the value of agricultural land, grazing land, or any other kind of land in Queensland and compare it with the price of land of similar quality in New South Wales or any of the other States, they will find that it is much cheaper in Queensland, and that is the reason why we get such numbers of people coming here from the other States. We see in the papers every day almost that herds of people are coming here from the other States, because the land is cheaper here.

Mr. MULLAN: Is land cheaper in the Moreton?

Mr. FORSYTH: In some places it is cheap. I quite agree that economic conditions which apply to everything else should also apply to land, and that if there is a high demand for land and only a small supply, that the price must go up. But in Queensland we have got plenty of land, and we are only too delighted to see people from the other States settling amongst us. I know that in the Moreton, the electorate which I have the honour to represent, a number of farmers from New South Wales have settled there. They are the right class of farmers, as they have gained their experience in New South Wales, where they lived for many years. They sold their farms in New South Wales and came to Queensland with their capital and their experience and settled amongst us. They are now bringing out the wealth of the soil and assisting in the development of this great State. The more men of that class that come to Queensland the better will it be for us. Our friends opposite are entirely against a policy of immigration. They say that they are not against people coming here, but they are against the Government assisting them to come here. They say, "Let them come here themselves if they wish to, but we object to the Government assisting them." The leader of the Opposition, the other day, said he would like to see the £50,000 knocked out that was put down for immigration. With regard to that item, I consider that is one of the very best ways of spending the money of this great State. We have any quantity of land in Queensland, and we hear so much about the sparsely populated districts, and we will hear a great deal more about the sparsely populated districts when we come to consider the Redistribution of Seats Bill. Our friends from the far-away places say that it is not right that members should represent huge areas of land with no population, and the very men who say that are the very men who complain about our bringing immigrants to this country to fill up those vacant places.

Mr. MANN: You are bringing them all to Brisbane; you will not allow them to land in Cairns.

Mr. LENNON: About 70 per cent. of them come to Brisbane.

Mr. FORSYTH: The other day I asked Mr. Brennan, the officer in charge of the immigrants when they come out here, how many people he had in the dépôt just now, and he said, "Not one." These people have all been absorbed and utilised in some way. With regard to the men who come here who are agricultural labourers and who want to take up land, I say that the best way for them

*Mr. Forsyth.]*

to do is to take a billet for a year or two until they know what are the conditions of the country, and when they do that they will be in a far better position to take up land than they are when they first arrive here.

Mr. MANN: They will not allow them to land in Cairns.

Mr. FORSYTH: Perhaps the reason they will not let them land in Cairns is because Cairns is represented by my hon. friend. (Laughter.) Queensland is in a prosperous state at the present time, and we are all delighted to see that that is so. There was never a time in the history of Queensland when she was so prosperous as she is now.

Mr. FERRICKS: They are paying white men 4d. an hour up North. That does not look like being prosperous.

Mr. FORSYTH: If they are paying men 4d. an hour, it is rather small pay to give any man, and there must be some special reason that a man should be asked to work for such a rate.

Mr. FERRICKS: In all the sugar-mills.

Mr. FORSYTH: Whether that is so or not, members must admit that the country is prosperous. What is the cause of it? Some say that it is because the Premier is in his present position in Queensland. It is a fact that ever since the Premier has been a Minister of the Crown, right up till to-day, Queensland has had great seasons. That is true. If we could get an assurance from the Premier that he would continue to give us good seasons, I would say let us keep him there for all time.

Mr. LENNON: And failing that assurance?

Mr. FORSYTH: If we could only get that assurance, then the country would be bound to progress. All our industries are flourishing at the present time. I have spoken to contractors who employ carpenters, and men who employ bricklayers and other mechanics, and they say that they cannot get sufficient men, although they are paying good wages. Everyone will remember the terrible time we had in the drought period, and how it crippled our finances. Hundreds of people were going about looking for work, and out at Toowong, where I live, a carpenter whom I always engaged to do carpentry work for me when I needed it, told me that he was glad to work for 5s. or 6s. a day. He was a really first-class workman, and that was what he told me. One of the results of prosperous times in Queensland is that it has increased wages. I remember when members sitting on the opposite side railed against the Government of some years ago for spending so much money on railways in the bad times. They were accused of spending money right and left when times were bad. But what was the result? That Government had faith in Queensland, and the spending of that money kept hundreds of men in employment during the bad times.

Mr. HAMILTON: What railways were objected to? Only syndicate railways.

Mr. FORSYTH: If the hon. member looks at the Financial Statement which I have here he will see where the money was spent on railways some years ago by the Government then in power. They used to spend £1,000,000 a year—and to-day we are feeling the benefit of the money spent on those railways.

Mr. BOWMAN: It was your present leader who condemned that Government for spending the money.

[Mr. Forsyth.

Mr. FORSYTH: I am not discussing the question of any leader, but the Government of that day was blamed and railed against by members of the Labour party, and yet the

railways are the best paying assets [8.30 p.m.] of the Government to-day. Mr.

Airey was one of the members who used to rail against the Government at that time. As a matter of fact, it was the very best policy the Government could have adopted. We are all satisfied and pleased to find that the country is so prosperous, and I am sure every one of us hopes that the country will remain prosperous for many years to come, as it is good for the pastoralist, for the farmer, for the storekeeper, for the publican, and for everybody. The more prosperity we have in Queensland the more will people be induced to come to the State. The three things that the Government believe in are a vigorous immigration policy, a vigorous land settlement policy, and a vigorous railway policy. The result of the closer settlement policy of the Government has been particularly satisfactory. During the last year the Lands Department has closely settled more land than has ever been settled in a single year before in Queensland, and the revenue from this source increased by £80,000. I have to congratulate the Minister for Lands upon this splendid achievement, for it is a splendid achievement. I honestly believe that at no distant date instead of getting £700,000 odd from our land in a year we shall get £1,000,000. The more people we have settled on agricultural farms, on grazing farms, and grazing homesteads the better it will be for Queensland. The settlement of so much land is a magnificent achievement for the department, as close settlement is one of the finest things for the country. All the big areas will have to be cut up into smaller blocks, and the more the large areas are subdivided the more intense will be the cultivation and the greater the wealth we shall get from the soil. The results of the administration during the year just closed shows what is the policy of the Government in this respect. We saw that 150,000 acres of land in the Burnett district were sold in one day, and if there had been 150,000 acres more it would have been sold. That shows that when we have land available the people will take it up. I believe the Government are engaging every surveyor they can lay their hands on for the purpose of cutting up land for settlement, which is a proof of their practical interest in this matter. Last year the area taken up for closer settlement increased by 1,000,000 acres. There is certainly a slight decrease in the area taken up as agricultural farms and grazing farms. In 1908 the area taken up as grazing farms was 607,000 acres, while in 1909 it was only 541,000 acres. The area taken up as grazing homesteads in 1908 was 55,000 acres, and in 1909 it was 39,000 acres, showing a small decrease. But when we come to grazing farms, and more especially grazing homesteads, we find that there is a large increase in the area selected, and it is most gratifying to note the increase in grazing homesteads, because under that tenure a selector has to reside on his land. The area taken up under those tenures doubled during the last year. In 1908 the area taken up as grazing farms was 2,500,000 acres, while in 1909 it increased to 3,114,000 acres—an increase of 655,000 acres in twelve months. In grazing homesteads there is an enormous increase. The people who take up land under that tenure get priority, the condition being that they must live on the land. In 1908 only 870,000 acres were taken up under this tenure.

