

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 18 JULY 1911

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

The SPEAKER: And that in regard to the question of the assent of the Legislative Council to a Finance Bill, it should be returned here before it is presented to His Excellency for the Royal assent. It is held by Hatsell, page 321, and accepted by Sir Erskine May, page 510, vol. xi., that when both Houses have passed a Bill as mentioned in above extract—by Lord Marchmont and Lord Sandys—it is not within the power of any person to withhold it from being offered for Royal assent (or, as they expressed themselves, to take it off the table), and I believe they are right. The message to the Commons is only a matter of ceremony, and not an essential form to the passing of a Bill. Consequently, when the Clerk of Parliaments presented the message to me on Friday last that the Legislative Council had passed the Appropriation Bill No. 1, and knowing that it was your wish that the Bill be assented to at the earliest possible moment, so that the services of the State might be paid, I presented to His Excellency the Bill which had received your unanimous assent, and His Excellency was pleased to give the Royal assent to it.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ASSENT.

The SPEAKER: I have to report that I presented to His Excellency the Governor Appropriation Bill No. 1, 1911-12, for the Royal assent, and that His Excellency was pleased, in my presence, to subscribe his assent thereto in the name and on behalf of His Majesty.

PAPERS.

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

Report, dated 7th July, 1911, from the Auditor-General on Savings Bank securities.

Report, dated 7th July, 1911, from the Auditor-General respecting Treasury bills and notes.

Report, dated 10th July, 1911, from the Auditor-General on the public debt reduction fund.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

ORDER IN CONDUCTING BUSINESS OF HOUSE.

Mr. THEODORE (*Woothakata*): I desire to ask the Secretary for Railways questions 5, 6, and 7, standing in my name.

HON. R. PHILP (*Townsville*): I rise on a question of privilege. Members have got into the habit of rising and asking questions out of their order. It has always been the custom to ask them in the order in which they appear on the paper. The member who is down to ask question No. 1 should ask that question first, and so on through the list. Here we have an hon. member asking questions 5, 6, and 7. The member who has the first question should come first.

Mr. COYNE: Sometimes the member may not be here.

HON. R. PHILP: He is here to-day.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

TUESDAY, 18 JULY, 1911.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL No. 1.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

The SPEAKER: I have to report that I have received the following message:—

“ Mr. Speaker,—

“ The Legislative Council having this day agreed to the Bill intituled a Bill to authorise the appropriation out of the consolidated revenue fund of Queensland of certain sums of money towards the service of the year ending on the thirtieth day of June, 1912, beg now to return the same to the Legislative Assembly without amendment.

“ ARTHUR MORGAN, President.

“ Legislative Council Chamber,
“ Brisbane, 14th July, 1911.”

Mr. MAUGHAN (*Ipswich*): Mr. Speaker, —I rise on a question of privilege. With the permission of the House, I would like to ask the following question: Was it not necessary for the Legislative Assembly to meet for the receipt of the Appropriation Bill from the Legislative Council before it was presented to the Governor for the Royal assent?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: The hon. member for Ipswich, who has this question—as a question arising out of the business of this Chamber—previously notified me that he intended to ask the question. I find that all authorities are agreed upon the question of finance as between the Legislative Assembly and Legislative Council, that the Legislative Assembly is supreme.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: There is no absolute rule with regard to the order of asking questions; but, for the proper conduct of the business of this House, so far as possible members should ask their questions in their proper rotation.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: If they are asked in a haphazard way it is likely to lead to confusion, and it is better to take them in order. I hope that hon. members will do so.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS.

PRICKLY PEAR PEST.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER (*Maranoa*) asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

"1. Will he inform the House when he expects to be furnished with the report of the advisory board appointed to inquire into the prickly-pear pest?"

"2. Will he cause the report when received to be printed and distributed to the House?"

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. E. H. Macartney, *Brisbane North*) replied—

"1. It may be assumed that the board will report as soon as their inquiries place them in a position to advise.

"2. It is intended to make public the results of their inquiries from time to time."

TRAMLINE FROM CHINCHILLA TO TIMBER RESERVE.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER asked the Secretary for Railways—

"1. Is it a fact that the department intend constructing a tramline from Chinchilla to the Government timber reserve in a north-westerly direction?"

"2. Is it not a fact that on the recommendation of the experts of the department rails had been deposited at a point further west with the intention of making that a starting point?"

"3. What is the relative estimated cost of each? When were the rails removed to Chinchilla, and for what reasons has the route been altered?"

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

"1. Yes.

"2. I am not aware of any material being deposited as stated.

"3. (a) No estimate prepared; (b) See answer to No. 2; (c) To secure the cheapest and most serviceable route."

GRANT FOR STANWELL CREEK BRIDGE.

Mr. FOX (*Normanby*) asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

"1. Was a sum of £300 authorised from the public estate improvement fund towards the cost of a bridge in the Tarampa Division, and when?"

"2. On what ground was the same approved?"

"3. Was any application made in respect to a bridge over Stanwell Creek, with what result, and why?"

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS replied—

"1. Yes.

"2. The application therefor was made on the ground that such bridge would afford the principal means of access to lands in the neighbourhood (including certain areas of unsold Crown lands), and that such Crown lands would be

benefited thereby, and was approved in 1907. The amount of the advance was made a charge against the Tent Hill Improved Estate.

"3. Informal applications were made to the Premier and to the Home Secretary for a general grant towards a bridge, but no application has been made to the department for the application of the public estate improvement principle to such bridge. From the information available to me at present, I am unable to suggest that there are sufficient unsold lands affected to warrant the belief that a fund can be created to provide the advance desired, but if application is made in the usual way full inquiry will be made and consideration given to it."

REWARD FOR DISCOVERY OF "YONGALA" WRECK.

Mr. FOLEY (*Townsville*) asked the Chief Secretary—

"In the reward offered by the Government for the discovery of the wreck of the s.s. "Yongala," was any time limit fixed for such reward?"

The PREMIER (Hon. D. F. Denham, *Oxley*) replied—

"Yes. The period within which the reward can be obtained expires on the 31st of July, current; but the question of extending it will receive consideration."

REPORT ON PORT DOUGLAS-MOUNT MOLLOY AND CAIRNS-KURANDA RAILWAYS.

Mr. THEODORE (*Woothakata*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

"Will he have a report made by competent engineers (not in the Government service) upon—

(a) The advisableness and probable cost of a railway from Port Douglas to Mount Molloy; and

(b) The stability or otherwise of the Cairns-Kuranda Railway?"

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS replied—

"It is not considered necessary to go beyond the engineers already in the railway service."

COST OF REPAIRING CAIRNS RAILWAY.

Mr. THEODORE asked the Secretary for Railways—

"1. What was the cost to the department for repairing the damage to No. 10 Tunnel, Cairns Railway, during last wet season?"

"2. What was the cost to the department for maintenance and repairs on the Cairns-Kuranda Railway from 1st December last to date?"

"3. What does he estimate will be the total cost to the department for maintenance and repairs on the Cairns-Kuranda Railway from 1st December last, until it is restored to its original condition?"

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS replied—

"1. £11,223.

"2. £36,572—excluding No. 10 Tunnel, but including ordinary maintenance, as well as damage by rain.

"3. £61,200."

PROPOSED EVELYN RAILWAY EXTENSION.

Mr. THEODORE asked the Secretary for Railways—

"Is it his intention to introduce early in the session a Bill authorising the extension of the Evelyn Railway to Cedar Creek?"

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS replied—

"The Government's intentions in this direction will be disclosed in due course."

REPORT OF SCOTTISH COMMISSION.

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

"1. Has the Government received the report of the Scotch Commissioners?"

"2. If so, will members be supplied with a copy of same?"

The PREMIER (Hon. D. F. Denham, *Oxley*) replied—

"1. Yes.

"2. I regret that the Commonwealth Government has supplied me with only five copies of that document; but I am considering the advisability of reproducing in pamphlet form, for the information of hon. members, the section of the report dealing with Queensland."

CONDITIONS *re* SUGAR WORKERS.

Mr. COLLINS (*Burke*) asked the Treasurer—

"1. How many sugar-growers are doing field and mill work at Gin Gin Mill?"

"2. What rate of pay do they receive?"

"3. Are the hours of work and rations the same as received by the men who struck for better conditions?"

"4. Does the mill find the farmers' horses fed while working?"

"5. Is he aware that no person is allowed to go to the post office at the mill without police escort?"

"6. Has he given instructions to this effect?"

The PREMIER replied—

"1. Thirty in the field and fifty-five in the mill.

"2. The same as paid by the mill to employees last season.

"3. Yes.

"4. Nine farmers' horses are fed by the mill at farmers' cost.

"5. No.

"6. No."

SELECTION OF BARCALDINE TOWN COMMON.

Mr. RYAN (*Barcoo*) asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

"At whose request has it been decided to make part of the Barcaldine Town Common available for selection?"

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS replied—

"The request which originated the proceedings for opening was made by William Price."

REQUESTS *re* WATER CONSERVATION ACT.

Mr. RYAN asked the Treasurer—

"1. Is it his intention to take any action, in conformity with the requests made by the Flinders, Barcaldine, Kargoolnah, Tambo, and other shire councils, regarding the regulations attached to the Rights in Water and Water Conservation and Utilization Act of 1919?"

"2. If so, what is the nature of the proposed action?"

The PREMIER replied—

"The matter is now under consideration."

JOINT COMMITTEES.

On the motion of the PREMIER (Hon. D. F. Denham, *Oxley*), it was formally resolved—

"1. That the following members of this House be appointed members of the Joint Library Committee:—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Cottle, and Mr. May.

"2. That the following members of this House be appointed members of the joint committee for the management of the Refreshment-rooms:—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Roberts, and Mr. Ryland.

"3. That the following members of this House be appointed members of the joint committee for the management and superintendence of the Parliamentary Buildings:—Mr. Speaker, Mr. D. Hunter, and Mr. Payne.

"4. That these appointments be communicated to the Legislative Council in the usual form, in reply to their message of date the 13th instant."

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. LENNON (*Herbert*), who, on rising, was received with Opposition "Hear, hears!" said: Mr. Speaker,—Of course, the work of preparing the Address in Reply is the work of the Government, and I suppose from their point of view it is very well done. With regard to the Address moved by the hon. member for Dalby and seconded by the hon. member for Enoggera, I congratulate those hon. gentlemen, who are new members, on the way in which they acquitted themselves of their task. The matter of their speeches was in every way agreeable to me personally, and I think to this side of the House generally; but the matter of the Opening Speech itself is an entirely different thing. With regard to their candid criticism, we know very well that two candid friends of the Government have met their reward by being included in the Cabinet; and I dare say the hon. gentlemen who moved and seconded the Address in Reply will reap a like reward if they persist in their candour.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. LENNON: The speech from the Throne contains, of course, the usual number of platitudes. It raises many false hopes, and no doubt keeps dark many things which require light thrown on them, as is customary with the present Government. The opening passages of the Speech fittingly refer to the coronation of the King and to the death of the late Speaker; and, referring to the wreck of the "Yongala," it says—

"No event of late years has excited a sorrow more sincere or more widely felt than the loss, in a terrific hurricane, of the fine steamer "Yongala," with all her passengers, officers, and crew. Apparently it was one of those calamities which no human effort can avert, as it is proved that the vessel was efficiently manned, well equipped, and normally laden; and there seems to have been no foundation for the opinion at first expressed that the disaster was due to defects in the lighting of our coast. Though a most exhaustive search has been made, the wreck has not yet been located."

The opinion first expressed is one to which I shall refer very briefly. The Premier, when travelling up North in connection with the referenda, referred to the loss of the "Yongala" at some of his meetings—at Cairns, Herberton, Atherton, and other places—and he is reported to have said, with dramatic effect, "Why did not the Federal Government put a light there?" Echo-answers "Where?" because from that day to this the site of the wreck has not been located.

The PREMIER: Are you quoting?

Mr. LENNON: I am quoting.

The PREMIER: From what?

Mr. LENNON: From one of the Northern papers. As to that part, I cannot say where it appeared; but for this part I am going to give place and date. In the *Townsville Bulletin* of 10th April last the hon. gentleman is reported to have said—

“During the course of his remarks, Mr. Denham said that whilst he had no desire to make political capital out of such a grave disaster as that which happened to the “Yongala,” still he could not but feel that the Commonwealth Government were far from being entirely exonerated. The Constitution specifically set out that they (the Commonwealth Government) had power to control all lighthouses, light-ships, beacons, buoys, etc. During the years that had elapsed since federation, there had been a steady and rapid growth in our shipping, both in regard to the importance and number of ships trading along that coast. Yet the Commonwealth Government had done absolutely nothing to improve the coast lighting.”

The Commonwealth Government has not taken over the State debts, yet the hon. gentleman did not complain of that. The State debts are exactly on all-fours with the question of taking over the coast lighting. It is a right conferred on the Commonwealth Government by the Constitution; but they have not yet exercised that right; and the care of the coast lights has been in the hands of the hon. gentleman's Government for the last three years; and if blame is attachable to anyone, I say the blame is entirely his. That goes to show what methods the hon. gentleman and his Cabinet use when they go abroad to try and upset the intentions of the present Federal Government. No doubt, if the Commonwealth Government were otherwise, we would have hon. gentlemen opposite fighting for them instead of against them. At a later stage I will refer to another item on a somewhat similar matter. I think for a gentleman holding the position of Premier to use such arguments to try and fix blame on the Federal Government to try and gain a few paltry votes it is acting beneath his position.

The PREMIER: The context shows it was perfectly legitimate.

Mr. LENNON: No doubt the hon. gentleman may endeavour to justify it, but I doubt very much if he can. I say the hon. gentleman should not descend to such low-down practices as to try and get votes by such arguments.

The PREMIER: The argument was that it was undesirable to give them more power, seeing that they were not using the power already there.

Mr. LENNON: The argument was to blame them for the loss of the “Yongala.”

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. LENNON: In another paragraph of the Speech I find this—

“A succession of good seasons has produced unexampled prosperity, and there is every hope that this prosperity will continue. It is this gratifying condition of things that has lately induced so many enterprising men, each with a fair amount of capital, to make their homes in Queensland.”

I would like to issue a word of warning to the Government—I have issued many words of warning to them, and I am sorry to say, for their own good, they

[4 p.m.] have not taken those words of warning to heart—that is, to bear in mind that Queensland has had a

succession of good seasons for seven years, and as sure as I am standing here to-day we shall have bad times. That is the opinion of many men who have devoted considerable study to this question—that the normal condition of Northern and Western Queensland is one of drought, and that the splendid seasons we have had during the past seven years, strangely enough, is an abnormal state of things. I want to bring this under their notice, so that they will not go on in the happy-go-lucky style, because we have had five, six, or seven years of splendid seasons; this state of things is not going to last for ever.

The PREMIER: You say we want to shorten sail?

Mr. LENNON: Yes; shorten sail, especially in regard to the money which is recklessly expended in immigration.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. LENNON: The very next paragraph deals with immigration, and says—

“Though the census recently taken shows that our population greatly increased during the past decade, yet it is not increasing at a rate commensurate with the requirements of our thriving and rapidly expanding industries. My advisers are therefore making earnest and, it is thought, successful efforts to encourage immigrants of the most suitable type to settle amongst us. It is confidently hoped that the recent appointment of special immigration agents in England, Scotland, and Ireland will have results in the highest degree satisfactory.”

Now I would like to quote something which is, I think, a very strange commentary on that. They point to Canada, and want us to emulate the actions of that Dominion in this matter of immigration. I quote from the *Sun* of 21st May of this present year. “Poverty in Canada” is the heading—

POVERTY IN CANADA.

GRAVE OUTLOOK FOR THE WINTER.

* While the cable has just informed us that the Canadian Government is arranging for the Salvation Army to send out 10,000 navvies to the Dominion, a very different version of the state of that country is given in the latest English papers. The *Daily Mail* (London) says—

“The financial stringency is producing a serious effect in Canada, particularly in the eastern provinces. Naturally at this time there is much unskilled labour out of work, but the distress is altogether exceptional, and, it is contended, should serve as a warning to the would-be emigrants in the mother country.

“Many thousands are out of work, and hundreds are leaving weekly on their return to Europe. The *Toronto Telegram* states that in consequence of the Grand Trunk Pacific closing down construction work between Port Arthur and Kenora 8,000 more men have been discharged. Wages generally “are down, and this is driving many from Canada. There has been a drop of 25 per cent. Dozens of English immigrants ask every day when the cattle market is, in order to get passages on the cattle ships to Europe. They are broke, and anxious to leave the country. The labour market is bad here now.” The *Toronto Daily Star* states there are more unemployed in Montreal at the present time than for some years past, and it is feared there will be considerable stress during the approaching winter. Mr. Ballantyne, president of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, states that the same conditions prevail almost everywhere in Canada. The *Halifax Herald* quotes Mr. Ballantyne as saying that “there were more unemployed men walking the streets.”

The PREMIER: During their winter.

Mr. Lennon.]

Mr. LENNON: I want to inform the Government that if they do not take care, and they bring out people in this wholesale fashion that they seem inclined to do, in the very near future we shall have the very same condition of things existing in Queensland, and I am sure that that will not be good for the country either temporarily or permanently. I want to induce the Government to hold their hand a bit till they let the people gradually disperse themselves throughout the country, and not have them dumped down in Brisbane by the hundred to do men out of jobs which they have had in Brisbane since they were born. This is a short extract from one of the speeches of the recent Scottish Commission that visited our shores. I am quoting from the *Daily Telegraph* of 15th October, 1910, which contains a report of a meeting at Kingaroy attended by the Scottish Commissioners, and Mr. Morrison, who was speaking, said—

“Something has been said of young men not liking the country and flocking into the towns. We have found that the young Australian is worthy of the race from which he has descended, and is a man of strong character. (Applause.) Whatever may be said of the towns, I cannot speak too highly of the country population. I understand that land at Taabinga soon will be thrown open for selection. When that is done, it is admitted that there will be from six to fifty applications for each separate lot. That means that people already in this country, and others attracted to it, are ready to take up land. You have more people than you can supply with land already, so why should you ask us to supply immigrants?”

That is what the Scottish Commissioners ask.

The PREMIER: For their benefit and our good.

Mr. LENNON: Mr. Morrison proceeds—

“I do not think there is speculation; we find the people are not speculators, but hard-working men, who are working land which is a Garden of Eden; but if you cannot supply genuine settlers with land, then when we are asked at home whether Queensland is a good place to go to, we must say there is a difficulty in getting Government land.”

Mr. COYNE: That is what all sensible people will say.

Mr. LENNON—

“If we send out immigrants, and they cannot get land, they will look for employment in the towns, where you do not want them. The first step is for you to see that land is laid open where it is possible for men to live and to prosper, and that nobody here can say, “I want land, and the Government will not give it me.” I am aware, said Mr. Morrison, there are difficulties, but until we are assured that there is plenty of land for settlers on fair and liberal terms, there will be a certain difficulty in recommending young men or middle-aged tenant farmers to come to your country.”

Now that is from a thoroughly impartial man—a member of a thoroughly impartial commission—invited here at the instance of the Federal Government to report on Australian conditions, and dealing with Queensland, where we hear so much of the thousands, ayé millions, of acres, indeed, that are open, and people are invited to come and share them. We cannot find them land at the present time.

The PREMIER: Plenty to meet their requirements.

[Mr. Lennon.

Mr. LENNON: I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should interject that nonsense, because I have absolute proof in my experience.

The PREMIER: Where?

Mr. LENNON: I will give one instance out of many—I won't delay the House. There is a place called Watervale, 40 miles from Townsville, and 30 miles south of Ingham. A selection of 3,500 acres was forfeited about twelve months ago by reason of non-fulfilment of conditions. I had been hammering away at the Lands Department for nine months before I could get it surveyed, and for the last three months I have been hammering away at them to throw it open for selection. In one case a man has been camped on the ground for the last four months with his wife and family, with a dray, waiting for permission to take up the land. Other men have been standing by at Stannary Hills to take up land. There are only seven or eight blocks there, and yet it has taken the Government twelve months after the land was forfeited to throw it open for selection. If the Government do not get a hustle on, if they cannot shake things up and put the land in the market more expeditiously than that, all their talk about being ready for the farmer is all moonshine.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. LENNON: I warn the Government against misleading people. Until they have land to offer they have no right to say they have it ready for selection. Some of these men who have come here are perhaps men of small means, and by being put off time after time by the red tape of the Government their small means are expended, and the men are stranded. What sort of an idea will they have of Queensland?

The PREMIER: Surveying is going on very rapidly at the present time.

Mr. LENNON: This bringing in of people of small means, whether they are suitable or not, is bound to bring ruin to the people themselves, and ruin to the people of Queensland too.

The PREMIER: So far it has been quite the reverse. I have never found any difficulty in finding land for the landless man yet.

Mr. LENNON: I am really astonished at the persistent denials of the Chief Secretary, and his assertion that there is no difficulty about getting land. It is a matter of public notoriety from Normanton to the Tweed that people who want land cannot get it.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. LENNON: I have given one instance; I do not wish to tire the House by enumerating a number of cases, but I give half a dozen instances of the same state of things on the Tully River, at Ingham, and all around. And yet the hon. gentleman persists in throwing doubt on my statement. It is a matter of public notoriety that people are waiting and waiting for land, and cannot get the land to which they are entitled. We are offering land to people 12,000 miles away, and yet native-born Queenslanders cannot get the land they apply for. I say that native-born Queenslanders should have the first cut at the good things—the first cut at the cake—but hon. members opposite offer inducements, which

very often prove to be will o' th' wisps, to people 12,000 miles away. Then we are told in the Opening Speech that—

“The commissioners appointed under an Act of the last session of Parliament to rearrange the electoral districts of Queensland more equitably, and on a one-member basis, have performed their work in a manner that gives general satisfaction. My advisers are of opinion that there are serious defects in our existing electoral laws, and a Bill, having for its object the removal of these defects, will be laid before you.”

My only comment on that is that I am curious to know what the great improvement is that the Government promise to make in our electoral law. The Speech goes on to say—

“It must be a source of unmixed pleasure to you to know that the University of Queensland has commenced its career under the most promising circumstances.”

Although that is a pleasure to me, it is not an unmixed pleasure. While I am glad to see a University established in Queensland, I am sorry to find that it is likely to be like all other Universities—a sort of close borough for the well-to-do. The institution, with the exception of the technical features of it, is not open to the son of the poor man. The son of the poor man will not have an opportunity of reaping the advantages of the University.

The PREMIER: No British community has such liberal conditions.

Mr. LENNON: I say we ought to have a University absolutely free.

The PREMIER: This is pretty nearly free.

Mr. LENNON: I say we ought to have a University absolutely free, where boys of merit, the bright boys, the geniuses—and we know that we have many of them in Australia—can go on the recommendation of their teachers at the State schools or other schools, and make a career for themselves by their industry. What encouragement is given to such boys?

The PREMIER: Very great encouragement.

Mr. LENNON: We are not offering them the inducements that it is desirable we should offer them. I shall just make a few comments on some other items. I am not going to take the whole Speech and tear it to pieces, although it would perhaps be very easy to do so. We are told—and this is a matter which interests me more than a University—that the question of erecting additional sugar-mills in North Queensland has been the cause of much serious consideration to the Government, and it is stated that—

“In the measure which will be submitted to you on the subject, provision will be made for the erection of additional mills in the order recommended in the report of the Royal Commission, and care will be taken to safeguard the interests of the Treasury, of the cane-grower, and of the agricultural labourer.”

It appears to me that there is one strange omission in that paragraph. It may be an inadvertence on the part of the Government, but they have omitted to say that their great care will be to conserve the Colonial Sugar Refining Company. (Hear, hear!) Throughout the piece all their care has been for monopolies, particularly for that huge monopoly, the Colonial Sugar Refining Company.

The PREMIER: In what respect?

Mr. LENNON: What care has that company ever shown for the cane-grower? None that I can see.

Mr. FERRICKS: The Government want to give them £1 a ton extra.

Mr. LENNON: Their whole care has been to so manage their business as not to produce a few tons more sugar than we are likely to consume. Three years ago I exposed the absurdity of that fear, when it was expressed by the then Premier, the hon. gentleman's predecessor. There is no danger whatever of a surplus production of sugar. The Government need not be alarmed on that score. I believe the production of sugar in Queensland this year will be 46,000 tons less than last year, and last year we imported 99,000 tons of sugar. I do hope the Government will take care that the interests of the cane-grower and the cane labourer are really conserved. Of course the accidental omission of their care for the Colonial Sugar Refining Company will come out later on. We are also told in the Governor's Speech that—

“It is the intention of my advisers to introduce at an early date two measures which would have been presented last session had time permitted—a Liquor Bill and a Police Offences Bill.”

With regard to the Liquor Bill, my attitude respecting it is one of intensely interested curiosity.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and laughter.

Mr. LENNON: I have tried to curb my interest and impatience, so that I may wait patiently until it is introduced to see what it contains. It is with difficulty that I have been able to do so, and I may have to take a cooling draught to restrain my impatience to see what this curious measure is like.

The PREMIER: It is a real good measure; that I can promise you.

Mr. LENNON: With regard to the Police Offences Bill, we had that before us in a previous session, and probably the measure now to be introduced will be the same Bill slightly amended. But I shall postpone comment on that until the Bill is before the House. Then we are promised a sort of substitute for a Pure Food and Drugs Bill. We are told that—

“A Health Act Amendment Bill, the leading features of which will be provisions to ensure the purity of foods and the protection of consumers, will be laid before you.”

There is no Bill, so far as my knowledge goes, that is more necessary, even in the city of Brisbane, as well as throughout Queensland, than a Pure Foods Bill. At the present time, in Brisbane and its suburbs a large portion of the milk supply is seriously adulterated.

The PREMIER: There is plenty of provision to deal with that now.

Mr. LENNON: I can assure the hon. gentleman prosecutions are not very frequent, even in Brisbane.

The PREMIER: That is a municipal matter.

Mr. LENNON: The other day in Melbourne a milkman who was selling milk containing only 16 per cent. of fat solids—that is which had been watered to that extent—was fined a sum of £50, with costs. In

Mr. Lennon.]

Queensland if a man is found guilty of a breach of the law it is the general practice to impose a penalty of a very small fine with costs. That is not sufficient.

The PREMIER: The Government cannot dictate to the bench.

Mr. LENNON: The Government cannot dictate to the bench, but the Government might give a hint to magistrates that a little more decency should be observed in the matter of fines. It is quite a common thing in Brisbane for a man charged with a trivial offence—for breaking some paltry by-law about going fast round a corner or something of that kind—to be fined 1s., with £2 2s. costs. In the recent prosecution of a number of men found in houses in Brisbane devoted to gambling fifteen men were fined a small sum with £2 2s. costs in each case, and the gentleman in charge of the business received that sum, earning perhaps thirty guineas in twenty minutes or half an hour. The Premier may say that the Government cannot dictate to the bench in such matters, but could they not through the Justice Department make the various magistrates throughout the country understand that it is desirable that if a man is fined only 1s. he should not have to pay £2 2s. costs? Then we are told that the Government are going to bring in “a comprehensive measure dealing with medical and kindred practitioners, and with private hospitals.” Why do they not bring in a decent measure dealing with public hospitals?

The PREMIER: What is wrong with public hospitals?

Mr. LENNON: They want nationalising. With few exceptions, the public hospitals of Queensland are in a state of insolvency.

The PREMIER: Oh, no, they are not.

Mr. LENNON: I say with few exceptions. Many of the hospitals in Queensland are insolvent, and they have to go cadging every year for money, and have to resort to all kinds of strange devices. They have to get ladies to stand at the street corners cadging money and shaking collection boxes under people's noses, and they have to do other things that should not be tolerated in any enlightened community. The whole thing is becoming a scandal and it is time the Government nationalised the hospitals, beginning with the public hospitals, and going on to the private hospitals. I thoroughly believe that they should be nationalised. Many of them are nothing but a means of extorting money from people. There is no doubt they want watching closely, and, if this Bill is anything like it ought to be, I shall be very glad to see it on the statute-book.

Mr. FORSYTH: Nationalise everything.

Mr. LENNON: I should be very glad to nationalise a good many things. I would like particularly to nationalise the hospitals, and I would like to nationalise the medical profession as well. I think that would please the hon. member for Dalby, and so he and I are at one on the matter. We might also nationalise the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, and other things of that kind.

Mr. RYLAND: And the butter trade. (Laughter.)

Mr. FERRICKS: And the timber trade.

[Mr. Lennon.]

Mr. LENNON: There is one thing mentioned in the Governor's Speech on which the Premier and I are not in agreement. I allude to the reference made to the Commonwealth Government's failure to carry its referenda proposals.

The PREMIER: Is it not correct?

Mr. LENNON: When the Premier was speaking in the neighbourhood of Townsville during the campaign on the referenda proposals he referred to a certain matter for the purpose of catching a few miserable votes.

The PREMIER: And got them, too.

Mr. LENNON: The hon. gentleman did not get them.

The PREMIER: I did. We got 19,000 more than you.

Mr. LENNON: I say the hon. gentleman failed to get them. Everywhere the hon. gentleman went in North Queensland there was a solid majority in favour of the referenda.

The PREMIER: We got the votes all the same.

Mr. LENNON: Nothing of the sort. The hon. gentleman's efforts were devoted almost entirely to the Federal electorate of Herbert, and there we got the largest majority obtained in North Queensland, and particularly in the very places where the hon. gentleman devoted his strongest efforts. It reminds me of a former occasion—the time of the last Federal election—when members of this Government went up North trying all they could to get the people to down the Fisher Government. The Home Secretary went to a place called Yungaburra, in the electorate of the hon. member for Cairns, just adjacent to my own electorate, and he told the people there his grandfather had been a farmer, that his father had been a farmer, and that he himself was a farmer—(laughter)—and that he therefore appealed to them with every confidence as one of themselves, and he told them what a terrible Government the Fisher Government was going to be. What was the result? Out of 213 votes polled at Yungaburra, the Home Secretary's friend got 13 and Mr. Bamford got 200. (Laughter.) Prior to these unseemly interruptions, I was about to refer to what the Premier said at Innisfail. The hon. gentleman adopted very questionable tactics, and tried to get those poor people in the North to believe in his utterances. He told them a lot of tarradiddles and fairy tales. By the way, I was speaking at Innisfail the same night as the hon. gentleman. I was speaking in the street, as Labour men are wont to do.

The PREMIER: I spoke in a hall.

Mr. LENNON: The hon. gentleman was in a cushion-seated hall.

The PREMIER: You had the opportunity of speaking there too.

Mr. LENNON: The Premier said in reference to that, “When Mr. Lennon was coming here, I suggested to him that I thought it would be rather a good arrangement if we should each have twenty minutes, so long as I got the last twenty minutes.” (Laughter.) Well, Mr. Lennon may be very green in regard to parliamentary tactics, but he is not to be caught with chaff of that sort. (Hear, hear!) I declined the offer. If the arranger had been that I should have the last twenty minutes, I would have been quite content. (Laughter.) I would have acknowledged

the hon. gentleman's claim to precedence, and I would have let him open the ball and speak for an hour and a quarter, leaving me the last twenty minutes. But the hon. gentleman would not agree to that. He wanted to be in at the finish. I want now to refer to what the hon. gentleman said was the object of getting those people, who are ready to believe almost any story, to vote as he wished. He said to them: "I have come here to show you the enormity of the Federal Government. They are trying to grab everything"—

The PREMIER: Are you quoting me now?

Mr. LENNON: Those are only my own statements, which will be accepted without any verification. They are quite true. I shall now quote from the *Innisfail Advocate* of 6th April—the paper that supports the hon. gentleman's party. This is how it reports the hon. gentleman among other foolish things that he said—

"It declares the Federal Parliament may declare any business a monopoly. Why, your own State can do that; so why hand the powers over to the Federal Government?"

Yes, the State may, but the Government very carefully refrain from exercising their power—that is the trouble. We should confer that power on the Federal Government. They would not show such a disinclination to tackle monopolies as the hon. gentleman. Fancy anybody looking to that Government in the hope that they would tackle any monopoly!

The PREMIER: It is a fact all the same.

Mr. LENNON: Then he went on to say—and I want to draw particular attention to this terrible warning—

"If your vote is "Yes" on the 26th, I shall seriously consider the question of the North Coast line."

LABOUR MEMBERS: Ah, ah!

Mr. LENNON:

"I say again, if you vote "Yes" I seriously consider whether we will build another mile of railway or not."

That is a nice sort of thing for the Premier of a country to say in a district like that, where the people are not in the habit of meeting public speakers who resort to such tactics as that.

Mr. FERRICKS: Intimidation.

Mr. LENNON: He goes there and tells them, as the hon. member for Ipswich reminds me, that, although the North Coast Railway Bill was passed by both Houses of Parliament, if the Federal referenda are carried he will have seriously to consider—and he repeated the assertion—he will seriously have to consider whether he will build another mile of railway.

Mr. MULLAN: Shame!

Mr. LENNON: And yet the hon. gentleman comes to Ipswich and talks of the thousands of miles of railway that his Government are building. Such tactics should be beneath the Premier of Queensland. We are also told in another paragraph of the Speech that certain increases are to be given in the Estimates, and, it goes on, "It is hoped that no objection will be offered to the increases of salary set down therein for many of the lower-paid officers, especially those of the railway service." Fancy the Government on that side expressing the hope that

there will be no objection to giving the lower-paid officers of the railway service deserved increases! Why, we have been clamouring for that very thing for years. We have been clamouring for even-handed justice being dealt out to the lower-paid [4.30 p.m.] branches of the railway service for years past. It is well known to every member sitting on that side of the House that for the past two sessions, on every occasion when a measure came before the House in connection with the construction of a railway, we moved for the insertion of a minimum wage of 8s. per day, or the current rate prevailing in the district. On every occasion members sitting opposite were opposed to that proposal, and yet they coolly put these words into the mouth of the Governor, and "hope that no objection will be taken to the increasing of wages in the lower branches of the service."

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Perhaps the Premier is afraid of his own followers.

Mr. LENNON: I suppose it is a bit of the Premier's humour, but it is hard to see where the humour comes in. I would like to inquire, now that the Government is seething with a desire to improve the conditions of the lower-paid officers of the railway service, whether they are also prepared to consider the very ill-paid attendants in our hospitals for the insane.

The HOME SECRETARY: We have just increased their wages by 10 per cent.

Mr. LENNON: We shall see what those increases are when we do see them. We shall also see what the increases in the railway service are when we do see them. These things are only done for advertising purposes, to appeal to the multitude of people outside who have no time whatever for that party over there. I have a quotation which I would like to read in connection with our hospitals for the insane. It is from the *Sun*, and I am sorry I cannot give the date. It was sent to me by someone who wanted to call attention to it, and they evidently considered that I would be an excellent medium for doing that. This article speaks of the conditions at Goodna, and says—

"At present the inmates number about 1,300, of which 800 are males. This means at least 300 patients more than can be properly accommodated there. To see fifty-six female lunacy patients taking their tea in a low-roofed building, where only half that number could be comfortably seated, is a scene simply indescribable."

The HOME SECRETARY: We have just built a fine new dining-room which I hope the hon. gentleman will go and see for himself.

Mr. LENNON: The hon. gentleman will not make me sit down by waving his hand at me and raising his voice in that way. That way may have been a very good way at Yungaburra, but it is no good here. (Opposition laughter.) The article goes on—

"But to go through dormitories with eighty-seven and eighty-three insane inmates packed so tightly that there is not room for bedsteads for them, is more than any pen can do justice to. The lady whose unfortunate duty it was to witness these scenes confesses that any description is beyond her, and she could only say afterwards that her heart went out in sympathy to the female nurses. A screeching, squealing mass of delirious, distracted human beings only worthy of a place in delineation alongside Dante's "Inferno." Several of the patients not only rent the air with their

Mr. Lennon.]

screams, but insisted upon rending their garments and had disrobed entirely. Others were going through performances intended apparently to be part of religious ceremonies, while others were adopting the most ludicrous attitudes akin to nothing human."

The HOME SECRETARY: Does the hon. gentleman expect anything else in an asylum for the insane?

Mr. LENNON: The hon. gentleman does not expect anything from that side at all. The hon. gentleman expects to be allowed to quote this passage from this article if the Home Secretary will let him.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is incorrect.

Mr. LENNON: I am not vouching for its correctness. It was sent to me, and I deem it my duty to read it to the House. It goes on—

"In each of these wards there were at the most but three attendants, and their attentions were more than fully occupied, as can be imagined. In the male wards Nos. 1 and 2, where the worst patients are housed, there are 161 and 92 respectively. The room is so scanty in both wards that mattresses have to be largely utilised instead of bedsteads just as in the female wards, and while it may be bordering on exaggeration to say the patients have to sleep on their sides, they certainly cannot turn over without disturbing their neighbours. The ventilation in these wards is so bad that the air was simply reeking with loathsomeness when our representatives passed through about 9 o'clock at night, and what the condition is by daybreak can only be left to the imagination. When the uncleanly habits of most lunatics are known, it can better be imagined than described. Any application of a term such as "The Black Hole of Calcutta" would be quite within the mark. And as to the insanitary state of affairs that prevails in summer time, words must fail to convey any idea of the condition ruling then. In passing, let it be said that, under less efficient management the overcrowding would certainly result in disease being rampant. Great credit is reflected on the attendants and those supervising them that wards and patients show the cleanliness they do.

"Sufficient has been suggested to give some conception of the urgent need for improving the conditions of treatment, but there are other considerations even that render this more imperative. With no private mental hospitals in existence in Queensland, it means that any person becoming mentally affected in a serious degree, though perhaps temporarily, must be herded thus with these insane patients. What possibility is there of recovery under such conditions? Only a particularly strong-willed and healthy individual could attend to these patients without becoming mentally affected. Then, more especially as to the treatment of mentally deficient children, there would appear to be no likelihood of their condition being improved when they have to come in such direct contact with incurable and long-standing cases.

"The present staff of male and female attendants means the individual supervision of about twenty-nine patients, when, at the very outside, one to every ten is considered a fair proportion elsewhere. In the No. 1 male ward, where many of the patients have criminal tendencies, there are usually five attendants to 190 patients, and should it not be for the fact that lunatics are not given to concerted action, an even graver danger would be constituted."

The HOME SECRETARY: Is that the whole article?

Mr. LENNON: No, but that is all I have got to say about it just now. I will proceed in my own way notwithstanding the impatience of the Home Secretary. I am not making any charge against the Home Secretary, but I am relying on the facts as they come from the newspaper. If these

[Mr. Lennon.

statements are anything approaching the truth, then it is time the Government increased the staff of attendants at this place.

The HOME SECRETARY: We are doing that.

Mr. LENNON: These unfortunate people are entitled to claim our utmost sympathy. No one would refuse their entire sympathy to people so afflicted as these.

Mr. COLLINS: What paper did you quote from; is it the Government organ?

Mr. MAUGHAN: Yes, the Government official organ.

Mr. LENNON: The next quotation I wish to refer to is that from a statement of a lady visitor who happened to be present when the reporter was also there. She said—

"I saw the women patients at tea. Long, narrow wooden tables spread with coarse unbleached cotton-damask, whose sole adornment were plates of thick slices of brown bread and butter. Round these swarmed an overcrowded mass of female lunatics, with here and there a nurse in charge, her time often being occupied by a restless patient. If you or I, reader, became demented to-morrow, there being no private asylums nor mental hospitals here, it would almost certainly be our fate to herd round those tables, too! To sleep cramped up in little narrow beds or on mattresses, placed side by side so close together on the floor that the breath from the next patient and our own must mingle and intermingle for all the dreary hours of the long night. Most of them retire at 6 p.m.; the very best remain up till about 8.30 p.m. In summer time the air must be insupportable; indeed, one might say that it is so now. Such is Goodna!"

Now, I have one further quotation.

Mr. MURPHY: There is a strike on at Goodna now against the food.

Mr. LENNON: Just fancy! The patients, although they are lunatics, they are not so insane but what they can object to the food.

Mr. MURPHY: They have the strike fever.

Mr. LENNON: I am sorry to hear it. This last quotation which I have got is a letter dated 3rd July, and signed by H. E. Poole. It was written to the *Sun*, and reads as follows:—

TREATMENT OF THE INSANE.

(TO THE EDITOR.)

"Sir,—You are to be thanked for your article on the above subject in your last issue. If your description of the state of affairs even remotely approaches the truth, you have touched upon a grave scandal. Can it be that the lack of political influence on the part of the poor creatures confined in our madhouses is in any way responsible for their cruel neglect? It is a strange fact that mental affliction has in all stages of history been treated more as a crime than as a disease, and the unfortunate sufferers have been subjected to untold misery. But other nations are waking to the fallacy and inhumanity of this position; and I trust that Queensland, which in these times of unprecedented prosperity has no excuse for parsimony when dealing with the helpless—for she has no poor—will not lag behind. You quite fairly speak in terms of praise of the Home Secretary."

I do not refrain from repeating that compliment which the hon. member has obtained—

"His work in improving the prisons and his interest in hospital affairs are widely known; but on his shoulders must rest some of the blame if the conditions are as described. If there are 161 patients in one ward, packed so closely at night that there is not room for sufficient beds; if fifty-six mad women eat together, in so ill-fitted a room that only half

are able to be seated; if raving lunatics are indiscriminately assorted with the peaceably inclined; if screaming patients, rending their clothes in delirium, form a welcoming choir for the poor wretched imbecile on his first entrance to the institution, as seems to be the case—here is room for some heroic action on the part of the Home Secretary, which would show him to be in every sense a responsible Minister. He would find no member either of his own party or the Opposition daring enough to question any action, however drastic, he might take in ameliorating the lot of our pitiable insane. Common sense has probably dictated his action in improving the conditions of the prisoners, for he knows that a reclaimed criminal becomes an asset instead of a drain on the State. But let common humanity, which revolts against cruelty to dumb animals, direct his course in dealing with the lunatic asylums. The miserable salaries mentioned in your article are not the least scandalous of the whole wretched position. If £120 per annum be considered a sufficiently low minimum for Federal civil servants, whose hours are short and labours not unpleasant, surely something more than £80 is due to a warder in a lunatic asylum."

If £80 is the salary—I do not know whether it is or not, but if the correspondent is correct, then I say it is a perfect scandal to ask a man to undertake the dangerous duty, because it is a dangerous duty to attend to those unfortunate people. I say if this is the wage, it is a miserable pittance and a disgrace to Queensland. Ten per cent. on that amounts to an £8 rise, and I think that a miserable pittance also.

The HOME SECRETARY: I will be able to demolish the whole structure the hon. member has been building up.

Mr. LENNON: That interjection I pass without any notice whatever. It is like many other rash assertions of the hon. member.

The HOME SECRETARY: The public won't.

Mr. LENNON: The people of Yungaburra have his measure. The letter continues—

"I trust, sir, you will continue your good work, and will persistently agitate until better conditions exist for both patients and warders. If you could publish a series of extracts from the recent Royal Commission which inquired into the matter of asylums in England, you would be doing useful educative work.

"I am, sir, etc.,

"H. E. POOLE."

I think that is sufficient food for thought for the hon. member for the next week or two.

The HOME SECRETARY: It has all been thought of and arranged for.