while this year 1,509,000 acres were taken up. So that last year closer settlement under those two tenures increased by over 1,000,000 acres, and that, I contend, is one of the reasons why Queensland is so prosperous to-day. The Government have done splendid work in connection with their land policy, and I hope that policy will be continued. The revenue received last year was £353,000 more than was estimated by the Treasurer.

Mr. MANN: And the Government spent £307,000 more than they expected to spend.

Mr. FORSYTH: The hon. member will get the other side of the question in a minute. I say that the revenue increased by £353,000 during the last twelve months, and it is quite clear that if the Government continue to increase their revenue in that way they will be doing good business. But while recognising that the revenue has been increased, we must not forget that they raised the expenditure very considerably. I will come to that aspect of the subject presently. But I want now to speak of another item, which I consider one of the principal factors in the great prosperity of Queensland. The hon. member for Ipswich spoke just now about the railway policy of Queensland. Well, I may point out that the railway revenue last year increased by £208,000. The revenue from railways last year was £2,318,000, and in 1908 it was £2,100,000. That is particularly satisfactory. Our railways are doing well, and we are building more railways all the time. So long as we can get anything approaching 3½ per cent. on the money invested in railways we are doing good business. There are places, however, where it would be foolish to build a railway, particularly some mining centres. Take the Croydon Railway as an illustration. That line has never paid. The Government built that railway, no doubt, believing that it would pay, but Croydon is now practically deserted. There is nothing doing there. It is a very sad thing to think that the place is practically deserted, but such is the case, for there are only a small number of people living there now, and they cannot make the railway pay. The line does not pay working expenses, much less interest on the money invested, and the reason is that the railway runs through a part of the country that is no good. The land is utterly useless. If mining centres were situated in places where there was good land, then, when the mines failed, the miners could take up land in the vicinity and make a living on it, but they cannot do that at Croydon, and the consequence is that the railway in that district is a very heavy drag on the State. That is a line I would have allowed a syndicate to build. The same thing applies to the Mount Elliott Railway. The land between Cloncurry and Mount Elliott is no good.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: What about the land beyond?

Mr. FORSYTH: There is some good land beyond, but the land between Cloncurry and Mount Elliott is no good at all. If that particular mine does not pay, the railway will be a great burden upon the State. While I have always believed in the principle of the Government building railways for the purpose of opening up agricultural districts, pastoral districts, and timber districts, where there is a big risk of the Government losing heavily by a railway going to a mining centre which to-day may be prosperous and in a few years may be done, they are not wise in building such a line.

Mr. FERRICKS: But a syndicate will not build a railway to such a place.

Mr. FORSYTH: They do it sometimes. How much have the Chillagoe Company got out of their railway? They have opened up an enormous extent of country, and they have found employment at good wages for a large number of men in their mine and on their railway, but they have not made a single shilling since they started. The Chillagoe line pays, but the mine does not pay, and, when you add the expense of the railway to the expense of working the mine, the shareholders have not received any profit, and they are not likely to do so for many years to come, because they have an enormous debt of debentures which they have to pay off before the shareholders are likely to make a profit. I make no objection to the Government building railways, but I do not think they should risk their money in building railways like that.

The TREASURER: They are a great assistance to the State lines.

Mr. FORSYTH: No doubt the Cairns Railway benefits very much by the building of this particular syndicate railway. The hon. member for Ipswich spoke of the increased returns from our railways as compared with the returns of a few years ago. Comparing the receipts for the year just closed with the receipts for the year 1902-1903—the last year of the great drought—in seven short years we have received £1,073,000 more than we received in that year. That only goes to show what good policy it is for the Government to go on building railways. I suppose that at the very outside there are not more than 250,000 workers of all sorts in Queensland out of a population of only 570,000. Yet, in spite of that small population, this Government, and previous Governments, have seen the force of rushing railways out in all directions, to open up timber districts, agricultural districts, pastoral districts, and to-day that small population has a larger mileage of railways than any other State in Australia. It is an achievement for which the Government deserve every credit. New South Wales, with about three times our population, has not as great a mileage. Victoria, with two and a-half times our population, is going behind all the time. It only shows that if we want to develop this country as we are developing it on sound lines, we must continue to build railways into places where they are badly wanted. The hon. member for Townsville made an excellent speech to my way of thinking. It was full of good, sound common sense, and I believe that if the Government only act upon his suggestion with regard to railways it will be doing good business for Queensland.

Mr. MULLAN: Particularly as regards his remarks about the sugar industry.

Mr. FORSYTH: With regard to his remarks about the sugar industry, I entirely approve of the principle laid down by the hon. member for Herbert the other night. I believe, as the hon. member for Townsville said, that no matter what Government is in power in the Commonwealth Parliament they must continue to protect the sugar industry, even after 1912. The people of Australia will not permit any Government to allow that magnificent industry to fall to pieces. (Hear hear!) Therefore, my fears are not the same as those of the Premier with regard to building mills in places where there is plenty of good land—places where, as in the North, the industry is likely to pay, because there are no frosts, although they have grubs. I believe that in such localities money spent in that direction will be perfectly secure.