Mr. LENNON: We are told by the hon. member for Croydon that there is a strike on at Goodna in regard to the food. I know a great deal of dissatisfaction has existed for years past in Goodna in regard to the miserable salaries paid, not only to the male but to the female attendants, and a 10 per cent. rise on the paltry salaries they have been getting in the past is not worth mentioning. A paltry £80 per annum, and if 10 per cent. on that is going to satisfy those people, they are very much more easily satisfied than I should be.

The HOME SECRETARY: Does the hon. member state that as a fact?

Mr. LENNON: The letter I have read states the salaries are as low as £80 a year. I want to point out that whilst the Government intend to raise the lower-paid officers of the railway service, I want them to go a little further in their intention; I want their

good intention to be crystallised into action, so that all these people will participate, to some extent, at all events, in the unbounded prosperity of Queensland. I think it perfectly unfair that all that prosperity should be confined to a few people, and the working man and those attendants in public institutions, particularly those engaged in dangerous occupations, should participate in some of the prosperity we are enjoying in Queensland today. I should like to make a few further remarks on some of the items here. I notice then comes the long list of Bills that are to be tabled in the House. The first is the Agricultural Bank Acts Amendment Bill. A very necessary Bill, indeed.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: It has been two years in the box.

Mr. LENNON: We have been promised this Bill over and over again. Then comes the Technical Instruction Act Amendment Bill, and the State Education Acts Amendment Bill. I do not know how they are going to amend that Act unless they amend it in the only decent way they can, and that is to repeal the Religious Instruction Act which was passed in this House last year. That is the only way that will give satisfaction to this side of the House as far as I am aware. Then we have the Sugar Works Bill. That I do not intend to criticise, because I understand we will have the Bill at a very early date, and I hope it will be found acceptable on this side of the House. I do not know until I see it, but if it is a good Bill it will be well received by the Opposition, but if it is not a good Bill it will get the other kind of reception. Then comes the Factories and Shops Act Amendment Bill, the Wages Boards Act Amendment Bill, Health Act Amendment Bill, Medical and other Practitioners Bill, and we are also promised an Elections Acts Amendment Bill. My disposition regarding that Bill is somewhat similar to that regarding the other measure I spoke of—the Liquor Bill—one of intense curiosity. I want to know exactly what it is going to be. Of course we know the tendency the present party has for shandy-gaff legislation.

The PREMIER: There is no shandy-gaff in the Liquor Bill. That is a straight-out Bill.

Mr. LENNON: We have also a Rabbit Boards Bill promised and a State Children Bill. Regarding the latter, I hope it will be a comprehensive Bill, and will be the means of providing ample protection to State children, and that every care will be given to the children. I say that no kind of immigrant can compare for one moment to the Australian baby.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. LENNON: No kind of immigrant compares with him, and I say every care is necessary on the part of the Government for the preservation of infant life; and if the Bill is a decent one, of course it will get decent treatment, and if it is not, well, we won't say what will happen—we will leave that to imagination. We have also our old friend the Jury Bill. We do not ever seem to get away from some of these old friends. Then there is the Police Jurisdiction and Summary Offences Bill. We will see that probably very late—probably so late that they will have to drop it at the end of the session, as they did before. We are also promised a Leases to Aliens Bill. That is a Bill, if it is a Bill worth having at all, which I am sure will find hearty acceptance throughout Queensland. Of course

Mr. Lennon.]

we are not in a position to criticise it until we see it. If the Bill justifies its existence at all, it will no doubt be heartily supported. I might also briefly state the fact that while the Government bring in all these old friends of ours and hold them out to admirers—to admirers who credit the Government with being in earnest in all they do—it does seem strange that nothing is said about a Trades Disputes Bill. A Trades Disputes Bill was part of the famous Rockhampton programme. What a splendid advertisement they made of that for years! They travelled on it, and the people outside thought there was some wonderful virtue in it. It was a wonderful programme; it was talked about with bated breath as if it was something holy, and now one of the leading features of it—a Trades Disputes Bill—is dropped as a thing not worth touching. Another item of that famous Rockhampton programme is a State Insurance Bill. Now these two things are urgently needed, particularly a Trades Disputes Bill. Will any hon. member of that side of the House have the courage—I was going to say the audacity, but I might offend the Home Secretary—have the courage to say that a Trades Disputes Bill is not urgently necessary in Queensland? They must know that it is, and if they possess one-fiftieth part of the democratic tendency they claim to possess, they would at once go in for a State Insurance Bill. They won't do that because their friends down the street, the insurance companies, out of the profits they get from the people, are able to erect those magnificent piles of buildings in all the capital cities of Australia. This Government would not deprive them of the opportunity of making those profits and allow the general community to share in the general prosperity.

The PREMIER: The Government Statistician shows that the general community is sharing in the general prosperity.

Mr. LENNON: Well, the hon. gentleman will find it very hard to justify such a statement.

The PREMIER: The Government Statistician makes the statement. Look at his report.

Mr. NEVITT: We'll have a say on that.

Mr. LENNON: At all events, there is so much money to be made out of the business that it is one which the Government should take up; and if they were really State socialists, as some of them claim to be, they would establish a State insurance office, because we know it is a very profitable business.

The PREMIER: Has New Zealand found it so?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Yes.

Mr. LENNON: There was evidence from this side of the House last session and the preceding session as to the urgent necessity for an amendment of the Workers' Compensation Act, but I fail to find a reference to it in the programme of work for the present session.

The PREMIER: We have not put our complete programme there.

Mr. LENNON: I suppose the second edition will come later on.

The HOME SECRETARY: There will be enough to satisfy the hon. member.

Mr. LENNON: I thought the Governor's Speech contained the programme of Government business for the session, but I find I am wrong.

[Mr. Lennon.

The PREMIER: It says "among the measures."

Mr. LENNON: I see—after they have got the approval of the Brisbane Chamber of Commerce and other agencies.

The PREMIER: "King Charles's head!"

Mr. LENNON: When they get that, they will come along with their second edition. I place very little faith in that kind of legislation. Then there is another strange omission. We hear of the great amount of prosperity they are causing by reason of their vigorous railway policy; and, of course, a splendid railway policy involves splendid expenditure; and if you have not the money in the chest to build railways you must borrow the money; yet I notice a total absence of any reference to the failure, or rather—not wishing to hurt the feelings of the Home Secretary—to the loan that has not been an apparent success. The attempt to float £2,000,000 of the amount required to carry out that railway policy has been a bit of a frost.

The HOME SECRETARY: We have got the money all the same.

Mr. LENNON: And when we get the Auditor-General's report we shall be curious to see what it cost.

The PREMIER: The net result was a fraction better than the former loan.

Mr. FERRICKS: That is not saying much.

Mr. LENNON: If the loan was such a success as the hon. gentleman would have us believe, how is it that 85 per cent. money had to be underwritten?

Mr. NEVITT: Ninety-one per cent.

Mr. LENNON: Ninety-one per cent. That shows that the investing public only thought it worth while to apply for 9 per cent. of the amount of this splendid loan. It is a most unaccountable thing that the Premier should go to London when he had the opportunity of using Australian money offered by the Federal Government on better terms.

The PREMIER: No.

Mr. LENNON: Infinitely better terms.

The PREMIER: No.

Mr. LENNON: It may not appear so in the first instance; but when you consider the amount to be sent to London to pay interest, which would have circulated here if Australian money had been borrowed, would it not have been far better? No doubt the hon. gentleman, swelling with importance at being Premier of this State, when the Federal Government very courteously—more than courteously, because they wrote a second time to inquire if the Government required any of this money—the Premier said he thought it better to go to the open market. Other States availed themselves of the offer made by the Federal Government; but our business manager thought he would rather go to the open market—

The PREMIER: And did better.

Mr. LENNON: To the London sharks. Instead of taking the opportunity of letting the people in London see that they can be done without, the hon. gentleman's policy is to let them see that they are absolutely indispensable. But I do not want to be too hard on the hon. gentleman, so I will turn my attention to something else—though it may affect him more severely than

what I have already said. I refer to the changes in the Ministry. It is one of the most reconstructed Ministries of which we have had experience in Australia. We find that the gentleman who led the Government with more or less success for some years was jockeyed out of his position; and the hon. gentleman who is now Chief Secretary has got home on him.

The HOME SECRETARY: You are not going to draw any secrets.

Mr. LENNON: He has thoroughly re-vented himself for past injuries.

The HOME SECRETARY: Another mare's nest!

Mr. LENNON: It is no mare's nest. The Hon. Dr. Kidston having been ousted from the Ministry, we are left with only one ewe lamb of the Kidston party—the Secretary for Public Instruction. The Kidston Ministry has been wiped off the slate, and we have the Conservative Government in power. The tactics employed by the Government are most peculiar. I see the Minister for Agriculture smiling very much, also the Minister for Lands. I am going to touch those two gentlemen a little presently. Those two hon. gentlemen, by their candid criticism last session, absolutely fought their way to the Treasury bench. It was found necessary to get rid of someone, so Mr. Hawthorn was pushed through the window. As a natural corollary to the reconstruction of the Ministry, we have the reconstruction of the People's Progressive League, which has changed its title more than any other organisation—I was going to say in the world, but I will say in Queensland. Now, I see it is to be no longer the People's Progressive League, but the Queensland People's Progressive League; and in course of time, when our new candid friends have forced their way into the Ministry; and that will go on until perhaps—

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member may be there.

Mr. LENNON: Until there comes a very rapid destruction. Now I want to show, for the edification of those young members, what a profitable business it is to be a candid critic of the Government; and I will quote from *Hansard*, page 119, vol. cv., some pearls of wisdom from the Minister for Agriculture. In his desire to put things right, he spoke of the absolute necessity for constructing a certain railway line of which we have heard a good deal in the past. That particular railway line has been a

[5 p.m.] matter of very grave concern to many Ministries in the past, and it is possible that the same railway may cause considerable trouble to the present Ministry. I need not say that I refer to the Drayton deviation. The Minister for Agriculture said—

“Another railway which has been referred to, and one which the hon. member for Ipswich mentioned, is the Drayton deviation. It is desirable that I should make some reference to that particular railway, in view of the amount of interest which has been excited in that line inside and outside of this Chamber. That is a railway in which I have taken a very keen interest, upon which I have felt very strongly in the past, and upon which I feel very strongly now. That is a railway which I believe ought to have been constructed forty years ago, and which I believe to-day should be constructed. I want clearly to define my attitude in regard to it, so that there may be no misconception in regard to the matter either in this

Chamber or out of it. Many hon. members know that I have had to take up a very strong position in regard to it, and, if circumstances warrant it, I would be prepared to take up a position equally as strong to-day.”

Circumstances evidently were so shaping that it was unnecessary for him to pursue his discussion of the Drayton deviation. That will now, of course, be in the womb of the future. I do not know whether it will ever come to light, but the hon. gentleman will evidently rest quite satisfied that he is perfectly safe, at all events, where he is. I would like to say also that we had a lot of talk about other matters of very great interest last session, and I will come to them presently, but they more particularly concern my friend, the Minister for Lands. Just another item regarding the Minister for Agriculture. He said—

“Looking through the various departments the other day, I was struck with something that seemed strange to me, but probably is quite capable of explanation. Looking through the Agricultural Department, I find that the cost of the administration of the Shearers and Sugar Workers Accommodation Act is debited to the department at something over £800 a year. I think that that Act has nothing whatever to do with the Agricultural Department, and probably it would have been found better to have it under the Works Department.”

He showed in that remark what an authority he was on the management of the Agricultural Department, and, of course, as very fittingly turned out, he is put there to manage it. When a gentleman shows by his knowledge in this House that he knows a great deal about anything, is it not a very fitting thing that he should be placed in charge of that thing? And so the hon. gentleman, by that speech and other actions in the matter, has been placed in charge of the department he now occupies. He said—

“I think it is one of those Acts that ought not to be administered by the department, and you will find the same thing with regard to several of the departments. I think that the Workers' Compensation Act, which is administered by another department, ought to be in the same department, so that a member dealing with all these matters would be able to deal with the one Minister in connection with the whole of them.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: There should be a Department of Labour.”

The Secretary for Agriculture at that time was the hon. member for Mackay, Mr. Paget. The present Secretary for Agriculture continued—

“It does not necessarily follow that it wants a new Department of Labour. I might point out that purely revenue-producing measures, such as the Stamps and Succession Duties Acts, are administered by the Attorney-General's Office, which is not a revenue-producing office. Another matter that I desire to speak upon has also reference to the administration of the departments. I cannot shut my ears to the fact—and I think it is the same with other hon. members—that in some respects there is a certain amount of dissatisfaction with regard to the administration of the Police Force.”

That will show that the hon. gentleman was a very candid critic of the Government last session.

Mr. CORSER: Why should he not be?

Mr. LENNON: I dare say that that is a character which the hon. member would like to fill more than any other. There is

Mr. Lennon.]

no limit to his ambition. The hon. member who interjected no doubt thinks he is to be put there as Premier of that Cabinet.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Have you not said other things about the Government than that?

Mr. LENNON: In reply to the interjection of the hon. gentleman, let me say that I am an opponent of the Government; but the hon. gentleman is a supporter of the Government, and he fought his way to the place he occupies by reason of candid criticism. I want to fire them out by other criticism—by straightout condemnation. I would like to refer to another matter of great importance. The House will remember—and I hope the country will remember—that when the late Treasurer was arranging his finances, he had to deal with certain votes that were passed by both Houses of Parliament, amounting to £70,000, in regard to our University, and he so juggled with the figures as to do away with the necessity of paying those sums into the public debt reduction fund. He did this thing in a totally illegal manner, and public attention was most forcibly drawn to that by the present Minister for Lands, who then sat on the Government cross-bench, and he not only drew public attention to it, but, as stated by the hon. member whom I have been referring to, at great personal expense the present Minister for Lands had sought and obtained the opinion of two eminent counsel in Brisbane, and had shown the illegality of the whole proceeding. Both the Minister for Lands and the hon. member for Barcoo quoted from very extensive reports, both State and Federal, the opinion of judges—High Court judges especially—on the question I am referring to. The present Minister for Lands has fought his way to that Treasury bench by his criticism of the Government, and has shown conclusively that the Government were wrong in their treatment of that matter. Now, if the Government were wrong—I am positive they were wrong, and the hon. gentleman knows that I have expressed considerable admiration for the pluck he showed on that occasion, although the then Premier, I noticed, did not like it at all. I do not know what the present Premier thinks about it, perhaps he will reveal that later on. The hon. gentleman took great pains to prove up to the hilt that it was utterly illegal. I do not envy him in the position he has got into, and I say he has all the training and talent to fill the position worthily, but I say it is up to him, if I may use the term, to justify his inclusion in the Ministry by bringing in an indemnifying Act. You look in vain in the Governor's Speech for anything like an indemnifying Act to put the Government right in that matter. I ask the hon. gentleman why he has omitted that? He knows it was perfectly illegal; he proved it up to the hilt. He spoke quite calmly, and quoted many eminent authorities to prove beyond all doubt that the Government acted illegally, and that they put the Auditor-General also in a very wrong position indeed, and persuaded or cajoled him into giving a certificate when he should not have given it. If the hon. gentleman wants to justify his existence in the Ministry, it is really a matter which he cannot overlook, and I here call the attention of the House to it, and, through the House, I hope the country. The hon.

[Mr. Lennon.

gentleman is not properly there, and he has no right to remain there unless he can induce the Government to bring in an indemnifying Bill to put them right in regard to what I may call, not in its worst sense, a misappropriation of funds.

Mr. ALLEN: He does not care now.

Mr. LENNON: I think he ought to be made to care. I want to speak strongly on this matter because the hon. gentleman took such a strong stand in regard to it, and proved conclusively that the Government had acted in a perfectly illegal manner, and, as I have already said, it is up to him now to justify his continuance in the Ministry by using his influence to induce the Government—to compel the Government—because he has power to compel them to do anything, I know, as he represents all the wealth and capital in Queensland—that is the character he has, that he is the best representative of capital in the House—and, I repeat, it is his bounden duty to see that an indemnifying Bill is brought in, and brought in speedily. I should like to quote what the hon. gentleman said last session, because I may be told later on that I gave only my own bare statement of what he said. First of all, I shall refer very briefly to what the hon. member for Barcoo said about the letter sent by the Treasurer to the Auditor-General. The hon. and learned member for Barcoo said, page 1358 of *Hansard* for last year—

“That letter was a misleading letter, and it actually misled the Auditor-General in giving that certificate. That was a letter which should never have been written by a professional man to a layman, with the suppression in it that it had.

“The TREASURER: Your opinion does not make it a fact.

“Mr. MACARTNEY: It is a fact all the same. (Hear, hear!)”

So that the hon. gentleman agreed with the hon. member for Barcoo that it was an improper thing to do, that the Auditor-General had been misled by the letter and had done a thing which he ought not to have done. Speaking himself on the subject, the Secretary for Lands is thus reported—

“Mr. MACARTNEY thought it was rather surprising that the hon. gentleman who led the Government did not think it necessary to reply to such a serious question as that raised by the hon. member for Barcoo.

“The PREMIER: I do think it necessary.

“Mr. MACARTNEY: The hon. gentleman was allowing the vote to go through without an explanation. It was a matter which demanded the keenest attention of every hon. member. He did not know of any matter that had come before the Chamber of so much importance, and it certainly was a matter that should not be allowed to go without some notice from both sides of the House. It was a many-sided matter—an important matter—and he regretted that the alteration of the Standing Orders did not allow a proper discussion of it. It was one of those cases where perhaps twenty minutes or half an hour was not sufficient for a full elucidation of the question.”

Yet, I suppose we shall have the hon. gentleman in a day or two backing up his side in the obnoxious system of curtailing speeches. The hon. gentleman said a great deal more, but I do not wish to weary the House by quoting all he said. I shall, however, quote a few extracts from another speech, which is reported at page 1471. That speech contains opinions from Mr. Peter B. Macgregor

and Mr. Real. I shall not quote them, because they are too dry for me, but I shall quote the following:—

"They must expect, whether they sat on the Government side or Opposition side, that the Government must do things orderly and by proper methods.

"OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!"

"Mr. MACARTNEY: They were entitled to expect that from the Government. The Audit Act was not passed for one side of the House or the other, but for the protection of the whole community, and for the orderly observance of both sides of the House; and the Government should be just as jealous in observing the requirements of the Audit Act as hon. members were. As it was his opinion that the Government had departed from the terms of the Audit Act, it was his duty to draw attention to it, over and above party politics.

"OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!"

"Mr. MACARTNEY: His endeavour was to set the position right and get the right thing done. (Hear, hear!) When it first came to his notice, he spoke about it on the Financial Statement, and he subsequently called the Premier's attention to it by private letter—"

That was not the present Premier, but the previous Premier.

Mr. ALLEN: Dr. Kidston?

Mr. LENNON: Yes, Dr. Kidston. (Opposition laughter.) The hon. gentleman continued—

"and, no notice having been taken of it, he had nothing else to do but to give expression to his opinions to justify his action. He had taken no other course in the matter. He was not in collusion with his friends on the Opposition side of the House. He merely wanted to see the point cleared up, and he did not care who cleared it up. He was like the senior member for Townsville on the Port Alma Railway. The hon. gentleman on that occasion did not go to any of the Government supporters asking their support, and he (Mr. Macartney) did not ask for any support on the Government side on this occasion. He simply stated his position, and his position was strengthened by the opinions he had quoted. The opinion read by the Premier consisted largely of extracts, and it purported to advise that the Treasurer could do what the Parliament could do in no conclusive fashion. That was what the opinion quoted by the Hon. the Premier claimed. He (Mr. Macartney) claimed that the position which he took up was the correct one, and he adhered to it, and so far as any insinuation by the Premier was concerned, he threw it back at him.

"OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!"

The Secretary for Agriculture, Mr. Tolmie, said, page 1482—

"He desired to say that the hon. member for Brisbane North had discharged a public duty, from the point of view in which he (Mr. Macartney) looked at it, in speaking as he had done. The hon. member had discharged that duty at great expense to himself in getting counsel's opinion, and he had earned the respect of every member of the Committee."

Considering the circumstances, that was no doubt a well-deserved compliment. We admired, and even now I am free to say that I admire, very much the stand taken by the Minister for Lands on that occasion in regard to elucidating this very difficult question, and exposing to the House the wrongdoing of the Government. That was quite right, and it has my unstinted admiration. But the hon. gentleman's position now is quite untenable. If the Government were wrong then and acted illegally, the duty rests upon the hon. gentleman—and I know the hon. gentle-

1911—H

man stands very well in the country as a man of good repute, and I do not wish for one moment to cast doubt upon his reputation in that respect—but I should like to see him justify his retention in the Ministry by introducing an indemnifying measure to make this illegal thing legal. I shall quote one more passage from a speech of the hon. gentleman which is found at page 1489, and then I shall have exhausted my quotations. In consequence of the wrongdoing of the Government we on this side moved certain reductions in the Estimates to emphasise our opinions. We moved a similar reduction in the vote for the Auditor-General. The quotation I now make is in connection with that reduction—

"Mr. MACARTNEY wished to make it clear that those who supported the amendment to reduce the vote by £1 intended by their votes to express their opinion that the Auditor-General had failed in his duty to Parliament. The vote might incidentally bring some reflection on the Government, or it might not; but he had never yet understood that a vote of that sort in Committee of Supply amounted to a vote of want of confidence in the Government. Similar reductions in Estimates had frequently been carried in the past in that Chamber without being considered as want of confidence motions. He intended voting for the amendment, simply as a protest against the action of the Government and the failure of the Auditor-General to do his duty to Parliament. The Auditor-General had allowed the hon. gentleman whom he was particularly appointed to watch to lead him to come to a conclusion which was wrong. If he had been careful in his duty to Parliament, he would have obtained some outside legal opinion, and reported the whole thing to Parliament without giving a certificate of discharge. In days gone by the Auditor-General, in his annual report, gave the opinions of the Crown Law Officers on all points upon which he had consulted them during the previous year. That was the practice laid down in the Commonwealth Audit Act, and an excellent practice it was, because it showed that, wherever the Auditor-General had any doubt with reference to any transaction, he submitted the question to the Crown Law Officers, as a prudent man would do, and reported the opinion he obtained to Parliament. If the Auditor-General had done his duty faithfully to Parliament, he would first have obtained the opinion of the Crown Law Officers, obtaining outside advice, if necessary, and reported thereon to Parliament. Politics were coming to a pretty pass if, when hon. members raised any question affecting the privileges and rights of Parliament, they were to be told that it was a vote of want of confidence, and if it was to be insinuated that an hon. member was false to the trust reposed in him. He had been pleased to hear the opinions expressed by members on that side, and, although the leader of the Government had told them that the carrying of the amendment was going to mean the defeat of the Government, and for that reason they should stand behind the Government when the vote was taken, he felt sure that the bulk of members on that side in their hearts of hearts knew that the opinion he (Mr. Macartney) had expressed was the correct one. He was perfectly satisfied of that."

I am satisfied of it, too; otherwise the hon. gentleman would not have had the pluck to vote as he did.

"He had no opportunity of studying the opinion given by Messrs. Feez and O'Sullivan from the way in which it was read by the Premier; but he had had the opportunity of perusing it for a few minutes since, and he found that Mr. Feez took up this very logical position: That, say on 26th September, the Auditor-General was in a position to give a discharge for money which, had he waited for another six days, he would not have been in a position

Mr Lennon.]

to give a legal discharge for. That was a most extraordinary thing; but it was put forward in the opinion. That opinion only went this far—that it said that the money in question did not belong to the surplus which had to go to the public debt reduction fund. The opinion, if carefully read, did not go as far as the Premier wished them to believe it went. The opinions which he (Mr. Macartney) had quoted from Mr. Macgregor and Mr. Real were short, crisp, and to the point, and there was no room for doubt as to their meaning.

"OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!"

"The PREMIER thought he was entitled to say that the ground had been somewhat shifted.

"Mr. MACARTNEY: Not a bit.

"Mr. LENNON: No shifting at all. The only shiftiness has been on your side.

"The PREMIER submitted that there could be little doubt that the whole debate had been directed to blaming the Government and not to blaming the Auditor-General.

"OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Both. You cannot blame one without the other.

"Mr. MACARTNEY: Unfortunately.

"The PREMIER: Did hon. members opposite mean to tell him that they were unanimous in blaming the Auditor-General?"

"Mr. LESINA: Not a bit.

"The PREMIER: It was the most foolish kind of foolishness for the hon. member for Brisbane North to talk as if it were a question of the Auditor-General. It was not a question of the Auditor-General at all.

"Mr. MACARTNEY: You will find before you are finished that there is another foolish man. You don't know everything.

"The PREMIER: Very possibly.

"Mr. LENNON: You will find a foolish man somewhere near yourself.

"The PREMIER: He did not know everything.

"Mr. MACARTNEY: But you think you do."

I have finished that quotation to show the relations that existed between those two hon. members.

Mr. RYLAND: That is the kind of thing you should forget.

Mr. LENNON: That is a nice remark coming from the hon. member for Gympie, who is one of those charitably-disposed individuals who are ready to overlook anything of that kind. He is so constituted, but, unfortunately, we are not all so constituted. If we see an illegal practice in this House—if we see the Government of the day playing ducks and drakes with things, we think it our duty to expose them. I distinctly conceive it to be my duty to call in question the action of the Government with regard to that illegal disposition of £70,000, and the way in which they dragged the Auditor-General down into the gutter—a gutter made by themselves. I want to call attention to the fact that the Secretary for Public Lands took great pains, and most creditably exposed the thing—and all credit to him for doing so; but I repeat—and with these remarks I close—that I think if the hon. gentleman does not justify his retention in that Ministry by bringing in an indemnity Bill that I consider absolutely necessary to put things right, then he will not continue to enjoy the reputation that I think he does enjoy in Queensland.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER, who was received with Government cheers, said: I join with the hon. member who has just resumed his seat in congratulating the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply. It was only

[Mr. Lennon

natural that they should be able to deal effectively with such excellent matter, being men of personality and capacity. At the same time I must express my great sympathy with the hon. member opposite in having to attack a policy so sound and so acceptable to the country. (Opposition laughter.)

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Naturally, the hon. member had a most difficult task.

Mr. LENNON: Not at all.

The PREMIER: He did it to the best of his ability, but his speech reminded me very much of one of Aesop's fables—the mountain in labour that brought forth a mouse. The mountain was emitting terrifying sounds, and the villagers from all parts came to see what was about to happen. They thought something terrible must ensue because of the noise, and, lo and behold, there came forth from a little crack what Aesop calls "a ridiculous mouse." After the hon. member had been speaking over an hour and a-half, and speaking in his most forceful manner, the only mouse brought forth—the only delinquency of the Government—was the omission to place on the programme a Trade Disputes Bill and a State Insurance Bill. Then the hon. member says that the Speech contains platitudes. Can any man who reads the Speech say that it indulges in platitudes if all these measures are passed? The hon. member was unfortunate in his references. He referred to milk prosecutions—a thing that is hardly worth bringing into an important debate like this.

Mr. LENNON: Is not pure food an important thing?

The PREMIER: Most important—so important that the Pure Food and Drugs Bill will be one of the earliest measures introduced.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: If I may indicate the order in which Bills will be laid on the table of the House, the first will be the Sugar Works Bill, and then the Pure Food and Drugs Bill. The hon. member referred to the smallness of the fines imposed in connection with milk prosecutions. Now, oddly enough, in this afternoon's papers there are reports of two prosecutions, and in each case there was a fine of £5 and 3s. 6d. costs of court.

Mr. LENNON: What were the other costs?

The PREMIER: The report merely mentions 3s. 6d. costs of court—it does not refer to the legal costs at all—so that there were big fines and small costs. I am quite sure the hon. member's generous nature would not lead him to be vindictive, not that he would not so far transgress the laws of Great Britain and of all British dominions as to try and intimidate the bench, though I am not sure that there have not been attempts during the last fortnight to intimidate the bench in regard to some prosecutions.

Mr. LENNON: Don't say that.

The PREMIER: But I do not think that the bench in Brisbane would be intimidated into fixing fines in accordance with the wishes of members of this Chamber. The magistrates deal with cases as they come before them. The hon. member also referred to the increases to the railway employees in a light

and airy manner. Now, I want to tell the hon. member that those increases in the aggregate amount to no less a sum than £93,000. The Government were, therefore, quite justified in expressing the modest hope that there would be no objection to the increases. They affect between 8,000 and 9,000 men, and it involves a very large sum. For the information of the House I will say that, seeing these amounts cannot be paid until the House passes them, the Secretary for Railways is dealing with the temporary hands on the increased scale as from 1st July, and trusts to be indemnified by this House. I certainly think we should be able to claim the support of the Opposition by way of endorsement of the action of the Secretary for Railways. I shall leave the hon. member's remarks dealing with the hospitals for the insane to my hon. friend, the Home Secretary. But there, again, the hon. member's references were unfortunate, inasmuch as already there is in course of erection one structure, and I think tenders have been invited for two considerable additions to one hospital, the details of which can be dealt with by the Home Secretary when the time comes. The business that is referred to in the Governor's Speech is very considerable, and I hope, during the course of my address, to reply to many of the points raised by the hon. member opposite. I may say that I consider it is the business of the Government to indicate, in as succinct a manner as possible, some of what their hopes and aspirations are. I do not propose to enter into any details of the Bills. I think myself that it would be unwise for hon. members to anticipate any Bills, because it is not possible for those who have not seen them to know what their contents are, and therefore their forecasts may be all at sea. I therefore will not deal with any of the Bills set forth except, perhaps, that important one dealing with the sugar-works. As leader of the Government it is fitting that I should make some particular reference to the paragraph dealing with the coronation of the King and Queen. I think it will be admitted that the reason that the British rejoice in their King is that he is a constitutional King, and not an absolute monarch.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Even from the time of the conquest of Britain in the middle of the century (449), when the office of King began first, although the succession was hereditary it was held to be within the people's right to pass over any successor if he was regarded as being of weak physique or too wicked for the throne.

Mr. LENNON: Wicked?

The PREMIER: Yes; wicked. (Opposition laughter.) And even in the early days of the kingship it was only with the consent of the wise men that the King could make laws, declare war, assign public lands, and name public offices.

Mr. COLLINS: Kings have outlived their usefulness.

The PREMIER: The kings have not outlived their usefulness, and the monarchy has not outlived its usefulness.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Speaking of the Plantagenet period, Sir John Fortescue writes—

"An English King can undertake no enterprise of account without assembling his Parliament, which is a thing most wise and holy, and therefore are these Kings stronger and better served than the despotic sovereigns of the Continent." The astuteness of the Tudors enabled them

to use the machinery of liberty to accomplish the purposes of absolutism, whilst the obstinate folly of the Stuarts—

Mr. MANN: What! This is disloyalty.

The PREMIER: And their attempt to trample a free people under their feet resulted in the loss of King Charles's head, and finally their line driven from the throne.

Mr. MANN: The king descended from the Stuarts.

The PREMIER: By the passage of the Bill of Rights all claims of divine right, or hereditary right, independent of the law, was formally put an end to. William, Mary, and Anne were sovereigns simply by virtue of the Bill of Rights. George the First and his successors have been sovereigns solely by virtue of the Act of Settlement. Under the modern British monarchy the King reigns, but he does not rule. He wields enormous influence, but he exercises no absolute power. He succeeds to his father's titles and estates on that father's demise, but he is King solely by the people's will.

Mr. MULLAN: Is this an academical lecture?

The PREMIER: No. George V. has become our Sovereign solely by the people's will.

Mr. MANN: So was William III.

Mr. MULLAN: Are you an undergraduate of Dr. Kidston's?

Mr. LENNON: What are you replying to now?

The PREMIER: I am controverting the statement that the monarchy has outlived its usefulness.

Mr. RYLAND: Are you going for the chair of history at the University?

The PREMIER: No. King George, like his illustrious father and his beloved grandmother, is a constitutional monarch, and his throne is

"Broad based on the people's will,"

and the reference made to it in the Governor's Speech is perfectly fitting. No monarch of ancient or modern days has been crowned amidst such rejoicing as King George and Queen Mary have been.

Mr. MANN: What about Charles II.?

The PREMIER: The manifestations of heartfelt loyalty to which the Empire, from its vast metropolis to its remotest outposts, gave voice acclaim His Majesty enthroned in the affections of his subjects, and establishes our glorious free Constitution. And in the words of the Governor's Speech—

"We fervently pray that all good may attend their Majesties, and the highest success await them in the discharge of the great duties that have devolved upon them."

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Life is full of contrasts, and in the Speech, in two succeeding paragraphs, one refers to a period of great rejoicing and another to an event of transcendent sorrow. I refer to the passing of the "Yongala." The whole community was thrilled with emotion and overwhelmed with grief when they realised that the fine ship "Yongala," with all on board, had disappeared, and so far there is not a soul to tell the tale as to how she disappeared. It so happened that I was in the vicinity at the time of the disappearance of the "Yongala." I was on the steamship "Wyandra,"

Hon. D. F. Denham.]

which passed over those very waters in which the "Yongala" was engulfed, not more than thirty hours before. At the time when I passed over those waters they were as calm as a mill stream. On the Thursday I was at Charters Towers, and I can recollect some violent gusts of wind, but little did I think that out in Whitsunday Passage, through which I had passed a very few hours before in perfect serenity, there was a great tragedy being enacted. The boat went down, no one knows how, and on my return from Hughenden on Saturday night I heard that she was overdue. No one dreamt that a calamity had occurred. On Sunday morning I made further inquiries, as I felt then that there was something seriously amiss. I inquired of the "Wodonga" to see if in their passage they had met with anything to indicate that anything was wrong. I called up the portmaster, the inspector of police, and the Adelaide Steamship Company, and at once organised a search from Cape Upstart as far north as Lucinda Point, but in vain. The vessel was never discovered. An inquiry was held in due course, and we offered a reward for the discovery of the "Yongala." We further sent out a ship specially to make a search, but no tidings have as yet been heard of her. The junior member for Townsville has made inquiry as to the date on which the reward expired. The date has expired, but if anyone thinks that any good can come of a further renewal of the reward, it will be done, because it is in everyone's interests that it should be done. (Hear, hear!) I am quite sure that if all the lights of Australia were concentrated on the coast on that night they would not have been of any avail. (Hear, hear!) I am told that the "Cooma" was lying under Roundtop that night because there is better shelter there, that the weather was so bad that those on the bridge could not see the fore-castle, so blinding was the storm. The best protection possible was the barometer. The barometer certainly influenced two ships, one four hours earlier than the "Yongala," to remain at anchor, also the "Cooma" remained there because the barometer said stay. The master of the "Yongala," for reasons known only to himself, chose to weigh anchor in the hope of reaching his next port. I have never found words more apposite than those uttered by Mantell, which read—

"The sea is the largest of all cemeteries, and its slumberers sleep without monuments. The same waves roll over all, the same requiem by the minstrelsy of the ocean is sung in their honour. And there unmarked, the wealthy and the powerful, the plumed and the unhonoured, will sleep on until awakened by the same trump; then the sea shall give up its dead."

It is one of the greatest tragedies that has occurred in the Australian waters, and I am quite sure of this: That every member of this House and every member of the community feels intense sympathy for those who were thus robbed of their relatives and of their friends—and with the owners of the ship and the officers and crew.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: I think the House will pardon the time that has been taken up in making reference to what I am sure we all recognise to have been one of the saddest calamities that has occurred on our coasts. (Hear, hear!) I do wish it to be understood

[Hon. D. F. Denham.

that everything that could reasonably be done in order to get information has been done, and we still will be only too ready to do all we can. Now, as to the lighting of our coasts. These matters already are in hand. During the past few days I received a communication from the Acting Prime Minister of the Commonwealth, intimating that the expert dealing with lighthouses will shortly be available, and asking when our Portmaster could be placed at his disposal. I previously had offered every possible assistance in that direction. It is one of the functions that the Commonwealth are charged to take over, and apparently now they are going about the matter in a very earnest and serious way. Now, I pass on to matters which I think should be within the knowledge of the House. I shall, therefore, during the course of my remarks, deal with proposals regarding railways, with immigration, with labour, and with finance briefly, and then to deal also with the projected conference, or suggested conference, to secure more effective operation of certain Commonwealth matters.

Mr. RYLAND: Will you tell us all that tonight?

The PREMIER: I shall, and very briefly. It will be within the recollection of this House that last year we passed a very big railway proposal. A very big scheme indeed, dealing with the great Western districts, and also along the coast connecting Rockhampton to Mackay, Mackay to Bowen, Bowen to Townsville, and Townsville to Cairns. Some of these are already in hand, and, in the case of the others, active preparations are being made.

Mr. LENNON: What part is in hand?

The PREMIER: The parts in hand are near Mackay, near Rockhampton, and out on the Western line, near Wallal.

Mr. LENNON: I refer to the coast line.

The PREMIER: At Bobawaba and Ayr there are three or four sections already started, and active preparations are being made for proceeding with other portions. As soon as some of the men working on railways now in course of construction are free they will be passed on to some of these works. Arrangements have been made to bring out some 1,800 men from England to assist in the construction of these main lines.

Mr. ALLEN: Some of them have left.

The PREMIER: Some of them at Wallal have left. They came out as free labourers; they were not under agreement, and they were perfectly free to do as they liked, and if they did not like the terms they could "down tools" if they pleased.

Mr. COLLINS: They were misled.

The PREMIER: They were not misled. Different rates were offered for different parts of the State, and, if necessary, the English papers could be produced which will show the rates at which these men were engaged, and at which they applied for engagement.

Mr. MULLAN: What did the men know about the conditions on the coast and those in the West?

The PREMIER: Well, we offered 8s., 9s., and 10s., and they would recognise that the extra 1s. was for increased cost of living, and I take it the average Britisher has sufficient intelligence to understand what that would represent to him in a new country. The

point I want to hasten on to is this: That it will be remembered when this big railway scheme, coastal and otherwise, was under discussion, it was explicitly stated that the big schemes would not interfere with agricultural development and the construction of railways into agricultural centres.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Therefore, during this session there will be introduced in this House resolutions to construct agricultural lines in various parts of the State.

Mr. LENNON: Are there to be any in the North?

The PREMIER: Yes, there happens to be one in the North.

Mr. LENNON: We thank you for small mercies.

The PREMIER: I do not propose to deal at this juncture with all the railways in the various parts of the State, but I think the House and the country should know what our railway proposals are. The hon. member for Ipswich just now interjected that he was particularly interested in the *via recta*. Now, we shall bring in this session a proposal to construct a railway from Munbilla towards Sandy Creek. That will be at least one portion of the *via recta* that will ultimately be constructed.

Mr. ALLEN: What about the gap?

The PREMIER: The gap will then be between Sandy Creek and Maryvale, and it would be unthinkable not to span over this. The interests of the agricultural districts around Warwick demand it, the great South-western traffic demands it, and also the New England traffic demands it—(hear, hear!)—and to have a little gap like that would be simply absurd. What we shall propose to do will be eventually to make from Munbilla up to Warwick responsible for the interest to be earned at the rate of 3 per cent. That is the only agricultural line to which I will refer at the present time, because that is a part of a big scheme which is known as the *via recta*. The acting leader of the Opposition waxed very earnest about the Drayton deviation. Now, he must know quite well that the traffic going into Toowoomba is so largely increasing that it is a departmental necessity that the long-talked-of Drayton deviation shall actually be taken in hand. It will be taken in hand with other works of a similar nature, and I am now taking the House into our confidence as to what I call "works of a similar nature." The Drayton deviation may not be gone on with this session. We are not ready for it. The Drayton deviation is somewhat akin to the deviation on the North Coast Railway. The hon. member for Barcoo knows quite well, in his travelling to Rockhampton, the tedious delay which is incurred by running from Croydon Junction into that Maryborough *cul de sac*. It makes it very difficult to handle that traffic, and by making a deviation, I think somewhere near Tinana, the traffic will be expedited, and not only will time be saved, but there will be great economy, so we are told, in the administration and working of the department.

Mr. MULLAN: There must be more discontent in the party.

The PREMIER: There is no discontent. Last year a proposal was sketched out which it would take years to complete, and it is

quite proper that the House should be told what is our ultimate intention. When the proposals last year were brought in it was stated that none of the strictly agricultural lines would suffer. We are now going to redeem that promise this year by introducing certain lines, and to indicate what we are working up to. We say there are certain deviations that are essential for the safe working and for the expeditious working of the Railway Department, amongst which are the Drayton deviation and Tinana deviation. You will notice from what has appeared in the Press that one of the Ministers of New South Wales said they were going to complete the link connecting Murwillumbah with the Tweed. When that is completed, we shall have a line from the Tweed to Sydney along the coast.

Mr. NEVITT: Which will relieve the other.

The PREMIER: Which will relieve the other, and will eventually become the mail route, because there being no big hills to climb the travelling will be faster and time will be saved.

Mr. MAUGHAN: It will obviate the necessity for the *via recta*.

The PREMIER: It will not obviate the necessity for the *via recta*; but if the New South Wales Government bring their line up to our border, it is only common sense that we should widen our line, not merely to Melbourne street, but across the river to Roma street. (Hear, hear!) Some years ago, when in the Railway Department, I investigated the matter, and found the department advocating the crossing of the river. They said it would departmentally mean economy in administration. And if New South Wales completes their system to the border, surely Queensland will promptly respond and construct the line from the border right through into Roma-street Station on the broad-gauge system. There are merely 70 miles; and it will be most convenient for passengers to come through without being transhipped. Another desirable thing is to have a uniform gauge from Brisbane to Albury; and this would give that gauge as far as Queensland is concerned. It would then rest with other Governments to adopt the 4 ft. 8½ in. gauge. I see it is contemplated by the Western Australian Government to adopt a 5 ft. 3 in. gauge; but I hope wisdom will prevail, and they will build their line on the 4 ft. 8½ in. gauge, in which case we shall have a line right through from Brisbane to Perth on the same gauge.

Mr. FERRICKS: Is this part of the Government policy?

The PREMIER: Yes. I wish it to be understood that having dealt with our coastal construction and our Western construction we are going on with agricultural lines, and will also make deviations which are considered essential for purposes of traffic. At the present time there are improvements, as hon. members know, going on at the Roma-street Station. The traffic of 1,515 miles of railway comes to the Roma-street Station; and the Railway Commissioner is engaged on a big scheme to expedite the receiving and despatch of goods, and to improve the arrangements in connection with passenger traffic. He contemplates that the traffic for the West and South shall start from Roma street, and that for the north shall start from the Central Station.

Hon. D. F. Denham.]

I deem it wise that the House should know what we contemplate doing. We are going on with railway lines that will serve agricultural districts already settled, and we will make lines into agricultural districts where Crown land will be opened up for settlement. In a scheme like that it can readily be seen that there is big work ahead of us; and that brings me to a point in connection with the question of immigration. But before dealing with that, I would like to say that the question of ports is one of great urgency. There are ports along the coast to be dealt with as well as the port of Brisbane. A deep-water port at Maryborough has long been talked of.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

The PREMIER: As soon as the plans are complete it will be dealt with on its merits, and with a desire to serve the extensive back country.

Mr. LENNON: Have you got the report about Mackay too?

The PREMIER: The Commissioner's report is in, but I have not digested it yet.

Mr. LENNON: Rather an indigestible report.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Did you not receive a threatening letter from the senior member for Maryborough about the port there?

Mr. CORSER: No.

The PREMIER: I do not think I received a letter, threatening or otherwise, from the hon. member. The position is clear. The deviations to which I have referred should be made; and it would not be fair to go on with the Western line unless the construction of the coast line is assured, because there is more to be served by the coast line than the Western line.