*Mr. Forsyth.]*

Mr. FERRICKS: Prod the Premier along a bit.

Mr. FORSYTH: Members on this side are not bound to follow the opinions of any hon. member. We are allowed to hold our own opinions in regard to matters of this kind, and I am giving utterance to my own opinions now. I believe it will be a good thing to open up the rich lands of which the hon. member for Herbert spoke—the richest lands we have got—where you can have intense cultivation, and where you can settle a large number of people. If the Government bring forward a proposal to expend money in that direction, I am going to support them. But whilst I believe in that, I cannot forget that we have a very hard row to hoe during the next twelve months in connection with our finances. With regard to the transcontinental railway, I heartily approve of that—I do not care what route it takes. The hon. member for Gregory has been over a great deal of the country, but I suppose the hon. member for Townsville knows more about Queensland than any other man in it. He has travelled over more of it than any other man. I have travelled over a good deal of it too, and I say that the country out West, while it is in a dry belt, is good land, which can be utilised to advantage in raising cattle and sheep. Sheep especially can be profitably raised there once railway communication is provided.

Mr. LENNON: Where will you get the money if you are not going to get as much revenue?

Mr. FORSYTH: The hon. member knows that railways are not built out of revenue, but out of loan moneys. The same thing applies to the sugar-mills, whose construction he advocated the other night. If the hon. member argues that the money for either sugar-mills or railways should come out of revenue, then I would be dead against him; but as the money comes out of loan, it does not affect the revenue except so far as interest is concerned. As a matter of fact, the people who want railways have to guarantee 3 per cent. to the Government.

Mr. HAMILTON: There will be no guarantee for the transcontinental railway. You cannot expect to build it on those terms.

Mr. FORSYTH: Although hon. members opposite assume that members on this side know all about the Government proposals, I do not know what the Government propose, but I assume that the Railways Bill which is to be introduced will contain their scheme. I can quite understand the argument raised by the hon. member for Gregory. I say we want to wait and see what this Railway Bill is. It may have a provision whereby it will be built without a guarantee, which, as it is a large district sparsely populated, would be a burden on those people. We have to wait and see the Bill. I am sure the hon. member agrees with me—he knows the country well—that a railway built out there would be of enormous advantage to Queensland. It would open up a large area of country fit for sheep and assist in settling a large number of people. If I thought for one moment, as was mentioned by the leader of the Opposition, that the transcontinental railway was going to block the building of railways for closer settlement—as feeders from our lines to timber and agricultural country—then I certainly say I would never build it. I would not vote for the railway if it was going to be the means of blocking other railways, but we have the

[Mr. Forsyth.

assurance of the Premier, in reply to the hon. member, that such a thing would not take place.

Mr. BOWMAN: It is not the first time we have had an assurance from him which has not been kept.

Mr. FORSYTH: If we have an assurance, I feel certain it will be carried out—it is practically a matter he is bound to carry out.

Hon. R. PHILP: It is in the hands of the House.

Mr. FORSYTH: It would be a most unwise policy on the part of the Government not to continue building lines to agricultural and timber country. Nearly every hon. member has a railway in his pocket. The hon. member for Ipswich referred to a line between Woodford and Kilcoy. I think everyone knows who has dealings with business people and contractors—they know the demand for timber in Queensland is enormous.

Mr. BOWMAN: Kilcoy is the best part of the district.

Mr. FORSYTH: I quite agree with what the hon. member says. I have been told by one or two large sawmillers that at the present time they have orders on hand for several million feet of pine, and they cannot get it. I was speaking to a contractor the other day, and he told me he had several large contracts at the present time, and he simply could not get on with his work because he could not get pine—he has to wait for it.

Mr. HARDACRE: That is not because there is not plenty of pine—it is because the sawmillers won't sell.

Mr. FORSYTH: It is not a question of pine—it is a question of no means of getting it.

Mr. HARDACRE: Yes, there is; but the millers will not sell.

Mr. FORSYTH: Oh, yes, they will, but we know that the men have cut all the pine near the railways, and then they have to go further and further back, which means far more work, and that is one reason why the large sawmillers cannot get pine. As a matter of fact, it is not a question of selling the timber, it is a question of getting it, because the demand at the present time is far greater than the supply. It is the duty of the Government, now that timber is scarce, to run lines so as to get that timber trade. In connection with the line from Woodford to Kilcoy, which was mentioned by the hon. member for Ipswich, and which he thoroughly approves of—as a matter of fact, the Government themselves got a report from one of their own officers, along with another man in the district, as to the quantity of timber in that district, and if hon. members saw the report the Secretary for Railways got, they might honestly say it must be greatly exaggerated. It runs into hundreds and hundreds of millions of feet of timber, and a great deal of that timber cannot reach market unless a line is run out, and that is one reason why lines should be built to the timber districts, because the demand is so great that sawmillers cannot overtake it.

Mr. HAMILTON: Do you think it will cheapen timber to the public?

Mr. FORSYTH: I do not know, because, like everything else, there is that economic law which is as hard as iron.

Mr. HAMILTON: The timber ring.

Mr. FORSYTH: I know nothing about the timber ring. What I say is this: When the demand is so much greater than the supply, up goes the price. You cannot get timber, and I say it is the duty of the Government to build railways into centres of that kind to get that latent wealth.

Mr. BOWMAN: And establish their own sawmills too.

Mr. FORSYTH: I do not think it would be a wise thing for the Government to establish their own sawmills. I think it is far better to have individual enterprise. I can tell the leader of the Opposition this: That if that line were taken from Woodford to Kilcoy, we would have plenty of sawmills, and the land, after the timber was taken off, would be used for agricultural and dairying purposes. All that means settlement, and I therefore hope the Government will build that line. The people there are willing to give a guarantee, and I say the Government should assist them to get settled on the land. Another point: that particular part of the country was land that practically belongs to the State. There were two estates repurchased there—Durundur and Mount Kilcoy; the Government settled people there. I do not say the Government promised them a railway, but those people distinctly understood they were going to get a railway, and at the present time they are struggling very hard to get a living. I can assure you nothing would give me greater pleasure than to see this line extended in that district, because it will be the means of alleviating a great deal of trouble that these poor farmers have to put up with at the present time. I am not referring to my own electorate particularly—the same thing applies to other electorates. There is another railway which they have been advocating for in my electorate for the last twenty-five years—that is a line from North Pine to Humpybong. That is a splendid seaside resort for commercial and business men, and it would be a splendid thing for the poor tired politicians of this House. (Laughter.) When the trouble was over they could go down to Humpybong, which is one of the finest watering places in Queensland, and anybody who has been down there knows it. They have one of the finest beaches in Queensland. (Laughter.) There are several people who are willing to build tramlines from the present line. For instance, one is wanted from Buderim Mountains to Palmwoods. Then there is another wanted from Terrors Creek to Strathpine. That is in all large centres of population, and the people are willing, if the Government will give the money, to take the responsibility of building those lines, and I say the more feeders we have to the main lines the greater will be the revenue derivable by the Government in connection with the main lines. The hon. member for Cairns, when I was referring to the revenue derived from the various departments last year, also referred to the expenditure. There are always two sides to a question, and while we have an increased revenue of £353,000, we also have a large increased expenditure of £357,000, so that practically the increased expenditure more than wiped out the whole of the increased revenue.

The TREASURER: You do not object to that?

Mr. FORSYTH: I can assure the hon. gentleman that if he brings in the Estimates this

year on the same lines—if he is going to spend money on the same ratio as he did last year—he will soon find himself in a very [9 p.m.] unenviable plight. We shall have

a heavily decreased revenue from the Commonwealth Government this year, and it is the duty of the Government to set their house in order and prepare for the bad times coming. It should be their endeavour to pay twenty shillings in the pound—to make the revenue cover the expenditure. The Treasurer tells me that he is going to do so, and I hope he may. If he can do so, it will be good business, especially if there is no further taxation. Any man may have an estimate at the beginning of the year, but something may occur to upset his estimate. He may get a good deal more revenue than he anticipated; but if he spends more than the increased revenue will provide for, he will not be as well off at the end of the year as he should be. The main increases in expenditure have been in the Railways, the Home Department, the Lands, the Chief Secretary's Department—

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Railway expenditure is not taxation. We have to earn our revenue.

Mr. FORSYTH: I am aware of that. The more miles of railway that are open, the greater the expenditure. In connection with the matter of expenditure, I wish to refer to our financial relations with the Federal Government. This is a very important matter. I remember when the present high tariff was imposed, a great many Labour members said it would naturally have the effect of reducing the amount of money to be received from Customs and Excise; but I believe the expansion of the States will be the means of getting much more from Customs and Excise, especially when one-half that revenue comes from spirits and tobacco. During the elections a great many Labour members stated that we must not expect a great deal of revenue in that direction; but during the last twelve months ending in June, in spite of those prognostications, the Federal Government received from all sources, including Customs and Excise, an increased revenue of £1,000,000. The previous year it was £14,500,000, and last year it was £15,500,000; and that increase was due to a large extent to the increase in Customs and Excise revenue—an increase of £787,000. We have heard a great deal about the Commonwealth deficit and the £450,000 which the Commonwealth Government kept back. I think it would have been better if Mr. Fisher, instead of keeping the money back, had consulted the State Premiers, because the money did not belong to the Federal Government. In connection with the agreement, the various Premiers last year estimated the big deficit of £1,200,000, and agreed, in the event of £1 5s. per head being put into the Constitution, to pay the one-half of the £1,200,000—that is, £600,000. But what did Mr. Fisher do? Did he take the half? No; he made them pay the lot.

Mr. RYLAND: Only £400,000.

Mr. FORSYTH: When Mr. Fisher went into the matter he said to the States, "We will make you pay the lot."

Mr. FERRICKS: £200,000 less than you offered to pay.

Mr. FORSYTH: That is correct; we were willing to pay the £600,000 if the agreement was put into the Constitution.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Why?

Mr. FORSYTH: Because it gives us the greatest permanent security we can get. The population of Queensland is going to increase,

*Mr. Forsyth.]*

and if it increased by 20,000 a year, at the end of ten years Queensland would be getting £250,000.

Mr. HARDACRE: Mr. Fisher is carrying out his agreement with the electors.

Mr. FORSYTH: I say that instead of taking half the amount he is taking the lot, and I say it was an unwise policy on his part. It is only a paper entry. Will any hon. member tell me that to keep back £450,000 that is due on the 30th June, simply in order not to show a deficit, and then pay it over on the 15th July—will any hon. member say that is good finance? I say it is a wrong thing to do. It was not a business transaction, and it should not have been done.

Mr. HARDACRE: It was to save a loan.

Mr. FORSYTH: Did it save a loan? Has the money been paid yet? Has the Treasurer received the money yet?

The TREASURER: Not yet.

Mr. FORSYTH: I am told that it has not yet been paid. Suppose I have an overdraft of £1,000 at the bank, and because I do not want to show that overdraft at a particular time I get a loan of £1,000 from a friend, and pay that amount into the bank; and suppose I shortly afterwards draw a cheque for £1,000 to repay my friend, leaving my account in debit—is that business? Will any man say it is business? It is not business. No commercial man would do that. It would be a false entry. The States, according to Mr. Fisher's own figures, should have got £8,491,000. They did not get all that money, and now we are going to get a great deal less. I am quoting my own figures in this matter, because I am giving a bigger estimate than the Federal Government. They estimate that £3,720,000 will be needed for the financial year; I am saying £3,770,000—£50,000 more. If you take the estimated number of people in Australia as 4,375,000, at £1 5s. a head, you get a sum of £5,468,000, and then the States have to pay, under the agreement, one-half of the amount to £125,000 to be paid to Western Australia. Our proportion of that will be £16,000 or £17,000. Those are Mr. Fisher's figures. The various States of Australia will be handing back to the Federal Government about £3,200,000, and yet they want more. They are going to get £100,000 from the note issue, and more from the special issue from the mint. The Federal Government appear to forget that the States have got enormous liabilities.

Mr. BOWMAN: And yet you are willing to borrow another £10,000,000!

Mr. FORSYTH: They tell the States they are going to relieve them of the debts, but who is going to reap the benefit?

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Are we not people of Australia?