Mr. NEVITT: What about the promised port in the Gulf?

The PREMIER: Concerning the Gulf, I may say that Mr. Elliott is going to Cooktown, where he will join the "John Douglas" to make an investigation between two points in the Gulf hitherto not investigated. If we can find a Gulf port, it will be better to run the railway right through to that port instead of stopping at Camoo-weal; and the promise made last session to search for a Gulf port will be faithfully carried out. In order to carry out these large works, we need people, and their development will absorb a very large number. Our immigration is not increasing at a rate commensurate with the requirements of our rapidly expanding industries. Our primary and our secondary industries are suffering at the present time for lack of men and women and girls to carry them on. Over 300,000 people are imported into Canada year after year, while only 20,818 were brought to Australia last year.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: You would like to have 300,000 a year.

The PREMIER: If they could be absorbed and employed as advantageously as the 20,000 who came to Australia last year, I say "Yes"; but I would not be a party to bringing people here if there was not occupation readily to be obtained. In our industries there are openings not only for men and women, but also for young people. Our assisted and the nominated immigrants for 1910 numbered only 6,923. Those of New South Wales numbered only 5,272;

[Hon. D. F. Denham.

those of Victoria 3,600; and Western Australia 5,023. Queensland brought out one-third of the total number: and if the other States had been as active as Queensland, there would have been 55,384 [7 p.m.] brought to Australia instead of 20,818. Now I think there is no question of more vital importance to Queensland than that of immigration—there is no question around which our immediate future is so intimately bound up as in that of suitable immigration.

Mr. COLLINS: Define suitable, please.

The PREMIER: Men who can find ready employment, who will become assimilated to our institutions, men who will themselves benefit, and whose coming here will be of mutual benefit to the State.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Immigration is a very important question, because during the year just passed we will have spent, I think, about £80,000, and it is quite likely that during the ensuing year we shall ask for a larger vote in this regard.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: In the year ending 31st December last, there were brought out to Queensland 6,923, showing the steady increase and the growing popularity of our State. For the financial year—the year ending 30th June—the number was 8,340, and many of these were people who came of their own volition. During that time there were 2,575 assisted immigrants, 3,637 nominated, 1,391 free, and 537 special rate, so that for the year ending 30th June last 8,340 came to Queensland. That will show that there is a growing set towards our State. In the year 1905 only 278 came to our State.

Mr. NEVITT: A great deal more left it.

The PREMIER: That is not the case now; a great deal more are coming, and are remaining, as shown by the increase in the last census. Whatever occurred in 1905, when the number coming was small, now the numbers are much increased, and they are remaining. In 1906 there were 311, in 1907 there were 664, in 1908 there were 1,264, in 1909 there were 3,846, and for the year ending 31st December, 1910, there were 6,923. I shall further show that during the last few months there has been a monthly increase in applications. The striking feature is that there is a large increase in the applicants at home for assisted passages. These are not they who are nominated, who are influenced by people who are here to come out—writing to friends.

Mr. LENNON: Have you any reason to give for the cessation of German immigration?

The PREMIER: After long years, judicious advertising is telling, and people in the old country have heard of our increasing prosperity, and then the influence of the Scottish Agricultural Commission, the Agent-General tells us, is being felt. That must be so, because of the thousands of essays that have been written upon "What the Spies saw in Canaan." If the children in the households are writing, they are likely to create an interest in their parents and adult friends, and that may account for the increased interest being taken in our State.

Mr. LENNON: I spoke of the cessation of German immigrants—is there any explanation of that?

The PREMIER: My friend, the Home Secretary, tells me that they are not leaving their country.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is so.

The PREMIER: But beyond that I can give no explanation at all. No doubt the boats coming direct from Great Britain make it more attractive there than is the case with Germany, where they have to cross the Channel before they get their passage. I will now deal with applicants for assisted passages, which shows there is a strong desire to come to our State. In December, 1910, there were 810; in January, 1911, there were 1,103; in February, 1,286; and in March of this year 3,695. These were people who sought to get accommodation, and the Agent-General tells me in his correspondence that not only is the quantity increasing, but the quality also is improving, that there is a better class of people who are anxious to come to this State, but that he has some difficulty in finding adequate shipping accommodation to bring them.

Mr. MANN: Did you hear of Dr. Taylor's speech which he made in another place?

The PREMIER: I have read Dr. Taylor's speech, and have asked for a report thereon, and I am in a position to deal with that, if necessary. Now, the Agent-General, by cablegram, advises me that in the "Oswestry Grange," the "Themistocles," the "Essex," and the "Rimutaka," four steamers which left London within four days—from 5th to 8th July—there were 20 full paying, 739 nominated, and 482 assisted passengers, and 119 domestic servants, or a total of 1,360 who left Great Britain in four ships this week to come to our coasts.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: And next month the "Torilla," a new ship, leaves London for the State direct. She carries the biggest number of passengers, I think, that ever came to Queensland in one bottom. There are 1,500 souls coming in the "Torilla" to Queensland.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Where is the land for them?

The PREMIER: I think about 200 of these will be men who have to work on the railway lines, but outside that they are all either nominated or assisted immigrants. This is an important question, and we want to have it thoroughly considered. Another interesting phase which the House should know, is the increase in the immigrants' fees and deposits. The immigrants deposited through the Agent-General, in the Government Savings Bank, in 1909 the sum of £33,407, and £60,325 in 1910. Every new immigrant that comes to our coast creates work for others, besides doing his own share. I can never understand the proposition which has been often enunciated that an increase of population means a diminished wage. It has not been the history of other countries, and, so far, it is not proving to be the case here. Every new immigrant requires housing, clothing, and feeding, every new immigrant earns more and spends more, and therefore serves to create an all-round prosperity.

Mr. LENNON: What about China, India, and all the densely-populated parts of the earth—are the best wages paid there?

The PREMIER: The same room for expansion is not there; they are now seeking

an outlet, but this great country of Australia—to content ourselves with the big State of Queensland—surely the hon. gentleman will not say 613,000 is an adequate number for the State of Queensland! You could put the whole of that 613,000 between Townsville and Cairns and hardly know that they were there, and I hope the day will come when there will be many more living in the area indicated.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: You won't do it on £1 10s. a week.

The PREMIER: The agricultural wages may not be higher than they are at home, but there is this added advantage: That whilst the employee at home will probably be an employee all his days, the strong probabilities are that after a few years here he will become a land occupier and owner for himself.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Therefore, if there be not a big attraction in wage, there is certainly a big attraction to him in that he may cease to become a wage-earner and become an employer himself, whereas in the old land that can hardly be the case.

Mr. COLLINS: Your statistics do not prove that.

The PREMIER: Now, the big question of immigration is very largely bound up with that of employment, and I entirely agree with the hon. member for Enoggera that it would be most indiscreet to bring people here if we could not readily absorb them. I want to show now from inquiries that I have instituted that there is still a great opening for a considerable number of people in various avenues of employment. At present there is sitting in Sydney, and has been sitting for many days, a Royal Commission which is inquiring into the question of the shortage of labour. Doubtless hon. members have been following the reports of the proceedings of that commission which have appeared in the Press from time to time. There is a telegram in this morning's paper of evidence given before the commission by a farmer and grazier of Junee named Mr. John Fitzpatrick, concerning the shortage of labour in the agricultural and pastoral industries.

Mr. HARDACRE: That is the employers' side.

The PREMIER: If any hon. member can show that the statement I am going to quote is wrong, I shall be glad to hear it refuted.

Mr. HARDACRE: It is only the employers' side; the employees have not had an opportunity of giving evidence.

The PREMIER: The employees will have their opportunity in due time. Mr. Fitzpatrick told the commission that—

"Hundreds of unsewn bags of wheat are lying about the fields."

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: This is not harvest time.

The PREMIER: Wheat for planting. Surely the hon. member knows that there is a planting time as well as a harvest time! Mr. Fitzpatrick went on to say that—

"The immigrants have not materially eased the situation, so far as the all-round shortage

Hon. D. F. Denham.]

is concerned, and moreover, though willing, they are not nearly as good as the Australian labour."

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Read what he said about eight hours.

The PREMIER: I will. He said—

"His farm hands worked eight hours a day at a wage of 7s. a day."

In Queensland there is also a general shortage of labour. Therefore, we are justified, as long as that shortage exists, in encouraging a lively immigration policy. It is particularly said that there is a shortage in skilled labour. We are told of many cases in which business cannot be accepted because there are not the people to do the work; consequently business is turned down, and all development work must be retarded. Those hon. members who are familiar with the pastoral industry know well that there has been a real good time in that industry. Persons engaged in the pastoral industry have considerable sums of money just now to invest, and would be glad to improve their properties by water conservation, fencing, ringbarking, and in some districts by the destruction of prickly pear.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: The restrictions under the Water Conservation Act are stopping them.

The PREMIER: I do not think so. When representations have been made that the regulations under that Act are an impediment, the matter has been very promptly and satisfactorily dealt with.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: I know one case in which the plant was hung up for two months before the parties concerned could get permission to proceed with their work.

The PREMIER: I can only say that cases which have come under my notice have been promptly dealt with. Mr. George Storey, at one time a member of this House, told me of a case in the Balonne district in which work was being arrested, and I had a telegram sent that very morning so that the persons concerned could get on with their work.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: That is only one case.

The PREMIER: It is well known that the pastoral industry is suffering on the developmental side through the lack of labour.

Mr. COLLINS: And yet they are fighting the shearers in the arbitration court.

The PREMIER: That matter is a very long time being developed, but I shall deal with it by and by. In the building trade also there is a shortage of labour. Bricklayers, carpenters, plumbers, painters, and joiners are in considerable request, and we have to import many articles which would otherwise be manufactured in Queensland because we have not the men to do the work. I shall quote now from a report which has been furnished to me regarding the shortage of labour in the city of Brisbane. One large employer says—

"In Brisbane alone we could absorb a couple of thousand factory hands. These would include cutters and pressers, but would principally be young women who would be employed as machinists, hat trimmers, etc. We have gone so far as to offer those already in our employ a bonus for every new hand introduced,

[Hon. D. F. Denham.

and then we cannot get them. We have tried through our agents to secure employees in other States as far away as Western Australia, and we have found the same conditions existed there."

The same shortage of labour is experienced in Sydney and Melbourne. This gentleman, who is a man of the highest reputation, goes on to say—

"Their earnings range from 10s. to £1 10s. weekly. Over and over again we have had to recall our travellers before the season is over because we were not in a position to fill any more orders. In the same way, we have had to refuse orders from other States because there has not been sufficient labour available to give us a prospect of turning out the goods. This shortage quite precludes any idea of extending our operations. Male employees, such as pressers and cutters, are equally scarce."

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: Still they keep up their sample-rooms in Sydney.

The PREMIER: Because they are seeking for more business by getting in touch with their clients. Another employer, who is not an exporter, says—

"Coming to the workrooms, however, there is always a difficulty in getting tailors, tailoresses, dressmakers, and milliners. At the height of the season it is quite impossible to secure the requisite number of properly trained people to cope with the orders received, and we have to refuse orders, unless extended time is allowed in which to execute them. We have plenty of offers of apprentices—that is, girl apprentices—but the proportion we are allowed to take under the Wages Boards Act does not suffice to fill the places vacated by women workers who leave to enter into matrimony or from other causes. There is a great scarcity of boys. The minimum wage provided by law for boys leaving school is 5s. weekly, and we offer 7s. 6d. and 10s. per week without success."

Another firm affirms—

"There is not one clothing manufacturer in Brisbane who is able to cope with the business offering, owing to the shortage of labour. We have just refused an order to supply 2,000 pairs of trousers per month for twelve months for a Southern firm, who, furthermore, offered us an advance of 20 per cent. on ruling rates if we would accept the order. We could not get the labour, and had to let it go. The shortage certainly applies to male factory workers, such as cutters and pressers. The minimum wage provided under the Wages Boards Act is £2 10s. weekly, but I think there is not one of these men in Brisbane who is not getting more than the minimum, unless it be a few cases of young fellows just out of their apprenticeship."

Another clothing firm reports—

"So far as the clothing trade of Brisbane is concerned, I believe I could place 500 coat, vest, and trouser hands inside of twenty-four hours. I could personally find room for fifty right away, and probably, speaking for the order trade and factories, there would be not the least difficulty in absorbing 1,000 hands."

Mr. COLLINS: Did you make inquiries from the secretaries of unions also?

The PREMIER: Further on they say—

"We have found in our order trade that we have had to recall our travellers early in November because we could not fill any more Christmas orders. It is a case of "beggar my neighbour" amongst employers everywhere just now, so far as I can see; one trying to take people from others by offering a little more money."

Those in the furniture trade also tell of the difficulty of securing labour.

Mr. HARDACRE: Did you want to prevent them offering more wages?

The PREMIER: No. I want to put them in a position to do the business that is offering. There is work here for all these people at a larger wage, and I want people on the other side who are not so well off to have their condition improved by coming here and helping to increase the prosperity of the State. Does the hon. member want to put a wall all round Australia and keep everyone else out?

Mr. HARDACRE: No. I would let the natural law apply—the higher wages will bring population.

The PREMIER: The hon. member was not in his place just now, or he would have heard me quoting figures to show that month after month there is an increasing number of people coming to Australia on their own volition, because they can improve their condition here, and we should not hesitate to admit them.

Mr. HARDACRE: If that is the case, why should we spend public money in bringing them here?

The PREMIER: The hon. member knows that assisted immigrants are brought out at almost the same rate as nominated immigrants, only that assisted immigrants are much more closely scrutinised than those who are nominated, because the friends of the latter, who are in the State, take the responsibility. A furniture manufacturer says—

"We could employ a lot more cabinet-makers at top wages, but they are unprocurable. The average pay is £3 weekly. Even indifferent workmen at the trade are unprocurable, as they are snapped up by the builders. We have repeatedly had to turn down orders because the want of suitable labour made it impossible to fill them."

Now, I will deal with the boot trade. Hon. members will observe that I have made inquiries in connection with the various industries centred in and around the city of Brisbane, as I have not had the opportunity of going outside the metropolitan area. A boot manufacturer says—

"Qualified adult labour is difficult to get. Boy and girl labour is unprocurable. Adult female machinists are at a premium, and we cannot get enough young people coming on to take the place of those who usually leave the factories at from twenty to twenty-five years of age. We could not get one response if we advertised for clickers or makers. We could increase our output by 20 per cent. if we could get the labour."

I can quote from statements made in connection with the coachbuilders, saddlers, and house decorators, but I will just quote what was said by the Right Hon. Andrew Fisher, at Tonypanydy, in Wales—

"There is plenty of room for miners in the Commonwealth."

I do not know what is the situation in regard to either coalminers or auriferous miners, but that is what the Right Hon. Andrew Fisher said at Tonypanydy.

Mr. MAUGHAN: If he did say so—if he was properly reported—there is absolutely no room for coalminers in Queensland at the present time.

The PREMIER: I express no opinion at all. I merely quote the cablegram which

came through last week, and which, no doubt, all hon. members noted. But so far as the building trade, the iron trade, the clothing trade, the furniture trade, the boot trade, the coachbuilding trade, the saddlery trade, and the house decorators' trade are concerned in the city of Brisbane, the information I have given has been carefully collected, and I believe it to be entirely reliable. I have given it to the House in the manner in which it has been received by me, without adding thereto or detracting therefrom, because I think it is only right that the House should know just exactly the lines on which we are proceeding.

Mr. COYNE: Did you communicate with the secretaries of the unions?

The PREMIER: I did not, but I dare say the hon. member will be able to give the information, and I shall be most happy to listen to it with the same attention as hon. members have listened to the statements I have made. I have no interest whatever but the public weal. If the reports had shown that there was a sufficiency of men, women, boys, and girls here to undertake the pressing work of the country—not to speak of developmental work—if the information had been that there was a sufficiency of labour here, then we might wisely have called off our progressive immigration policy, but apparently such is not the case.

Mr. COYNE: It only amounts to an *ex parte* statement—that is all.

The PREMIER: It is not an *ex parte* statement. It is a statement of facts. If those statements can be refuted, let them be refuted. My view of the matter is that we have nothing whatever to gain by being misled. We have everything to gain by knowing the facts, and all that the Government wants to know are the facts. We do want to know, when we are spending £80,000 or £100,000 per annum in immigration, that it is being wisely spent, and that the people who are coming here are happier and better off than they were in the old land; and, as far as our information goes, that is absolutely the case. I now pass from the question of city employment to speak of the Sugar Commission, and the proposed establishment of additional mills. Hon. members will readily admit that there has been no time lost in appointing the commission, and I think they did their work in a thoroughly effective way, and brought up a very able report. The report says that the extremes of production were in 1903—which was the smallest year, owing to the drought—and 1910. In 1903, there were only 91,828 tons of sugar marketed, and in 1910 there were 204,500 tons marketed. As though to emphasise the vicissitudes of the industry and wide margin obtained from time to time, the commission quote the yield in 1909—134,584 tons, and the yield in the following year—204,500 tons. In 1909, to meet the requirements of the Commonwealth, there had to be landed in Australia no less than 80,000 tons of sugar. Far better that that should be grown in our own country. (Hear, hear!) The average amount imported annually during ten years was 46,306 tons. Allowing for the margin of milling power—because I take it that the mills could turn out in the aggregate more sugar than is now being turned out—we may set against that the varying crops and also the steady increase of population, by reason of births and immigration, and, making all allowances, I say

Hon. D. F. Denham.]

that the natural increase in sugar consumption in Australia is 3,750 tons per annum, the average increase in population being 75,000, and I am taking the commission's estimate of 1 cwt. of sugar per head per annum as the consumption. Now it will probably be three years before [7.30 p.m.] the first of the additional mills is actually in operation, which means that the increased consumption of sugar in that period will amount to 11,250 tons. The commission recommend that a mill should be forthwith erected at Babinda and another at Darradgee. The mill at Babinda will have a crushing capacity of 10,000 tons.

Mr. MANN: It will take some years before it reaches that.

The PREMIER: Quite so, but that is the crushing capacity. The mill at Darradgee, on the Johnstone River, will have a crushing capacity of 5,000 tons.

Hon. R. PHILP: Too small.

The PREMIER: Perhaps it is too small; and then in the following year there will be another mill in another branch of the Johnstone River with a capacity of 8,000 tons. As the hon. member for Cairns remarked, and quite correctly, it will be some time before the larger mills can work up to their full capacity. So it does appear on the commission's own figures that there will be a continued shortage for some time to come, and it is not improbable that the shortage will be considerable. Even last year, when there was the biggest crop ever marketed in Australia—namely, 204,000 tons—there was a shortage in the Commonwealth of 24,475 tons. I may say that we know that Fiji will continue to send sugar into Australia in increasing quantities and pay the duty for doing so.

Mr. LENNON: Java, too?

The PREMIER: Yes, and Japan. At any rate, we will be getting black-grown sugar into Australia.

Mr. LENNON: We might have the duty increased to keep them out. That is not impossible.

The PREMIER: I am quite prepared to be influenced by the note of caution struck by the commission when they are only proposing mills to be erected that will be absorbed by the present people, yet I think that we might consider whether it would not be wise, without delay, to increase the number of mills beyond that which the commission recommend for immediate construction.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: That is a matter for the House to face and give serious attention to. The commissioners in their report stated that from the evidence adduced it was clearly proved that vast areas of suitable cane lands were still available, and were capable of being utilised under white labour conditions. Are we safe in anticipating any shortage? If so, then it seems to me that we might, with every justification, consider the erection of mills at the other two places mentioned by the commission next in order in their report—namely, at Freshwater and Liverpool Creek. Are we not justified in occupying those fertile lands and in producing the sugar required

[Hon. D. F. Denham.]

for the Commonwealth—(hear, hear!)—or are we to still leave a margin to be supplied by other countries? I think it is only right that Queensland should set herself to grow the sugar required by the Commonwealth. Remember that the report of the commission says that there are vast areas of suitable land which can be occupied and upon which white men can be secured the results of their labour. The hon. member for Bowen, I think it was, or the hon. member for Woothakata, the other night dwelt somewhat at length upon the suggestion thrown out by me about an insurance fund against over-production, and the hon. member appeared to think that I wanted to impose a hardship upon the citizens of Australia. My argument was this—and I may tell you that I did not hear anything of the Australian Sugar Producers' Association till I returned to Brisbane from the North, and I never spoke to any member of the Australian Sugar Producers' Association until my return from the North—

Mr. LENNON: Is that really so?

The PREMIER: Yes, it is really so. I had no occasion to come into contact with that body, as I am not engaged in sugar-growing at all. The suggestion as proposed by myself would have cast no liability upon the States, except that it would take from the revenue of the Commonwealth just that sum as between the £3 and £4, excise and bonus, minus the cost of controlling the department.

Mr. LENNON: The Minister for Customs offered the other day to return the growers that money if they paid a living wage.

The PREMIER: I have not communicated with the Commonwealth Government at all about this matter, as I wanted to see the matter properly thrashed out; but the Sugar Commission in their report were apprehensive lest we should overproduce sugar, and the time would come when we would have to export. My suggestion was that the amount of money now gathered under the excise, and which is not returnable with the bonus, should constitute a fund so that when we reached the limit of consumption and had to export it would not depress the value of sugar to the growers of cane in Australia.

Mr. FERRICKS: You would give that £1 to the manufacturers to enable them to export, instead of giving it to the growers.

The PREMIER: The hon. gentleman is jumping to a conclusion. I would take care that adequate protection went to the grower, otherwise I would not have anything to do with it.

Mr. FERRICKS: But you have no power. It rests with the monopoly.

The PREMIER: The Commonwealth Parliament has supreme power, and they can impose any conditions they like.

Mr. FERRICKS: They have nothing to do with the manufacturer.