Mr. FORSYTH: We are the people of Australia, but we have to pay the heavy amount of interest. What will be the result? £1,634,000 will still have to be found for interest every year by Queensland. The only thing the States might get some benefit from is by floating loans at slightly less expense; but, as the Scotchman says, "I ha' ma doote." What I want to refer to is as to how Queensland is going to fare. Mr. Fisher says that Queensland's portion was £1,153,000 this year, and his own table of how much we are going to get is within £1,000 of my own estimate. He says we have to get £723,000. If you take off the amount which Mr. Fisher states we are going to get this year from the amount we got last year, there is a deficiency of £430,000.

Mr. COYNE: That is the result of the Treasurers' conferences.

[Mr. Forsyth

Mr. FORSYTH: We do not know what we are going to get, but we presume we will get it, and when we get that money which is held back from us Queensland will then have got £1,100,000. Taking that as a fair estimate—although I believe the Federal Government will increase the revenue very materially this year, as money is being spent in every direction—

Mr. ALLEN: Won't the Labour party ruin the country?

Mr. FORSYTH: No, I do not think the Labour Government will ruin the country.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FORSYTH: It is all very well for some members who are irresponsible to talk, but I believe when the Labour Government shoulder the responsibilities they will quieten down, and not make the wild statements they did before. Now, not only have we to pay that money, but we will have to pay a proportion of £16,000 to Western Australia. We will probably have to lose £25,000 on our note issue. Then there is the proportion of that £445,000, which the Federal Treasurer says is £53,000, and if you add these together, it gives the amount of £450,000 that Queensland is going to get less from the Federal Government this year than we got last. The leader of the Opposition made a statement the other night at which I was very much surprised, and I thought at the time that the hon. member could not have grasped the position from a financial point of view. I have given the figures exactly, without any exaggeration, and I have shown that we are going to lose £450,000 this year; and yet, in spite of that, the hon. member said that if he had been in Mr. Fisher's place, Queensland would have got a great deal less.

Mr. ALLEN: Not Queensland—the States.

Mr. FORSYTH: Is not Queensland one of the States? The most remarkable thing is that when the hon. gentleman made that statement he was "Hear-heard" by members on the other side of the House. How much more does he want to take off Queensland? Does he want to take another 5s.? Yet the hon. gentleman poses as a friend of Queensland. I say that any man who makes a statement of that kind, and the men who sit behind him who "Hear-hear" it, are not friends of Queensland, but the enemies of Queensland. Does the hon. member want to see the finances of the States shipwrecked? He knows that the States will have a very hard row to hoe this year, because, not only have they got to raise this £450,000, but we have been told by the Premier that the Government are going to increase the wages of the railway servants by £100,000. Of course, we know that the whole of the amount will not be charged against revenue, as, in connection with men engaged in construction work, it will be charged to loan; but it may be £50,000 that Queensland will have to find this year.

Mr. BOWMAN: Don't you think the Commonwealth has got a severe struggle also?

Mr. FORSYTH: Oh, yes; the Commonwealth have got a most terrific struggle. (Government laughter.) They have not got oneshilling of a debt, but every State has debts piled up.

Mr. RYLAND: They want to take all your debts from you. (Laughter.)

Mr. FORSYTH: Mr. Fisher states that he will carry out the Constitution Act to the end of the year. How wonderfully generous! He cannot help himself, but he is introducing a Bill which means this: That in the second half of the financial year we are in now, I do not think Queensland will get from the Federal Government £100,000 for the whole six months.

He is going to give us £1 5s. per head all round. For the first six months we will get our proportion under the Braddon clause, but he will take every shilling he can from us, so as to only give the States £1 5s. per head for the whole term. This is the generous gentleman from whom we were promised so much!

Mr. FERRICKS: Your own arrangement.

Mr. FORSYTH: As a matter of fact, Mr. Higgs, one of the Queensland Labour members said distinctly that he thought that Mr. Fisher was doing a wrong thing. Mr. Higgs said it was a wise thing to return £1 5s. per capita to the States, but it should date from the 1st of January, 1911, and not from the 1st of July, 1910, as Mr. Fisher proposed. That showed that Mr. Higgs had a good deal of common sense, and he was treating the people of Queensland far better than Mr. Fisher proposes to do. We have heard a great deal about what the Federal Government propose to give to the States. During the elections we heard Messrs. Turner, Macdonald, and Bamford all saying that £1 5s. per head was too much to return to the States, just as the leader of the Opposition said. When Mr. Fisher spoke about the Premiers agreeing to £1 5s. per head—it will be found in the Federal *Hansard* of August last year—he said that the amount was too much to give the States, and that it would cripple the Commonwealth. What does Fisher say now? He says that £1 5s. per head is a fair amount to give to the States. Let us come to Wide Bay, which we had heard so much crowding about. (Labour laughter.) In speaking at different meetings in Wide Bay, Mr. Fisher said again and again that £1 5s. per head was a fair amount, and yet, when speaking in the House of Representatives, he always said it was far too much.

Mr. NEVITT: That was for all time. He always advocated it for ten years.

Mr. FORSYTH: Mr. Fisher said, "We will not be able to pay £1 5s. per capita later on."

LABOUR MEMBERS: That is quite right.

Mr. RYLAND: He mentioned £1 7s. for one period.

Hon. R. PHILP: Then why didn't he give it?

Mr. FORSYTH: Some members said that it was too much to give the States £1 5s., because it would cost £3,000,000 for defence, and £1,500,000 for old-age pensions. It will mean that if the Commonwealth Government continues to take money from the States the States will eventually become insolvent, and then that will bring about unification. I have spoken at length, and do not wish to detain the House any longer, but before sitting down I would like to say a word or two about a question which seems to perturb the Labour party very much, and that is the question of redistribution of seats. Is there anyone in the House at the present time game to say that the proposal of the Government is not a fair one? Is there any member on that side who will venture to say that the electoral basis on which our electorates are framed is a good one where you have large electorates and small electorates with the same representation in Parliament? They cannot say it. We have not had any Redistribution of Seats Bill in Parliament for twenty-three years, and surely it is a fair thing that we should have one now.

Mr. COYNE: Did you advocate that when you were member for Carpentaria?

Mr. FORSYTH: I am glad the hon. member has asked me that, because I can tell him that I did so.

Mr. HAMILTON: In the last session?

Mr. FORSYTH: No; I advocated it in 1904, and again in 1906. Anyone can look up my speeches and they will see it. In advocating a redistribution of seats on the basis of one vote one value I said—and it can be found in *Hansard*—that it would probably mean that I would lose my seat in the House, but I was prepared to advocate it, as it was only a fair thing that it should be brought about. That shows that I was not arguing from a personal point of view, because I felt that if they joined Croydon and Carpentaria together I was done, as I would not be able to poll the necessary number of votes to enable me to retain my seat. I argued that way when I was sitting in Opposition, and I repeat it now that I am on the Government side of the House, that the Government should bring in a Bill to make things more equitable so far as the electorates are concerned than they are at the present time.

Mr. COYNE: Define one vote one value.

Mr. FORSYTH: Surely, if the hon. member believes in the Federal Elections Act he will see there the idea of one vote one value is carried out in regard to the representation in Parliament. A quota is obtained, and each member represents that quota as nearly as possible. That is the principle adopted by the Federal Act, and it should be adopted by the State. The hon. member for Herbert stated the other night that the quota in Queensland would be 3,600 votes, but I say that the sparsely-populated districts should receive a margin of 20 per cent. one way, and the thickly-populated districts a margin of 20 per cent. the other way. That would make a difference of 50 per cent.

Mr. HARDACRE: Forty per cent.

Mr. FORSYTH: Take the quota at 3,600 votes. By adding 20 per cent., or 720 votes, on to that number, it would give 4,320 votes, which would be the quota for the thickly-populated districts, according to the hon. member for Herbert. Take the 20 per cent. off the 3,600, it would leave 2,880 votes. The difference between the 4,320 and 2,880 would therefore be 50 per cent. and not 40 per cent., as the hon. gentleman suggests. The hon. member for Herbert worked out a scheme that the Northern districts, which were far away from Brisbane, should be allowed a greater margin than the thickly-populated districts in the State, but his margin was too high altogether. Why, in New South Wales they only allow a margin of 10 per cent. The hon. member for Herbert provided that places over 800 miles from Brisbane should get a margin of one-third. That would mean that Normanby, with 1,500 voters, would only get one-half the percentage that was given to the people of Charters Towers and Townsville. Would that be a fair distribution? The hon. member for Herbert raised the question of getting a deputation quickly to get anything for Brisbane when pointing out the need for more representation for the North. Would the hon. member for Herbert say that the hon. member for Murilla would not have practically the same trouble as the hon. member for Leichhardt in getting up a deputation? Would the hon. member argue that the Murilla electorate would be treated better than the Leichhardt electorate, because one is 500 miles away as against the other 200 miles? The Warrego, with 2,415 electors, is about 500 miles from Brisbane. Would this be more detrimental to the district because of the distance away from Brisbane, as against, say, Normanby, with 1,589 voters? But he knows that the member for Rockhampton, or the member for Charters Towers, or any other member, has just the same voting power in the House as the hon. member for Brisbane. There

*Mr. Forsyth.]*

is a huge population in Charters Towers, with 8,000 electors, and yet the hon. member for Herbert would give them a quota of 33½ per cent. They would be allowed to reduce their quota by that much, and yet places away in the bush would only be allowed one-third just the same. Anyone can see at a glance that the policy proposed by the hon. member for Herbert is utterly absurd and would be most unfair. The hon. member for Maranoa, Mr. Hunter, said that the hon. member for Herbert's scheme was worse than that of the Government, and he was quite right. I therefore hope that the Government will retain the principle of their proposal. I have no desire to see remote and small electorates wiped out altogether. I think they should receive consideration, and I believe they will get consideration under the Bill. So far this session we have got on very well. Our friends opposite have not been so caustic in their remarks as in previous sessions, and I am pleased to note that fact. We all desire to help the people of Queensland, though we may have different ways of doing so. I give members of the Opposition credit for being sincere in their views, and I hope they will accord the same credit to members on this side of the House. If we only have good seasons, a good Government, and good prices for our products, there is no reason why we should not progress and be the most prosperous State in the Commonwealth. There is no get-away from the fact that we are having good times. We hope that those good times will last, and if we only continue a wise policy of close settlement, of bringing people here to settle on the land, and of building railways to enable them to bring their produce to market when they are on the land, Queensland must prosper.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. THEODORE (*Woothakata*): I do not intend to say very much in this debate, but I have a few remarks to offer on the [9.30 p.m.] attitude of the Government and the programme submitted in the Governor's Speech. Anyone who has carefully studied the Governor's Speech will see an inordinate desire on the part of the Government to pander to different sections of public clamour. It contains promises of legislation that are calculated to satisfy the democratic section of the Government supporters.

Mr. BOWMAN: Have they got any?

Mr. THEODORE: I believe there is a section with democratic ideas—a section who have been deluded into giving their support to the Government. Their confidence is no doubt misplaced. They have been promised democratic legislation by the heterogeneous host who support the Government, and I also believe that the hon. gentleman who has the doubtful honour of leading the Government is pandering to them by promising certain legislation which is calculated to imbue them with further false hopes. The Government has also promised legislation which will probably please that section of the community who always have an eye to the public morals, a section who think that people can be made virtuous by legislation. Certain measures promised in this programme seem to me to pander to that particular section who want to revert to the conditions of the middle ages, to tamper with the social liberties of the people, and who have been clamouring for a certain brand of legislation. I speak of that section of the people who hold up their hands in holy horror at any slight transgression of the laws of propriety which they have set up, and who declare that they have a very grave misgiving as to the ultimate fate of all free, open-minded, sport-loving