The PREMIER: We propose to go full steam ahead.

Mr. FERRICKS: Your scheme is all for the manufacturer.

The PREMIER: No. I think the hon. member should accept my disclaimer on that point. The manufacturer will get some

value out of it, because you will give some assurance from the Government that they will work the mills without imposing any disability upon the growers of cane. It is of the utmost importance that we should do all we possibly can to have our north-east coast lands adequately occupied. There is no subject at the present time of so great mutual concern between the Commonwealth and the States as this question of cane-growing and sugar-milling. What we want is stability in finance and stability in control in the field, and in the mill too, and anything I can do to assist stability in the field and bring about a satisfactory relationship between the grower of cane and the men who assist him to cut it off and mill it will be happily undertaken.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: As soon as we can see stability in finance and stability in control with some scheme for export protecting against the day when we shall overproduce, then there is no reason why there should not be numerous sugar-mills erected along the coastline at suitable places, so that those lands can be occupied as we are told in the only proper manner for them to be occupied.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: A State refinery would help it.

The PREMIER: There is also some scheme for a banana mill which we cannot discuss now, but we can discuss the shortage of sugar and how to overtake it, and then if there is a surplus we can have some economic scheme whereby the growers of cane will not be injured by a depressed market should it reach the limit of consumption.

Mr. FERRICKS: The manufacturers are the bosses, and you have no control over them unless you have a State refinery.

Mr. LENNON: That is the only solution.

The PREMIER: Let us confine our remarks to the important questions arising out of the Sugar Commission's report. The question is whether it would be wise for us to go beyond the point recommended by the commission in immediately building three mills; or do the requirements of Australia justify us in going beyond that? Of course we know quite well that other countries such as Fiji, Java, and Japan can come and flood our sugar market. But that is a matter that could be promptly met by adjustment of duty. We notice from time to time in the Southern papers a protest, as though this sugar business was being particularly spoon-fed. The Southern people have not had brought under their notice so pertinently the duties that obtain in regard to other primary products, and secondary products, too. But this sugar business is essentially a Queensland product, and they are making great "bones" about the excise and duty that exists, as though they were being harshly and unfairly treated; but it seems to me that they are forgetting that great freetrader, Sir George Reid, said he did not regard it as a duty, but as compensation for the change from coloured to white labour. To my mind this is a question not merely economic, not merely industrial, but it is a big national question of defence. It is far better that money should be expended in garrisoning our north-eastern coast lands with settlers, with men who have their homes and property to defend, than we should ex-

pend a much larger sum of money in garrisoning it with troops. I think it is a far wiser and a far better policy that we should come to reasonable arrangements and terms with the Commonwealth, so that we shall know we may go full steam ahead with sugar development in this State, that there shall be assured harmony in the field as well as in the mills. I am quite prepared to hear the views of hon. members in regard to this big question of sugar production, particularly in regard to the report the commissioners have made, and, as I intimated at an early stage this afternoon, one of the very first Bills introduced will be a Bill dealing with the sugar-workers' business, because it is important that those who are interested should know early what their prospect and future is, in order that they may get ready. I have a great desire to help the north-east coast. My last visit assured me beyond all manner of doubt that the big interest of Australia lies in the settlement of those fertile lands, and they can be settled, I think, most effectively in the raising of sugar, for which it appears to me at present there is a very big demand.

Mr. LENNON: I have been telling you that for the last four years.

The PREMIER: The hon. member for Herbert has been telling us, but it was not until the alteration in the Commonwealth law, made last October, I think—immediately that alteration was made we set about appointing a commission. The commission were sent on their mission, even though it was the wet season, and I think hon. members will allow—at any rate, any fair-minded man will allow—that the Government have not lost a day in putting into motion the necessary machinery in order that there should be no delay.

Mr. LENNON: A death-bed repentance is better than none at all.

The PREMIER: There is no repentance on my part. So far from repentance, it is rather a note of triumph. It should be the business of this House to so settle the matter as to keep the industry right in the front, and secure a production that will meet the requirements of a big country like Australia. I would just like to refer briefly to the loan. The hon. member for Herbert would have the House to think that the last loan was not quite a success.

Mr. ALLEN: No.

The PREMIER: It was a success. The manner of floating a loan to-day is quite different to what it was in the old days. It may have been so a few years past, but the underwriters take the loan in hand and a day is announced for its flotation. Now, weeks before the loan was put on the market the underwriters said, "We will put that loan on the market on a given date provided there be no international complications." What did they mean? That if they put it on the market on that day, it was underwritten. Any premium that was obtained between that and the closing day, of course the State would get. They would float it on a given date provided there were no international complications. That day arrived and the loan was put on the market, and during that day there were applications for 10 per cent. at a premium of 5s. But what happened? The Morocco trouble loomed up. (Opposition laughter.) If the Morocco trouble had loomed up twenty-four hours before, the loan would not have been

Hon. D. F. Denham.]

put on the market. It is all very well for us, knowing nothing about the money market—I know nothing about it, and I am perfectly certain the hon. member for Kennedy knows less.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Why did you not go to the Commonwealth?

The PREMIER: It would have been more costly. Not only would it have been more costly, but the hon. member, like myself, not being acquainted with high finance, would have looked upon 100 at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. as being better to us than £96 10s. at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Can you demonstrate that in figures?

The PREMIER: I would only be too happy to show the figures which have been placed before me. The hon. member for Moreton has from time to time referred to the difference in rate of interest and the price that was realised, but the point is this: That the Commonwealth offered us a very small sum—I think it was £300,000.

Mr. LENNON: £700,000.

The PREMIER: I think it was £300,000. We did not want it at the time, and, further, it was offered only for three years—for three or four years. I wired to ascertain if the loan would be for a longer period, and they replied, "No." What was the use of a loan of £300,000 falling due in three or four years—just at the very time all our heavy loans are maturing? Financiers who understand the business say it was not as sound a proposal as that which we realised. But is it not a funny thing that whilst they would not let us have that money under $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. they come to us and say, so far as the transferred properties are concerned, which have been valued according to agreement, we only want to pay you 3 per cent. The loan was a success. It realised more than the former one. Compared with any loan in Australia it was an unqualified success. I pass from that to the impression that seems to obtain that there was some of last year's revenue purposely kept out of the accounts. I saw the Under Secretary of the Treasury—not being Treasurer myself and knowing nothing from my own knowledge—and inquired if there was any sum at all that should have appeared in the accounts on 30th June which was not included, and he said emphatically "No." Every shilling that should have been accounted for was included, and nothing was held back.

Mr. LENNON: That was done last year.

The PREMIER: It has been stated that we carried over some amount this year and did not allow it to appear in the statement. Now, if hon. members will look at the statement which was issued at the end of the year they will notice that we received from the Commonwealth £383,198 less than we received the former year.

Mr. LENNON: Won't we get all this in the Financial Statement?

The PREMIER: Yes; but I think it right at the present time to do away with the impression that on the one hand moneys were held over that ought to have been included, and that moneys were paid that should not have been paid. There was a general increase of revenue of £583,952, but there was a less amount received from the Commonwealth of

£383,198, so that there really was an increase in revenue last year of £200,754. Now, it has been said that there was an amount paid which should not have been paid. I am going to give the House the amounts that were paid on 30th June in anticipation of July, and compare them with the previous year.

Mr. LENNON: You are raising a bogey.

The PREMIER: I am not raising a bogey.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: It is the *Telegraph*.

The PREMIER: It is well that the House and the country should know the position. On 30th June, 1910, there were disbursed in anticipation of payments of July; the same course has been followed this year. Were the amount not paid the statement would have been incomplete. The statement rendered on 30th June simply included payments in order that a fair and just statement compared with the previous years might be brought up. Last year there were some adjustments made which have not been made this year, because we had not the money this year to make them, or we would have been glad to do it.

Mr. LENNON: Financial juggling, the same as last year.

The PREMIER: There has been no juggling. We are in the happy position of getting more from the Commonwealth this year on the £1 5s. basis than last year; and there is the interest on transferred properties that should be paid; but against that there is a very much larger expenditure in respect to hospitals and railways. There is a reference in the Speech to the vote taken on 26th April. I can quite understand the leader of the Opposition feeling a bit hurt that any reference should be made to the matter, but there is no gainsaying and no explaining the vote of the 26th April. The Right Hon. Andrew Fisher talked about people falling down with fright; but when he received the Marconi message informing him of the result, he went into his state cabin, and neither ate nor drank for twenty-four hours—he was so overwhelmed.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Where did your information come from?

The PREMIER: I heard it through a passenger on the steamer. He was lamenting and mourning over the result—I think it was he that fell down with fright. (Government laughter.)

Mr. LENNON: You must have been told by a lineal descendant of Ananias.

The PREMIER: No—he is a thoroughly reliable man. Of course the Commonwealth Government were very much wedded to these proposals, as were the Queensland Labour party. They put all their energies into the fight, in which there was a clear issue.

Mr. RYAN: Did you not say it was a non-party question?

The PREMIER: So we treated it; and I regret that it should have been prostituted into a party question by the Labour party. (Opposition laughter.) On no occasion can it be shown that we made it a party question—we made it a high constitutional question; but the Labour party made it a party question, and gagged their friends in New South Wales. (Opposition dissent.) They may as well take their gruel with a good grace. On the alteration of the Constitution, legislative powers, the majority "No" in Australia was

[Hon. D. F. Denham.]

257,531; and we are going to have it recorded in the sacred volume of *Hansard*. On the question of monopolies, the majority "No" in Australia was 245,725. In Queensland, on the question of the alteration of the Constitution, legislative powers, the majority "No" was 19,868; and on the question of monopolies the majority "No" was 18,213.

Mr. FERRICKS: It will be reversed next time.

The PREMIER: You will be falling down with fright yet. (Laughter.) The people of Queensland have said by a big majority, "Preserve the Constitution"; and I think it will be seen from their vote that they are democratic and not bureaucratic, while hon. members opposite are bureaucratic and not democratic. (Opposition laughter.) There have been two referenda here; and the wish of the people must be supreme.

Mr. ALLEN: Except on religious matters.

The PREMIER: In this matter too. The framers of the Constitution not only contemplated an alteration in the Constitution, but also the question of referring to the Commonwealth Parliament certain powers; therefore section 51 provides as follows:—

"The Parliament shall, subject to this Constitution, have power to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of the Commonwealth with respect to matters referred to the Parliament of the Commonwealth by the Parliament or Parliaments of any State or States, but so that the law shall extend only to States by whose Parliaments the matter is referred, or which afterwards adopts the law."

Now, certain matters referred to the High Court have proved to be *ultra vires*; but in spite of this, there are quite a number who think that certain matters should be referred by the State Parliament to the Commonwealth. They do not say the

[8 p.m.] Commonwealth Constitution should be altered, but that we should work within the Constitution, and refer certain matters to the Commonwealth Parliament.

Mr. RYAN: Do you think that?

The PREMIER: I am quite prepared to go down to a conference to discuss that matter.

Mr. RYAN: Have you any fixed opinion on it?

The PREMIER: I have a fixed opinion. I will give the hon. gentleman something to bear out that opinion. This is particularly interesting to the hon. member as being a member of the legal profession: In practically every constitutional case before the High Court the principle has been enunciated, and must be considered as clearly established, that if you consider the respective powers of the Commonwealth and the States, it is essential to bear in mind that each is within its own ambit a sovereign State, subject only to the restrictions imposed by the Imperial connection, and to the provisions of the Constitution expressed or necessarily implied.

Mr. LENNON: What are you quoting from?

The PREMIER: I am quoting from extracts I have made myself, and I will now proceed to quote extracts from reports.

Mr. MULLAN: It is rather rough on the lawyers when you deal with legal questions.

The PREMIER: There have been three big questions before the High Court, one dealing with monopolies, one with new protection, and one with settlement of industrial disputes. The High Court, by a majority of three judges to two, decided that the selection of a particular class of goods produced in Australia for taxation, by a method which makes liability to taxation dependent on conditions to be observed in the industry in which they are produced, is as much an attempt to regulate those conditions as if the regulations were made by distinct enactment, and that, in short, this Act was not one imposing duties of excise, but was an Act to regulate the conditions of manufacture, and was therefore not an exercise of the power of taxation conferred by the Constitution, and was invalid. Sir Samuel Walker Griffith pointed out in dealing with this very question, that the Constitution provided that the regulation of domestic trade and commerce was forbidden as effectively as if it had been so directed in express words, and that those sections were a prohibition against any Commonwealth statute which was substantially a statute to regulate trade and commerce. It is beyond all question, therefore, that the Commonwealth have not power to enter into another State and deal with a purely domestic matter.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: That is what we wanted to give them.

The PREMIER: The people of Australia said "No," but the question has been revived by the Acting Premier of New South Wales, and I understand that the Acting Premier of Victoria, Mr. Watt, is quite agreeable, and in some degree the Premier of South Australia acquiesces, that a conference shall be held to see whether it is not desirable that the States shall hand over to the Commonwealth matters dealing with new protection, so that it could be made more effective; giving them a wider control in respect to monopolies extending over more than one State; and to make the award of the arbitration court a common rule.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: Who gives your Government or this Parliament power to do that sort of thing?

Mr. HARDACRE: Against the people's will.

Mr. ALLEN: The people said "No."

The PREMIER: If hon. members will intelligently follow me, what I am saying is this: That a conference has been proposed to revive the question whether certain matters may be handed over to the Commonwealth in accordance with the Constitution, without asking for an amendment of the Constitution. But those matters can only be referred to the Commonwealth Parliament by the State Parliament.

Mr. MULLAN: But have not the people said "No"?

The PREMIER: The people have said "No" to the alteration of the Constitution, but it does not follow therefore that there are no matters that cannot be referred by a State Parliament to a wider National Parliament.

Mr. MULLAN: But the people took a stand against all those extensions.

The PREMIER: I am quite prepared to go down to a conference if it is convened—

Hon. D. F. Denham.]

I am not sure that it is going to be convened—but if it is, I shall go down to that conference, always bearing in mind that the people of Queensland have said that they will have no interference with their own domestic affairs.

Mr. RYAN: What is the use of going?

The PREMIER: Mr. Holman says that those are the lines upon which he is proceeding, that there are certain matters to which the purview of the Commonwealth Parliament might be distinctly extended without infringing on our own State affairs. If this can be done, there is no reason why it should not be done, especially in regard to new protection. I think it is highly desirable that the men who are working in trades that are protected should participate in the profits that are made in that trade.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear! That is what we advocated.

The PREMIER: My opinion is that the wages boards can do all that was sought to be done by the alteration of the Constitution. There was a conference of State Treasurers held in 1909, and they conferred with the then Commonwealth Prime Minister, Mr. Deakin, and it was agreed as between all the various States—

"1. It is desirable that the State should establish tribunals for regulating the conditions of labour in that State;

"2. That the jurisdiction and powers of each State industrial tribunal should be uniform as far as practicable;

"3. That to meet the case where it is proved that interstate competition exists in industrial matters which is unfair, and the State tribunals have failed to grant relief, the Premiers of the States should agree to vest the Commonwealth with the power to adjust the grievances complained of;

"4. When the court of a State determines on complaint of an industrial tribunal that—

"(a) Injury is caused to an industry carried on within that State;

"(b) Such injury is caused by competition of persons engaged in the same industry in another adjoining State or States;

"(c) Such injury is solely caused by conditions of labour under which employees in the competing industry work;

"(d) Such conditions, whilst making allowance for local circumstances, are unfair to the complaining State;

"(e) The industrial tribunals of the State concerned have failed either jointly or by separate action to alter the conditions of labour which cause such injury; such court may order that the conditions which are the cause of the unfair competition shall be referred to a Commonwealth tribunal for adjustment."

I am perfectly prepared to confer with the other State Premiers to make these alterations, so that the Commonwealth Parliament may work in harmony with State Parliaments, and that the welfare of the people may be conserved and preserved, but I am not prepared to see any action taken that would be in contravention of the vote that was given on 26th April. Wherever I went I discussed the powers of the State and the Commonwealth on the lines of that agreement, and if that agreement be put

[Hon. D. F. Denham.

into effect, and this Parliament acts under the Constitution, there is no reason why industrial matters should not be satisfactorily and wisely arranged without interfering with the Constitution. I will not dwell on the big question of monopolies at the present time, other than to say that I do not conceive that new protection was introduced for the aggrandisement of the manufacturers. I consider that the worker should share in it, and any action I can take to make it impossible to reproduce the conditions of older countries such as have been brought about by trusts or monopolies will be gladly undertaken by me. Therefore, there are those who urge that in the public interest the States should surrender certain powers to the Commonwealth in order to insure the smooth working of the industrial machine. If a conference is held, I am prepared to attend that conference and to work within the lines of the agreement made in 1909, because I can see that there is no difficulty in securing conditions between the States and the Commonwealth without interfering with the Constitution. Power is given under section 37 of the Commonwealth Constitution for a State Parliament to refer to the Commonwealth Parliament matters which they think can be controlled by a central authority with greater precision and efficiency.

Mr. HARDACRE: The Commonwealth Parliament cannot do that under the Constitution.

The PREMIER: I beg the hon. member's pardon. The Commonwealth Parliament can do so. The Constitution provides for an alteration of the Constitution, and also that certain questions now under State control may be referred to the Commonwealth Parliament. As I have said, a certain agreement was arrived at by the Premiers of the different States at the conference of 1909, and I think the people of this State—and I believe I understand their spirit pretty well—are content to work within the lines of that agreement.

Mr. RYLAND: The State would not give that power at the referenda.

The PREMIER: A great deal more was asked for in that referenda than is contained in the agreement of the Premiers in 1909. If we work within the lines of that agreement, we shall not surrender our sovereign rights as a State, and certain matters can be referred to the Commonwealth Parliament without any amendment of the Constitution Act.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: You will be asking Parliament to do what the electors refused to do.

The PREMIER: No; I am sorry the hon. member cannot see the point. All that is proposed is that when a question arises which causes any unfairness between States and which cannot be decided by one State, that question shall be referred to the Commonwealth Court. Every State has now its wages boards, and I think those boards can settle the matters with which they have to deal far more easily and far more cheaply than the industrial courts of the Commonwealth. How many weeks has the shearers' case been before that court, and yet, according to the judge, it may stretch out till "the crack of doom." A wages board could deal with questions affecting a trade in its immediate neighbourhood much more satis-

factorily and much better than the Commonwealth Industrial Court, because the members of the board are acquainted with local conditions. There is another matter which is looming up, and that is the question of the interest to be paid by the Commonwealth Government on transferred properties. Within the last few days I received a communication from the Commonwealth authorities on this subject. Prior to that there had been correspondence on the matter from New South Wales and Victoria, but last week I had a communication from the Federal authorities direct. They propose that they should pay only 3 per cent. for the transferred properties, and that they should establish a sinking fund of $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. I think it is perfectly fair that they should pay at least $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Some of the other States are asking more, but personally I think we should have a fair deal if we are paid $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. They have been using those properties for a number of years, our rates of interest approximate nearly 4 per cent., and I think it is a fair thing that the Commonwealth Government should pay us $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Mr. HARDACRE: Are you sure that they offered this State a loan for four years only?

The PREMIER: The loan they offered was for a currency of four years.

Mr. RYLAND: I heard it was for ten years.

The PREMIER: When the Right Hon. Andrew Fisher was last in Brisbane he saw me, and stated that he would be prepared next September to offer a loan of £1,000,000 for a currency of ten years, but at that time all he could offer was £300,000 or £400,000 with a maximum currency of four years. Now, the Government have placed before the House a very large programme. There are some twenty Bills mentioned in the Governor's Speech, and there is quite a large number of Bills that have not been revealed there, so that if the House gets earnestly to business and speedily deals with the measures indicated in the Opening Speech, there will still be a great deal more business to bring forward. I do not propose to-night to discuss those Bills in detail, but I thought it right to take the House into our confidence with regard to our railway proposals. We are going on with the big railway proposals of last year, but do not intend to allow the construction of agricultural lines to suffer, and we shall propose later on to alter certain deviations. I have endeavoured to show the House how we stand in relation to these and some other matters, and I have also referred to the big question of interest to be paid by the Commonwealth to the State in respect of the transferred properties. I have dealt with those matters as succinctly and briefly as possible.

Mr. HARDACRE: You have not told us anything about the resignation of Mr. Kidston.

The PREMIER: I told the House the first day we assembled of the resignation of Mr. Kidston and of the appointment of the new Administration. The new Administration has come down with a full list of measures for the consideration of the House, and I hope that we shall speedily finish the debate on the Address in Reply, so that we may settle down to the real genuine work of the session. I can assure hon. members that I shall do all I possibly can to facilitate the work of the session, and I believe that, if we

get through it quickly, the session will be fruitful of work for the future welfare and prosperity of Queensland.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MAUGHAN (*Ipswich*): The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat has no reason to complain of the way in which members on this side of the House have listened to his exposition of the Government policy—a marked contrast to the manner in which some speeches by a gentleman formerly occupying a similar position on that bench were received. The hon. gentleman made some humorous allusions to a certain statement made by the Right Hon. Andrew Fisher in reference to falling down from fright. I am by no means desirous of following the hon. gentleman's humorous style, but I should like to remind him that there was another hon. gentleman who nearly fell down with fright coming down the North Coast Railway on the occasion of the recent Rockhampton election. (Hear, hear! and Opposition laughter.) He had as his colleague on that occasion no less a person than the hon. member for Leichhardt, Mr. Hardacre; and I think that it is only natural, having regard to the fact that, as the daily Press of Brisbane—or at all events a section of it—stated that the prestige—the status of the Government depended upon the result of the Rockhampton election—I can quite understand that when the figures went up denoting the return of my hon. friend, Mr. Adamson—I can quite understand how the Premier felt on that occasion. Let me proceed a little further. That was not the only shock the hon. gentleman got. As one of those who from this side of the House had the pleasure of instituting a good deal of political propaganda in the Dalby electorate, I can quite understand the equally great shock that the hon. gentleman got at the tremendous progress that the Labour party had made in that electorate.