members of the community. To my mind it is a very reprehensible proceeding on the part of the Government to pander to any section of the community, or to submit to the clamour of any section; they should be actuated by broad-minded motives and act in the interest of all the people of Queensland. The programme submitted to us seems to be a cunningly devised scheme to secure for the Government that confidence which their legislative actions has not been able to inspire. However, if the Government are really in earnest in their proposals, there is a broad field for legislative reform before them. There is any amount of scope for reform in connection with the liquor traffic. I was very pleased to see that not long ago the Government extended for a few more months the proclamation prohibiting the granting of any more licenses on the routes of proposed railways. The hon. member for Ipswich dealt with this question, and I think his remarks were very apposite. There have been tremendous abuses of the liquor trade in Queensland, particularly on railway construction works. There have been abuses of the licensing system, and sly grog-selling has been rampant, as is well known to anyone who has been in districts where railways have been constructed during the last few years. I think more could be done than has been done in the direction of putting down that illicit traffic, and I believe the Government have taken a right step in prohibiting the granting of any more licenses in such places, because the licensing benches do not appear to be fully alive to their responsibility to the men engaged on construction works, and they have granted almost every license applied for. Personally, I am of opinion that before the liquor traffic can be properly regulated it will have to be controlled by the State. Before any lasting good can be done in the direction of removing the numerous evils in connection with that traffic, it will have to be brought absolutely under State control. The experience of Western Australia in regard to State hotels is most inspiring. The State hotel at Gwalia, which was established in 1903, has been very successful in proving what may be done by nationalisation. During the year ending 30th June, 1909, the receipts of that hotel, from all sources, were £10,181 16s. 1d., and the total expenditure was £7,714 14s. 1d., which left a profit of £2,467 12s. The total profit for six years was £12,196 15s. 6d. That shows conclusively what enormous profits are being derived from this traffic, and I think that profit should be taken from private persons and devoted to public uses. Better liquor was also sold at this hotel, purer spirits, and better service is given. The whole experiment has been most satisfactory, and there is no doubt that when the Labour party in Western Australia occupy the Treasury benches they will extend the idea. They do not expect very much from the present occupants of those benches. I would like to see this principle carried into effect in Queensland, and to see at least some experiments in this direction made. As the Government seem very anxious to pander to those who advocate interference with the liquor trade, this would be the most effective method of dealing with it. Let them experiment in the direction of nationalising the traffic, and there is a wide field in which to make the experiment. Why not establish State canteens, or State hotels, on railway construction works, and let pure liquor be dispensed? It would be very much better for the navvies, and at the same time it would be an experiment in the direc-

[Mr. Forsyth.

tion of nationalisation, and of bringing the trade under control. In carefully looking over the Government programme, I find there are practically no proposals that are likely to assist in the further development of the mining industry. The present Government seem to have overlooked the mining industry during the last few years, and to have overlooked the necessity for doing something for it. As was mentioned by the hon. member for Townsville, the industry is in a languishing condition. It is a great industry, and one that has come to the rescue of Queensland many times, yet it occupies the position of the Cinderella of our industries. If properly encouraged, it would again take a foremost place among the industries of the State. I believe the Government should assist the industry by the judicious expenditure of money in the establishment of State batteries, smelters, and so forth. They do not seem to recognise the value of these concerns. The Mines Department is most out of date in this connection. The Western Australian Government have had a most happy experience in the inauguration of State batteries and cyanide plants. During the last few years they have gone in largely for the establishment of these plants. At present they have twenty-two working, and working on a thoroughly commercial basis. We do not ask the Government to establish batteries merely to assist the prospector and miner to crush his ore at the expense of the general taxpayer. We want to see the matter placed upon a business footing. If the Government were enterprising enough to establish State batteries in places where there are no means of crushing stone—and there are any number of such places on our mineral fields—they could crush considerably cheaper than private enterprise, and they would help to develop the industry, and would lose nothing through the experiment. I think this proposition is the solution of the difficulties that now face Queensland in regard to this languishing industry. I could quote a few instances that would serve as illustrations in support of this argument. The Chillagoe Company, a few years ago, went into a district that was very backward in every way from an industrial point of view. It was practically undeveloped. The Chillagoe Company had to face all sorts of difficulties. It went into it with a certain amount of individual enterprise, and after nine or ten years' operations it finds itself in a very fine position. It certainly has not paid dividends, but during all the time it has been increasing the value of its assets, until now the shareholders find themselves in a fairly good position. They have lost nothing by their enterprise, and they have assisted in the development of the whole district. There are districts similar to the Chillagoe district that are yet undeveloped. If the Government would follow the example of the Chillagoe Company, and go into these districts, build railways, and establish reduction works and batteries, or other necessary plants, to treat the various complex ores, they would develop the districts and encourage the industry without placing any extra burdens upon the taxpayers. The Government could also help to revive the industry by subsidising prospectors. They do very little in that direction now. They certainly place a small sum on the Estimates each year to assist prospecting. Last year it amounted to only £2,000. Western Australia, with a very much smaller population, and with very insignificant resources compared with Queensland, have found it very beneficial to place

larger sums upon their Estimates for this purpose. In 1908—the last year for which figures are available—they spent £15,000 in this direction, and the results have been very good. They subsidise prospectors and miners who are doing development work, and they find the money returns to the Treasury through other channels. They lose very little by doing this. I am of opinion that the present Government of Queensland are treating the mining industry in a most niggardly fashion, and evidently quite intentionally. Evidently they know exactly the state of affairs, and they do not feel disposed to encourage the industry. I do not know whether it is because their ideas are out of date or whether they are at a loss to find some satisfactory scheme of encouragement for the industry or what is their motive, but there is no doubt that they are neglecting the industry. I notice in their programme a Mines Regulation Bill. Let us hope that at the end of the session that Bill will not be among the "slaughtered innocents." It is a Bill for which an urgent necessity is felt. We require some legislation better to regulate the conditions under which men work in and about mines, on the surface as well as underground. There are any number of mine managers and mine owners who, while humanitarian enough on general principles, seem to be actuated by a desire to get as much profit from their mines as possible, and while doing that do not give proper attention to safeguarding the lives and health of the men who are employed by them. There are certainly a large number of evils connected with mining. There are dangers to be undergone by the miner, and there are unhealthy occupations connected with mining, and I think that the burden of providing for those men who suffer in consequence of these contingencies should be placed upon the industry. The mineowner should be compelled to make such provision as is necessary to protect the lives and the health of the men who are working at the mines. I think it is urgently necessary that we should have a Bill providing for that, and I hope when the Mines Regulation Bill is introduced it will contain the provisions of which I have spoken. I hope it will also contain some provision in regard to the better inspection of mines—in regard to the appointment of inspectors and in regard to their duties. I hope the Minister will permit the mining members to suggest that mining inspectors should be elected by the men.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. THEODORE: The Minister in charge of the measure could, of course, make certain provision as to the necessary qualifications for inspectors, but I think the miners should have the opportunity of electing them, and they should be made responsible to the men for the proper carrying out of their duties, seeing that so much depends upon the inspector in regard to safeguarding the lives and limbs of the men who have to work underground. I also think more inspectors should be appointed. At present there are very few inspectors indeed, considering the large area of country they have to go over. The inspectors have very multifarious duties at present. I think the duties could be curtailed. They should have nothing to do but look after the state of affairs underground in the mines and on the surface—watching the interests of the men. These should be the main duties of the inspectors of mines. We have merely to look through the recent report of the Under Secretary for Mines to be struck with the appalling

*Mr. Theodore.]*

loss of life, and in some districts the percentage is fearfully high. In one district the percentage of fatal accidents was 1 per cent. of the number of miners employed in the district. The work of miners is very arduous and extremely dangerous, and I think every consideration should be given to this matter. I notice in the Government programme some reference to water supply—a Water Supply Bill. I think it is necessary that we should have some measure such as that. I recognise the great injury that has been caused by the pollution and by the diminution of the water supply, and I think the Government should make some provision for public control. I think the Government is to be complimented on securing the services of such a notable water expert and engineer as Mr. Ellwood Mead, and I hope when they are framing their water supply legislation they will carry into effect the numerous recommendations he has made. He sounds a note of warning against the squandering of artesian water. I think that is an evil that was not recognised by many people before.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It was dealt with by a Bill passed in this Chamber ten years ago, and thrown out in another place.

Mr. LENNON: Some people regarded the supply as inexhaustible.

Mr. THEODORE: Yes; and some people still regard the supply as inexhaustible, and until Mr. Ellwood Mead sounded this note of warning very few—

The TREASURER: The Hydraulic Engineer gave a note of warning in 1901.

Mr. THEODORE: How many people gave credence to that warning? The squatters in the Western country ridiculed the idea, and I think the Government should recognise their responsibility and endeavour to control the water supply. If the suggestion of Mr. Ellwood Mead were adopted, and the Government took full control of all water supplies, both surface and underground, it would be to the interest of the people of Queensland, and the people of the Western country particularly; and I also think, when they are dealing with the subject, the Government should adopt the suggestion that no perpetual rights should be given to any individual. They should limit the rights and not give any perpetual lease to any board or person whatever. I think Mr. Ellwood Mead's suggestions are very much to the point and should be worthy of consideration. I should like to see them become law. No rights of water should be recognised but the right of use. With regard to the redistribution scheme, while I recognise and admit that there are anomalies, as pointed out by the hon. members opposite—particularly the hon. member who has just resumed his seat—I do not admit that the anomalies are so great as those hon. members wish to make out. If we take into consideration the circumstances operating in the different electorates, and the fact that the electorates which have the smallest number of electors enrolled are the electorates which are most distant from the metropolis, and are electorates comprising large areas of country, then we must recognise that the disparity is not so great. When we recognise that those electorates that have about 1,000 electors are very many miles—hundreds of miles in some instances—from the metropolis, and that those electorates which have a large number of voters are within the metropolis, then the disparity does not seem

[Mr. Theodore.

so great. There are greater anomalies in our electoral law calling for more urgent attention than the anomalies pointed out by hon. members opposite. If hon. members on the other side are so anxious for reform in this matter, why do they not advocate the abolition of the Legislative Council? If they are anxious to secure the better representation of the people in Parliament, why don't they abolish the Legislative Council, as they do not represent the people at all? One is struck with the fact that for twenty-three years—since we have had a redistribution of seats—there has been so little disparity between the electorate having the smallest number of voters and the electorate having the largest number.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It is only in recent years that we got one adult one vote. Therefore the greater need for reform.

Mr. THEODORE: When we realise also that the electorates having the smallest number of electors are likely to be influenced by the increasing population and are likely

[10 p.m.] to be in the ascendant, there does not seem to be much urgent necessity for reform in the matter. A good deal has been said in this Chamber in reference to one vote one value. Hon. members on the other side seem to have become imbued with that great principle, though for many years they seemed to ignore it. I would like them to define exactly what one vote one value is. Take the case of an elector in an electorate in far Northern or far Western Queensland—would his vote have exactly the same value as the vote of an elector in the metropolis? If there were 3,000 electors in the far Northern or far Western electorate and 3,000 electors in the metropolitan electorate, would the votes given in the respective electorates have exactly the same value?

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Yes.

Mr. THEODORE: I maintain there is a great difference. I maintain that the electors at Croydon, where there are only 800 or 900 on the roll, are not any better represented—altogether apart from the virtues and qualities of the hon. member representing them—than the electors of a metropolitan electorate with 3,000 on the roll. Nor should they—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You are an accommodating democrat.

Mr. THEODORE: I think my argument can be borne out logically. I think many hon. members will coincide with me in the belief that the interests of the people of the metropolis would be well looked after if they had no direct representation in this Chamber at all; and if you admit that, surely when their votes go towards the election of a dozen or fifteen members their interest must be very much better cared for.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: There are more than material interests to be considered.

Mr. THEODORE: The social and political interests of the electors are the main consideration in getting representation. If it were not to look after the social, industrial, political, and other interests affecting their lives and their means of living, they would not require representation at all. Therefore, I think that in framing this law to provide for the better representation of the people of Queensland, great consideration should be given to area and to distance from the metropolis.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It is—there is a margin.

Mr. THEODORE: It is only 50 per cent., and I think better consideration than that should be given. If an electorate comprises a very large

area, it is almost sure to embrace various industries of such a nature that no one man can be fully acquainted with the wants of each. In the case of my own electorate, the electorate of Woothakata, which is not so very great in comparison with some other electorates, we have an electorate containing about 17,000 square miles, and embracing portions of the sugar industry, the timber industry, the agricultural industry, and the mining industry. I maintain that no one man can represent those divers industries in the way they should be represented. There are a large number of electors on the Woothakata roll, and if there is to be redistribution, no doubt there will be a new seat created somewhere in that locality. I think the area of country should be taken into consideration to a greater extent than 50 per cent. when fixing the quota. I think also that the commissioners should be instructed to see that the quota for the far Western and far Northern electorates should be as low as 1,500, and the quota in the metropolitan electorates as high as 4,000; and consideration should be given to the distance from other cities as well as from the metropolis—the distance from Townsville and the distance from Rockhampton.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. TOLMIE (*Drayton and Toowoomba*): I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Question put and passed.

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

The House adjourned at six minutes past 10 o'clock.

---