Mr. ALLEN: He made a lot of promises there.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Your man lost there.

Mr. MAUGHAN: I am quite well aware that we did not secure the seat. At the same time there was no more astonished person in Queensland than the Premier when the figures went up, because everybody who knows the history of the electorate, as I have known it for the last eighteen or nineteen years, knows quite well that the poll of Mr. McNeil, the Labour candidate, secured on that occasion was very satisfactory from our party's point of view, and would have been still more satisfactory had he been successful. At all events, so scared—if I may use a common expression—were the Premier and his colleagues as to the possible results of the election that the whole of them—save, I think, the Secretary for Railways—spent several days in the electorate, and scoured the country promising railways here and there, and promising public works and that sort of thing to such an extent that if any election was ever won on promises that election at Dalby was won by the hon. member who moved the Address in Reply.

The PREMIER: I certainly did not make one promise.

Mr. MAUGHAN: To go a little further, we can quite understand getting a rude shock when the figures went up at Enoggera.

Mr. Maughan.]

Mr. TROUT: That election was not won on promises.

Mr. MAUGHAN: As a matter of fact, the hon. member for Enoggera knows quite well that he owes his seat wholly and solely to the conservative vote of one of the most conservative portions of the Enoggera electorate. In all the democratic centres in the electorate the Labour candidate secured a majority, and I can assure the hon. member that the Labour party have by no means done with Enoggera. The Speech from the Throne contains, of course, a good deal of very valuable information. The Address in Reply to His Excellency is what we are considering at the present time, and there is one portion of that Address to which I would like to refer briefly. This House will tell His Excellency that we hope, among other things, that success will await the King and Queen in the discharge of the great duties that devolve upon them. Now, if there is anything that I hope will attract the attention of the new King, who is a young man, and a man of the world, who has seen the world, it is international peace. I trust no effort will be spared on the King's part to use his undoubted influence with the other nations of the world to secure to the world that long-desired peace as between nations. Before I leave that aspect of my case, I would just like to say with all sincerity that, instead of spending money on coronation fireworks and that sort of thing—as has been done by the present Government—I should very much like to have seen—if they could not spend it on public works and that sort of thing—I should very much like to have seen them spend a certain sum of money in erecting a monument to the late King Edward.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Why?

Mr. MAUGHAN: I should like to have seen a monument erected to King Edward with the words inscribed on it—"Edward the Peacemaker." We have discussed this at our Labour conventions, and I am very glad to say that at most of our Labour gatherings the toast of King Edward was drunk with enthusiasm.

Mr. THORN: I do not think so. I was present at one caucus of the Labour party. (Laughter.)

Mr. MAUGHAN: In the Labour platform I find these words: "The wisdom of settling international disputes by a council of civilised nations." The policy Speech which we are now considering is remarkable for many things, but I consider it is more remarkable for what is left out of it.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Well, that is my opinion, and I think it is an opinion that is shared by a good many members on this side. Let us consider a few matters that, in my opinion, should have found a place in a Speech of this character, having regard to the many happenings during the recess. For instance, seeing special reference is made to the Commonwealth referenda and Commonwealth matters, we might have expected to see some reference to one of the most profoundly important decisions that has ever been given in Australian law—the decision of the High Court in connection with the land value taxation. Yet that has been absolutely ignored. I am surprised at that, seeing the

[*Mr. Maughan.*

Government regard themselves as solely and wholly the farmers' friends—the friends of the man on the land. Having regard to the far-reaching developments that may result from the passage of the Land Taxation Act, one of which will be the placing of Australian land in Australian hands, and of settling thousands of people on the land, I am rather surprised that no reference is made to that decision in the Governor's Speech. Then there is something else. If Mr. Deakin had been in office, I expect all that has been done during the last few months by the Labour Government of the Commonwealth would have been referred to in the Speech; but because the Labour Government is in power—I presume that is the reason—no reference is made to any of them. For instance, there is no mention of the establishment of an Australian navy and army. That is a very important thing. We have heard the Premier talk to-night about defending our coastline, and we [8.30 p.m.] heard a great deal from a previous Premier about defending our shores by settlement, yet no mention is made of the matter in the Speech. Another important matter is to be found in the fact that no mention is made of the very able way in which Mr. Fisher has represented Australia at the Imperial Conference.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MAUGHAN: Matters of far-reaching importance, affecting this State just as much as any State, have been discussed at that conference, and I think the least the Government might have done would have been to give Mr. Fisher credit in connection with his efforts in that direction. Then we have here alongside of us that great big territory, the Northern Territory. It was not till a Labour Government came into power that steps were taken to deal with that great problem. But nothing is mentioned in the Governor's Speech about the Northern Territory. I think it would have been, at all events, a considerate act on the part of the Government to give the Labour Government credit for attending to these matters. Coming more to what I might term State affairs, as has been pointed out by the leader of the Opposition, no reference whatever has been made in the Speech with regard to a Trades Disputes Bill. As you know, Sir, we have had promises in all directions in this House for years in connection with that Bill. As a matter of fact, as my friends on this side and those on the Government side know quite well, it was in the Rockhampton programme, and it has been in the Labour platform for years. In fact, we had a mutual understanding when we first supported Sir Arthur Morgan, and afterwards Mr. Kidston, that we would get a Trade Disputes Bill; but all this time has passed, and apparently we are no nearer getting it now than ever we were. I can only touch on these matters, as I have no desire to speak at length. No word is mentioned of the amendment of the Workers' Compensation Act. That, we all know, is very necessary, and I hope that, before the end of the session, the Premier will see his way clear to introduce an amending Bill on the lines indicated by the hon. member for Gympie, Mr. Ryland, in his motion, which was carried unanimously in this House last session, calling attention of the Government to the need for an amendment of the Act in certain particulars. Then we have nothing

in the Speech about a Hospitals Bill. I quite expected to see some mention of a Bill made, which, at all events, if it did not go the whole hog, would certainly tackle the question of nationalising the Brisbane Hospital. But there is nothing whatever relating to that in the Speech. There is also another matter which is absent from the Speech, although it found a place in former Speeches from the Throne, and that is the question of establishing a training college for the benefit of the teachers of Queensland. That is a matter which affects not only the teachers of Queensland, but thousands of the children attending our State schools. Then we find also, in spite of the fact that we are supposed to be enjoying a measure of prosperity—I will not say to what degree, because, after all, it is a matter of opinion as to the real prosperity—but I think it is a great pity, having regard to the fact that there are evidences of industrial unrest throughout Queensland at the present time, that there has not been some decisive action on the part of the Government to introduce a Bill dealing with arbitration and conciliation in industrial disputes. It is a pity that such a Bill is not mentioned in the Speech.

The PREMIER: We think that wages boards are much more effective.

Mr. MAUGHAN: That is a matter of opinion. The Labour party believe that the most effective way of dealing with industrial disputes is through the medium of an arbitration court, presided over by a judge. The Minister for Public Instruction made a strong point on this matter in Rockhampton when speaking there on the 21st of February last. Mr. Grant was speaking in support of Mr. Walsh, the Government candidate for the Rockhampton election, and this is what the *Record* reports him as saying—

“The Rockhampton programme had been approved on three different occasions, and was it too much to ask them to elect Mr. Walsh to support Mr. Denham, who was to carry out that programme? Most of that programme had been carried out, but much remained to be done.”

I think, at all events, without going too deeply into this matter, that many things are included in the Rockhampton programme which are omitted from the Governor's Speech and which should have found a place there. Another matter is that of Government insurance. The Home Secretary at one time entertained an idea that State socialism in certain directions was a good thing.

The HOME SECRETARY: Hear, hear!

Mr. MAUGHAN: I hope to see the hon. gentleman, at no distant date, an enthusiastic supporter of a Government Insurance Bill whereby a department can be instituted somewhat on the lines of the New Zealand department, which is, I believe, judging by our returns and reports in the library, in a very flourishing condition. Our duty as a Labour party—and we never lose an opportunity of doing it—is to take a keen interest in all industries. There is no industry at work in Queensland at the present time that we are not directly interested in. There is one big industry in Queensland at the present time that I might refer to—that is, the building industry. If

1911—1

employs some thousands, or, at any rate, hundreds of men, and they are in a serious position at the present time because they cannot get material—they cannot get the timber and they cannot get the bricks. I have men meeting me every day coming to Parliament House, men whom I know are good tradesmen, and I ask them what are they doing out of work, and their reply is that they are waiting for bricks or waiting for timber.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Is it not for the want of men?

Mr. MAUGHAN: I do not think so. Perhaps the hon. gentleman, who is a practical man in that direction, might be able to throw some light on it. But the position is this: that owing to the want of material, large numbers of men who would otherwise be permanently employed from day to day, are idle. It is a serious thing, and the Works Department should take a much deeper interest in matters of this sort. My opinion is that the time is not far distant when the State will have to step in and attend to these matters, and the Home Secretary, as a State socialist, seeing that the private sawmills and brickyards cannot provide the necessary material to keep that big industry going, should set about establishing State brickyards, as they have in New South Wales, and State sawmills. To confirm what I say, the following appears in the *Daily Mail* of the 1st inst:—

“In and around Brisbane at present there appears to be an almost unprecedented number of buildings in course of erection. But though the master builders, the contractors, have jobs enough in hand to keep them busy, they are loud in complaints. There are few, if any, big building contracts on hand, in and around Brisbane, that are reasonably forward as regards the stipulated contract time. Contractors grumble bitterly that they are now handicapped by an incomprehensible shortage in the supply of bricks. One prominent builder, who has on hand one of the most important building contracts ever let in Brisbane, placed an order for 2,000,000 bricks. Within recent weeks he has been receiving the order in dribblets of less than an average of 1,000 bricks per week. In the course of seventeen and a-half days he was only able to get his staff of men at work for a day and a-half. At Bulimba, on a job the contract price of which is somewhere about £30,000, for a number of days the only hands that could be employed were a man and a boy.

Contractors are feeling this shortage of bricks during a season when the building trade is so brisk. One of the foremost Brisbane building contractors declares that the outcome is that, while some 12,000,000 bricks are required, the combined capacity of the brick factories is only equal to the turning out of about 176,000 per week. Contractors are being dealt out fractional portions of their requirements instead of a sufficiency. This regrettable shortage in brick, supplies threatens to seriously hamper the building trade in Brisbane just when its outlook appeared brightest. On this account building contractors in Brisbane are just now by no means a cheerful or contented fraternity.”

Mr. D. HUNTER: There is a great deal of truth in that.

Mr. MAUGHAN: That is what I want to get at. If there is anything wrong in my statement, I want to be put right. It is a very important thing, as we are all interested in seeing the people employed. When we know of our own knowledge that circumstances of this character are going on, then it is time, I think, for the State to step in

Mr. Maughan.]

through its Works Department, and use the powerful machinery of the Government. It is a very important office of the State, whose special function, I take it, is to inquire into these matters and see what is required. There are many people, of course, who would like to see speeches on the Address in Reply, if not wiped out altogether, curtailed to a very large extent. Well, there is one advantage in being permitted to deliver speeches on the Address in Reply. One is able, before the serious business of the session comes on, to review certain acts of the Government during the recess, and I cannot help thinking that, in some respects, the recess which has just gone by has been a very remarkable one. Certainly a very remarkable one for the Government, and a very interesting one, and I can quite understand how some Ministers—especially those new to office—I quite understand what the difficulties of office are, more particularly when Ministers are besieged by supporters on their side of the House with requests from hungry constituencies desiring public funds spent in their particular electorates. However, more of that later on. As a matter of fact, it takes a tactful Minister to satisfy supporters of this kind. If he does not accede to the requests, there is always the danger of “the candid friend” element becoming a big nuisance.

Mr. RYLAND: I think that Woolloongabba should have got something, at any rate.

Mr. MAUGHAN: I find that during the recess—I am not going to enumerate everything—there has been an unprecedented number of requests made by supporters of the Government for public works, and under the head “public works” I refer to railways. We have heard to-night of a declaration, which I suppose may be regarded as official, coming from the Chief Secretary, with regard to a very old friend in the shape of the Drayton deviation. I may tell you quite candidly that I hope to see the Drayton deviation an accomplished fact some day. As a matter of fact, before any of us thought of politics, this House thought, in its wisdom, that that was a necessary and important work. The men in charge of our Railway Department, years and years ago, regarded that as a public necessity, and if I mistake not, certain sums of money were appropriated for that particular purpose. At all events, the Drayton deviation will come, I suppose, some day. But my point is this: Why should it be necessary for the Premier to get up, as he did to-night, and in the first speech of the session, to make a statement to the country with regard to the construction of the Drayton deviation? Are we to understand that this is one evidence, at all events, of intense pressure coming from the Minister for Agriculture and his colleague, Mr. Roberts, the junior member for Drayton and Toowoomba? I suppose already there are evidences of unrest in that particular quarter. As a matter of fact, the junior member for Toowoomba only a few weeks ago, at the Toowoomba Chamber of Commerce, had the temerity to act “the candid friend” to the present Government. He referred to Mr. Kidston’s departure from politics, and before he got very far he gave an opinion regarding the present Government, and it must have been a great relief to the Premier and to his colleague, the Secretary for Agriculture. Mr. Roberts, the junior member for Toowoomba, said he realised Mr. Denham was sincere in doing his best for the State. Speaking for

[Mr. Maughan.

himself, he (Mr. Roberts) was prepared to give the new Ministry a fair trial. Any Ministry after that should breathe freely. After that declaration there should be no difficulty, at all events, in so far as the junior member for Toowoomba kicking over the traces is concerned. Another thing: we find the other day that the member for Cambooya, Mr. Mackintosh, is by no means satisfied with his political position. As a matter of fact, the hon. member refused point blank to be satisfied with the tiddle-winking extension to Millmerran. He has demanded already that there should be an extension of another 10 miles, and, if he does not get that extension, there is apparently going to be trouble in the camp during this session. Then we find that pressure must have been brought to bear on the Government with regard to the *via recta*, because we have the Chief Secretary referring in anything but a hearty way to that important public work. As a matter of fact, I regard the utterances of the Premier in respect to that great proposal, which has also been before the country for some time, and for which money has been voted many years ago by Parliament—I regard the statement by the Premier, when he laid special emphasis on the importance of connecting the South Coast Railway with the Tweed Railway in New South Wales, that it was a case of good-bye to the *via recta* for many years to come. I do not know what the hon. member for Cunningham and the hon. member for Warwick think about it, and also the hon. member for Fassifern, but I know that if they are satisfied with the position of that important public work at the present time, all I have got to say is that I am not. At the last general election and the previous general election these political bunches of carrots were hung before the noses of the electors of Toowoomba, Warwick, and other parts of Queensland—“Vote for the *via recta*,” “Vote for the Government and you will get the *via recta*.” “Vote for the Government and you will get the Drayton deviation,” and goodness only knows what you will not get, only vote for the Government. I honestly say I do not blame the Government half so much as I blame the stupid people who put their candidates in. As a matter of fact, if people are to be gulled election after election as they have been gulled, they deserve all they get.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Why not tell the electors that?

Mr. MAUGHAN: I told the people of Warwick just about as straight as I am talking now. Strange happenings have eventuated during the past recess. It was announced one day in the *Brisbane Courier* that owing to private reasons—owing to pressure of private business—it was necessary for the late Treasurer to give up his portfolio and attend to the said private business. One extraordinary thing happened a few days afterwards—he was called to the Legislative Council. What struck me as being very singular was that in the *Courier* of one day the late Treasurer found it very necessary that he should attend to his private business, and that a few days afterwards it was equally necessary that he should go to the Legislative Council. It is well known that a peculiar thing happened in connection with the late Premier. One day we found, according to the *Brisbane Press*, that he had arrived from the South and had determined to enter the referenda campaign with a tremendous amount of zest—he was

going to prevent the Labour party from ringbarking the Constitution; but we found before long that his zeal for the Constitution had vanished. After a shuffle of the political cards he was dethroned as Premier, and a certain event took place which I believe 80 or 90 per cent. of the people of Queensland did not endorse. The Hon. Mr. Kidston came down from the Premier's chair and was put into a very important position—where he is practically a judge—as a member of the Land Court; and we have yet to learn that he is fitted for that position. I do not think one member of this House at the close of last session believed the Hon. William Kidston would be made a member of the Land Court. No doubt later on more will be said about the matter, especially on the Lands Estimates. I regret very much that the Government—I suppose pressure was brought to bear upon them—should have made the appointment. I am not arguing that the late Premier has not the ability to fill the office, but I say that the whole thing savoured of a political job which should never have been perpetrated. Not only do I say it, but it has been stated in other quarters that the appointment should not have been made. Special references were made in the Press; and I will quote a reference made, not by a Labour paper, but by no less a journal than the *Sydney Daily Telegraph*, which has this in a leading article on "Political Self-appointments"—

"Australia has presented, during the past fortnight, two more conspicuous instances of the practical appointment by themselves of politicians to high-salaried official posts. Last week Mr. Kidston resigned the Premiership of Queensland on one day, and was on the next appointed to a seat in the Land Court, worth £1,000 a year, for fifteen years. This week the expected is announced with regard to Sir Newton Moore, who recently retired from the Premiership of Western Australia in circumstances which suggested a nigger in the woodpile. He now goes to London as the Agent-General for his State. A certain great man, on whom the mantle of a greater was said to have fallen, used to denounce with fine scorn the "eighteen-penny people" who were wont to ask, in pre-federation days, "What am I going to get out of federation?" Subsequent events satirised such high-minded politics when, at the first opportunity, the mantle-bearer appointed himself to a safe and high-salaried judicial seat for life, and carried on to the bench with him a political colleague who also had a voice in the appointments. Although the example was a bad one in the young life of the Commonwealth, both the appointees happened to be men of conspicuous personal and professional fitness for the positions they took. So much cannot be said for some of the more recent political self-appointments. Mr. Kidston added to the indelicacy of using his supreme political position for his own preferment the mistake of choosing as a member of the Land Court a man unqualified by any training or experience to perform the duties required of him."

I endorse every word of that, and I trust that any Government—I do not care what Government it is—will be particularly careful in regard to such appointments. In contrast to the appointment I have just referred to, I would like to refer to something on which I can congratulate the Government—that is, in not going abroad in connection with the appointment of a Railway Commissioner. I think they have done right in appointing as Commissioner and Chief Engineer Queensland men who have proved themselves fit for those positions. I am not going to eulogise those gentlemen too freely

at the present time, but I think it is a good principle to appoint to the blue ribbons of the service men who have graduated in the service and have proved themselves good men in every respect. But while I approve of their action in regard to those appointments in the Railway Department, I do not approve of their action in going outside Queensland for a Director of Forests. I may be wrong, but my opinion is that we have in Queensland more than one official able to occupy the position with credit to himself and to the State. The Department of Mines has seen fit lately to advertise for mining inspectors, and I understand that one of the officials appointed—he may be a very excellent officer—came from Maitland, New South Wales.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: He has special qualifications in connection with coalmining.

Mr. MAUGHAN: While that may be so, I would like to remind the hon. gentleman that there are men in the coalmines of Queensland who have had long years of experience in coalmining—some of whom, I understand, sent in applications—and their claims have been overlooked. I am not going to say that the most recent appointment to the inspectorial branch was not a good one; but I cordially agree with the principle of appointing our own men. The men in the coalmines of Queensland now number from 1,800 to 2,000, and there are any amount of these men able to take the position of coalmine inspector in any part of the world. Some of these men have not only a record of long experience in coalmining, but have goldmining experience as well. Reference is made in the Speech to that unfortunate maritime tragedy which occurred on our coast some time ago, and I can only echo the sentiments so ably expressed by the leader of the Opposition, and subsequently by the Premier, in connection with that dreadful fatality. At the same time, I think that some reference might have been made to the fact that the Commonwealth Government have this matter in hand, and intend to cope with it at the earliest possible moment. The Minister for Customs, the Hon. F. G. Tudor, has the matter in hand, and the Government have appointed Commander Lewis, an expert in these matters, to thoroughly examine and report upon the condition of the Australian coast in regard to its lighting. I think I mentioned something in the session before last on the danger of our coast in that respect, and the hon. member for Townsville then said that the coast was sufficiently well lighted. At the same time, we have evidence from many quarters that our coast was not lighted to anything like the extent, having regard to the safety of the public, that it should have been. The matter has been referred to at great length by the leader of the Opposition and the Premier, and I have no desire to labour it now, as there will be more time on the Estimates.

Mr. RYLAND: You might not get to the Estimates this year.

The HOME SECRETARY: Is that your wish?

Mr. MAUGHAN: Reference was made, Sir, to your predecessor, and I quite agree with the sentiment in the paragraph where regret is expressed at the cutting short of a career of so very much promise.

[9 p.m.] I think members of the Labour party will remember that one of the proudest incidents in that hon. gentleman's life was when we were on this side of

Mr. Maughan.]

the House fighting side by side on that big constitutional question, which I suppose at that time was regarded as one of the most profoundly important questions that has ever been discussed in this House. By a singular coincidence on that particular occasion, the hon. gentleman who now leads the Government was fighting on the same side of the House he is now on with the hon. member for Townsville, and other members, against the Labour party and the late Speaker. I noticed in the newspapers the other day that the Premier—and it appears to have become the custom of late—cabled to the people who assembled at the annual dinner of Queenslanders in London to this effect—

“Give warmest greetings assembled Queenslanders. Inform them railway policy approved of last session of Parliament is being carried out. Sixteen different lines are in course of construction, employing 4,000 labourers, and requiring further 2,000 from United Kingdom. The extent of country thus opening up is leading to land settlement on unprecedented scale. All our primary industries continue to be prosperous and progressive. Butter exports are expected to realise £1,000,000 this year. All meatworks in operation fully, with abundance of cattle available. The sugar industry is experiencing very favourable season. The mining outlook is very hopeful. The diminished gold yield is compensated for by an increase in other minerals, notably coal. The Treasury returns continue to be very satisfactory. The financial year will close with a surplus.”

From the point of view of the industries concerned, there may be a good deal of truth in it, but while I am glad to see all industries on a good solid foundation, yet what I and other hon. members on this side are concerned about is the people engaged in those industries. It is no good cabling 16,000 miles to the other end of the world about our great potentialities and possibilities unless the men and women engaged in those industries are enjoying conditions of life which in themselves would be the very best possible advertisement for Queensland. The condition of the people of Queensland should always be the chief concern of their representatives in Parliament, and if by examination we discover that, while on the one hand we may point to industries which are in an allegedly prosperous condition, on the other hand we see the men engaged in those industries living on the border line of poverty, then how can we honestly enthuse about our industries?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MAUGHAN: We know as practical men—and I believe some hon. members on the other side know just as well as we do—that in spite of our alleged progress, in spite of all those cables that are sent home, in spite of coronation speeches, and so on, we know that every little improvement that the workers have enjoyed for years and years past have had to be fought for tooth and nail.

Mr. RYLAND: Inch by inch.

Mr. MAUGHAN: And every attempt has been made by the controllers of these industries to prevent the workers from securing their rights in that direction. They fought them in the shearing-sheds, they fought them on the wharves, at the mines, and in the ships, and they fought them in every department of our trade and commerce, and they have actually gone further and fought them in the law courts. It is all very fine to get excited and enthuse about our trade and commerce, but unless we are consistent and realise

[Mr. Maughan.

that the people who are helping to build up our great industries are receiving good wages and enjoying good healthy conditions, then I say it is all moonshine cabling home to London, as the Premier did the other day, informing the Queenslanders assembled there round a luxurious table that everything was going on all right. I wish it was. I have always held that the real builders up of Queensland are the workers engaged in our industries, and it has been pointed out that the standard of living is none too good for the actual producers of wealth. I did not speak on the question the other night, because we thought those who thoroughly understood the industry should be the chief speakers. We find that in one of the biggest industries known—the sugar industry—hundreds of men are binding themselves together at the present time, and putting themselves in a very inconvenient position, simply because they are asking for better conditions and shorter hours of labour. I have no desire to refer to that any further. Reference is made in paragraph 5 to the census which was recently taken in Australia, and I cannot resist the temptation to say a few words on that very important matter. After fifty years of responsible government by what are termed business men we find that in this year of grace, 1911, Queensland has only a population of 611,369, of whom 25 per cent. live in the metropolis. We have, in other words, increased our population by 20.7 per cent. within the last decade. That suggests to me that there is something radically wrong. Hon. members who represent what is called the Liberal or Conservative side of politics are always getting at the Labour party about their being opposed to immigration—to populating this fair land—though they know that we cannot populate the land to any great extent until the land is open to the people to settle upon it. The Minister for Lands will discover before he has been very long in office—in fact, I believe he knows it now—that he will have no more enthusiastic supporters of any attempt he may make to encourage settlement on right lines—on liberal lines—than the members of the Labour party. The population we have at the present time is absurd—only a paltry 600,000 after fifty years of responsible government by business men. We are often told that the Labour party are only too anxious to belittle the country and give it a bad advertisement. I do not know where you could find a worse advertisement for the State than you find in the fact that with our very enormous territory—bigger than France and Germany with two or three subsidiary States tacked on—we have only a population of a little over 600,000. I should like to refer to the paragraph in the Speech dealing with the subject of immigration. There will have to be a very different land policy adopted in Queensland if we are going to get people from other countries to come to this State. The Scottish Agricultural Commissioners' report is one of the most damning indictments I have ever read against the system of land settlement which exists in Queensland to-day. In *Lloyd's Weekly*—I have not the date of the issue—there is an extract which deals with this matter. It reads as follows:—

“Briefly summed up (says *Reynolds' Weekly*, London), the conclusions arrived at by the Scottish Commissioners seem to be that Australia is a splendid country for the farmer who can put down plenty of capital, but anything but an Eldorado for the agricultural immigrant who enters the country with nothing but his personal outfit and a reserve of muscle and optimism.”

"As has been pointed out on more than one occasion in *Reynolds'*, married couples, especially if they have children, have the greatest difficulty in finding employment. The commissioners ascribe this to the lack of buildings on the farms. The failure to provide houses for families is excused by the fact that the farmer himself is yet in the pioneering state—living anyhow. At present the Agricultural Bank does not lend money on buildings. Families are objected to because obligations are imposed for schooling. On the arrival of an emigrant ship the commissioners say: The married couples had not been so fortunate (in obtaining work). Some of them without children had found employment on farms. Some had placed their families in lodgings and had gone to the country as single men; but, so far as we could learn, not one of the married men with children had yet got a situation on a farm where his wife and family could go with him. It was clear that

SINGLE MEN WERE MOST IN DEMAND.

Single men will do the work as well, or even better, and need little accommodation beyond a tent."

That is a very serious matter for Queensland and for Australia generally. We hear a great deal in different places, especially on the Darling Downs, about the shortage of labour. Hon. members are asked every year to pass enormous sums of money to provide for that contingency. What becomes of that money? How is it that there is this alleged shortage of labour when we vote such large sums every year to provide labour? Am I to understand from the Premier that farm labourers have ceased to come to Queensland? I remember that in the days of the Morgan-Kidston Government, when the Labour party were sitting on that side of the House, members like the hon. member for Cambooya and the hon. member for Cunningham urged the Government to bring out farm labourers to Queensland. We have heard every session the cry that there is need for farm labourers. Where are the farm labourers for whose passages we vote money every year? I ask hon. members who represent farming districts to answer that question.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: On farms of their own.

Mr. MAUGHAN: I beg to differ from the hon. gentleman. More than one member of this House knows very well that there are men coming out here who know actually nothing about farming. Men who have come out from England as farm labourers have told me with their own lips that in order to graduate at the Agent-General's Office as farm labourers they went down to Kent or other parts of south-eastern England, where they picked hops or did a little haymaking for a few weeks, and then appeared at the Agent-General's Office as farm labourers. Those men are no more farm labourers than I am. Some of them have credentials from great ammunition factories in Birmingham or gun works in the old country. The other day a case came under my notice in which a man held credentials from Sir William Armstrong's factory at Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

The HOME SECRETARY: What remedy do you suggest?

Mr. MAUGHAN: We shall get an opportunity of discussing the matter of a remedy on the Estimates, but I may say briefly now that more care should be taken

by the officials appointed by the Government in London to discriminate between bonâ fide farm labourers and others who come out under the guise of farm labourers.

The PREMIER: That is the object of sending home three special commissioners.

Mr. MAUGHAN: That may be true to a certain extent, but you can hardly take up a Darling Downs paper without seeing the stereotyped heading "Scarcity of Farm Labourers." And yet we are voting money every year to meet that demand. I ask the hon. gentleman again what becomes of the money and where are the farm labourers? They certainly are not coming out here.

The PREMIER: The money is represented by the immigrants, and all the immigrants who are coming out are finding ready occupation.

Mr. ALLEN: Where?

Mr. MAUGHAN: If that is true—and I have no desire to doubt the hon. gentleman's word—if that is true, then the demand for farm labourers on the Darling Downs and in West Moreton is not being satisfied; and that has been going on for years.

The PREMIER: I recognise that, and I am contemplating a means of more readily meeting that difficulty.

Mr. MAUGHAN: The trouble is that the money that has been appropriated for the special purpose of bringing out farm labourers is being diverted to other uses. We are bringing out coalminers. Any amount of new arrivals who are coming out ostensibly as farm labourers are coalminers. There are many of them working in my own district now.

The PREMIER: If they sign false declarations, how will you get over the difficulty?

Mr. MAUGHAN: There ought to be some method by which discrimination can be exercised in the office of the Agent-General. When we are called upon to exercise our authority on those benches opposite, we shall probably find a remedy. At all events, I have no desire to labour the matter any further now. I would like to touch on another aspect of the Governor's Speech, and that is the reference on the second page to railways and land settlement. Whenever I read anything in Governor's Speeches about land settlement and railways in agricultural districts, I cannot help feeling somewhat amused, more particularly when I think that the party on the other side have behind them—or say they have behind them—a powerful party called the farmers' party.

Mr. ALLEN: Who is the leader of the party?

Mr. MAUGHAN: I will ask a question to-morrow to discover who is the leader of the party, because I want to ask him some important questions. It is most extraordinary that, while we have in this House what is called a farmers' party, yet there are large and important institutions such as farmers' progress associations and a Farmers' Federal Council, who are continually clamouring to have direct representation in Parliament. The farmers cannot be satisfied with their friends who are running this Government. Only the other day

Mr. Maughan.]

on the Darling Downs—as I can prove by reading an extract from a newspaper published there—the Farmers' Federal Council adopted as a plank in their platform that they should have direct representation in Parliament. Surely that shows that they are not at all satisfied! I have a lot of extracts from which it would not be at all difficult to convince the House that the farmers are not by any means satisfied. At all events, there is plenty of room, so the farmers think, with regard to having their rights represented in this House.

The PREMIER: They have the right party to right their wrongs.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Only on 30th March last the *Daily Mail* had a leading article under the heading "Assistance to Farmers." In that article these words appeared—

"Can nothing be done by the Government to make settlement upon the land more attractive? And, specially, can nothing be done to induce a larger area of cultivation, in order that food for both man and beast may be produced in greater abundance and the wealth of the country be multiplied?"

The article goes on to say that nothing has been done. After all these promises where are the performances? However, I have no desire to labour the matter beyond mentioning that wherever I come in contact with farmers they want the very best land they can get hold of themselves and for their sons. They want relief from the heavy burden of taxation under which they are suffering at the present time, more particularly the income tax and those irritating little imposts which the Premier frequently brought up in this House when he was in opposition to the Labour-Morgan party.

The PREMIER: We hope this year to get rid of them. I am obliged to the hon. member for reminding me of them.

Mr. MAUGHAN: The farmers will have to thank the persistent agitation of the Labour party for that. They have to thank the Labour party for the promised changes in connection with the Agricultural Bank.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Claim it all!

Mr. MAUGHAN: It has only been promised because of the persistent agitation of the Labour party. The agitator has been very active.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear! (Laughter.)

Mr. MAUGHAN: And he always is going to be active until some reforms are accomplished. I glory in the title of agitator. To me it is one of the most distinguished titles that can be given to any man, and I can assure the House that there is going to be a great deal more agitation in the future than there has been in the past; and until the producer is put in a very different position to what he occupies at the present time that agitation is not going to cease.

Mr. GRAYSON: You would put on a land tax.

Mr. MAUGHAN: They have a land tax now, and it has been proved conclusively that since the land tax proposals of the Commonwealth Government came into force thousands of acres of splendid land throughout Australia have been made available to the settler. The hon. member for Cunningham should be one of the very

[*Mr. Maughan.*

first men in this Chamber to eulogise the Federal Labour party for taking that very important step—a step which has been held to be of supreme importance to Australia—a step which has been, at all events, embraced with open arms by the people who are taking advantage of it. I have something here of special importance to the State socialists who occupy the front Treasury bench. In the interests of the farmers, I ask them to establish State butter factories.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear! I should be glad to sell them three. (Laughter.)"

Mr. MAUGHAN: I may remind hon. members opposite that the South Australian Labour Government have established a State butter factory.

Mr. MORGAN: What has been the result?

Mr. MAUGHAN: I am not aware yet, but I dare say we shall have a report on the subject before many weeks are over. I should like to ask Ministers, with a view to relieving the financial strain on farmers, to establish as a Government institution implement factories, as a result of which farmers will be able to get their implements very much cheaper than they are getting them at the present time. In justification of this request, I should like to read the following extract:—

"The farmers of Western Australia are apparently not afraid of the socialism advocated by the Labour party. The other day the Premier was approached to undertake the manufacture of farming machinery, it being pointed out that this could be done by a slight extension of the Midland Junction Workshops, where the railway rolling-stock is manufactured. The deputation asserted that there was a difference of some 200 and 300 per cent. between the selling price and the factory cost. The Premier gave a very encouraging reply, saying it was anticipated that the area under cultivation would increase at the rate of 100,000 acres annually through the introduction of new settlers, in addition to the extension of the operations of present farmers. This meant a big market of agricultural machinery."

I submit that there is a good deal of profit to the Government in the business, apart altogether from the very great encouragement that would be given to the producer. The Secretary for Public Instruction, I know, is only new to office; but reference is made in the Governor's Opening Speech to the work that is being done in connection with the University of Queensland. In that connection I would like to emphasise the importance of meeting the wishes of the State school teachers, who have for years been asking successive Governments to establish a training college. At every conference for years past the teachers' associations have passed resolutions urging the Government to

[9.30 p.m.] establish such institutions. The Minister for Agriculture, Mr. Tolmie, has always been an enthusiastic supporter of that principle, being an old school teacher himself, and I trust that his influence in the Cabinet in that direction, if in no other, will be exercised. (Hear, hear!) We hear a good deal from the public Press and from certain Ministers about the contented public service. I can assure you that while I am prepared to admit that in the Railway Department there have been material improvements to the workers, there is any amount of room for more.

The PREMIER: There always is.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Mr. T. Ryan, M.L.A., the chairman of the South Australian Commission which visited Queensland some time ago, said, "What miserable salaries you pay!"

The PREMIER: He was under a considerable misapprehension.

Mr. MAUGHAN: I do not think he was. You have only got to pick up the Blue Book to see the salaries that are paid to our school teachers and you will see that they are a long way behind those paid in New South Wales, Victoria, or South Australia.

The PREMIER: There is a greater expenditure per capita on education in Queensland than in any other State.

Mr. MAUGHAN: You must remember that we have an enormous territory.

The PREMIER: It is not per acre, but per capita.

Mr. MAUGHAN: In spite of that fact there is a good deal in the contention of the hon. gentleman who came up here from South Australia, and made use of the expression, "What miserable salaries you pay!"

The PREMIER: I assure you he was under a misapprehension.

Mr. MAUGHAN: In connection with training colleges I may say that I have been requested by teachers in different parts of the State to bring this matter before Parliament, and I should be failing in my duty if I did not do so. Mr. R. H. Roe, M.A., Inspector-General of Schools and vice-chancellor of the University of Queensland, who was the first witness, gave an interesting account of the manifold duties of his office, and outlined the probable educational programme for this State in the near future. I would like to know if that is an authoritative statement. Can we go from this House and inform the teachers of Queensland that there will be a training college associated with the University, and that it will certainly be an established fact? I should also like to see more itinerant teachers appointed.

The PREMIER: There are twelve now.

Mr. MAUGHAN: And there should be more. I have a letter from a person on the Darling Downs, and they say, amongst other things, that there are fourteen youngsters attending the school, and that there are girls and boys from twelve to fourteen years of age who cannot read or write.

The PREMIER: Where do they come from?

Mr. MAUGHAN: The Cunningham district.

The PREMIER: Where were they born?

Mr. MAUGHAN: I cannot say. There are children in my own district, not very many miles from Ipswich—I am speaking now about a little district where they have no school at all—

The PREMIER: How far are they located from the school?

Mr. MAUGHAN: I did not intend to refer to that, as I proposed to see the Minister himself, and I do not wish to make any capital out of it now; but there are children in Queensland who will do well

with a visit from an itinerant teacher. I said just now that I regretted there was no mention in the Speech of anything relating to the hospitals.

The PREMIER: You know we propose to give £2 for £1.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Yes; but we have done that before, and the result has not been at all satisfactory. I think it is humiliating to find it necessary in order to maintain our public hospitals for a leading newspaper like the *Brisbane Courier* to have the stereotyped heading, "Who will be next?" every day in order to run the hospital. On the ground of common humanity, if for no other reason, we should do everything that it is possible to do to have the hospitals of Queensland put in a thoroughly strong position. What did we see the other day? We find the unfortunate cabmen of Brisbane, who can hardly make a living themselves, giving up a day of their time and holding a sports meeting to raise funds for the hospital.

The PREMIER: Much to their credit.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Much to their credit say I also, and to everyone who subscribed. But we are staying off the inevitable. You will have to come round to our platform yet, and you might just as well make up your mind to do it. One of the planks of our platform is to nationalise the hospitals, and you might as well accept it. The Childrens' Hospital is another branch of the hospitals.

The PREMIER: They are never lacking for funds.

Mr. MAUGHAN: I am surprised to hear that, as I have got something that will refute that statement when the Estimates come on. I will not weary the House with it now. There is another aspect in connection with the hospitals apart from the financial condition of the hospitals, and that is the wages paid to hospital attendants. The wages are not what they should be.

The PREMIER: They have been increased this year.

Mr. MAUGHAN: You have no control over them. No money should be paid by the Government to any hospital unless there is a guarantee given to the Government that proper wages will be paid to the nurses and attendants at the hospital. They should be paid standard wages the same as the attendants in our mental hospitals and other institutions. The other day I was in the Dalby electorate, and my hon. friends opposite were also there in connection with the Dalby election.

The PREMIER: It was a glorious victory.

Mr. MAUGHAN: There was not much glory about it.

The PREMIER: Your prophetic soul was wrong.

The SPEAKER: Order! I regret to have to call the Chief Secretary to order. These interjections are going beyond parliamentary endurance.

Mr. MAUGHAN: One or two of the Premier's interjections were rather helpful to me. I discovered while I was at Dalby that the scale of pay for nurses at the hospital there was nothing at all for the first six months, then 8s. a week for the

Mr. Maughan.]

second six months, and after that I do not know what they get. How they manage to keep up any sort of appearance and exist on that wage I cannot tell. At the Brisbane Hospital the pay is £5 per year for the first year, £10 per year for the second, and £20 per year for the third year. How is it possible for the daughter of a worker getting small wages to graduate in the Brisbane Hospital on £5 a year? It is absolutely impossible for a number of desirable girls to do so. I must not touch further on that subject, interesting though it is. We are told at the end of the Speech that the Estimates for the current year are under consideration, and will be laid before the House as soon as possible. A paragraph appeared in the daily Press and was copied in the country Press some time ago under the heading "Keep down Expenditure," and is as follows:—

"As some slight protection against the importunities of members, we (*Warwick Argus*) understand a ukase has been issued to every M.L.A., intimating that no further money will be available for expenditure nor will any further expenditure be made before the end of the current financial year—30th June."

I have no desire to elaborate this particular article, but I should just like to point out that while a large amount of public funds is being spent in all sorts of directions, it is a very difficult thing for some members of this House to get money spent in their electorates. I should like to see a return called for—I think I shall call for it myself—showing the amount of public funds from the loan works account and other sources that has been promised and granted by the Government, especially during the last six months.

The PREMIER: You have nothing to complain of in your electorate, at any rate.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Of course, if you regard the Ipswich workshops, which are purely a national concern, I suppose we ought to be satisfied.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The money is spent locally.

Mr. MAUGHAN: I am sorry the Minister in charge of the Home Department is not present, as I just wish to refer to a matter concerning his department. We have the case of the Ipswich mental hospital—a female ward that has been constructed for several months; in fact, I believe it was completed a year ago—in spite of the fact that there is tremendous pressure in the Goodna mental hospital, this great institution is practically empty.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: A doctor was appointed months ago.

Mr. MAUGHAN: A doctor was appointed months ago, and we have the deputy leader of the Opposition reading extracts showing the tremendous pressure in the Goodna hospital, and yet all that time the institution in Ipswich has been empty. The thing is ridiculous, and is one of the laughing-stocks of the place. I had intended to mention it specially on the Estimates, but I think it is just as well to mention it now as the matter has been referred to. I referred a few moments ago to the importance of members of this House being interested in the industries of the State. I should like to feel that the Government would take a peculiar and special interest in the various industries of Queensland. In

{*Mr. Maughan.*

some respects they do not. There have been cases where they have sent work out of Queensland that could be done in Queensland.

The PREMIER: Give an instance.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Yes, I will give an instance. I will show you what difference there is in the Government here and the New South Wales Labour Government's policy in that particular direction. Take, for instance, the new dredge that was ordered some time ago—a dredge costing £46,000. I should like to ask the Premier whether inquiries were made in Queensland as to whether that tool could be made here.

The PREMIER: Yes.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Then I am satisfied as regards Queensland. I should like to know if inquiries were made in the Southern States, because I can assure you there are great foundries—great concerns in Sydney and Melbourne—where a tool of that sort could be made.

The PREMIER: They have not the patterns of the type.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Of course, there may be something in that, and there may not be. I am not prepared to argue that point until I have discussed the matter with an engineer.

The PREMIER: Mr. Cullen was the authority.

Mr. MAUGHAN: According to the *Brisbane Courier* of the 21st March, we are told that the tender went to a German firm. At the very time—it is a singular coincidence—at the very time the Government were sending to Germany for a new dredge, the Labour Government of New South Wales were giving patterns to Australia. I should say it was the Victorian Government who inquired of the Labour Government of New South Wales as to whether such a tool could be made there.

The PREMIER: This particular tool could not be made in Australia.

Mr. MAUGHAN: If the hon. member has expert information in that respect, I must accept the statement, but it is a very extraordinary thing. I have heard a contrary opinion expressed. I have heard it said that the dredge could be made in Queensland, let alone in New South Wales.

The PREMIER: No.

Mr. MAUGHAN: However, there is no occasion to dilate on that matter. Another thing: I find the Minister for Railways, who has been particularly energetic of late in regard to his department—I find him entering into a contract for £376,000 for steel rails. I would like to ask the hon. member whether inquiries were made as to getting those rails in New South Wales.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Tenders were called in Brisbane and in London.

Mr. MAUGHAN: It is quite possible tenders called in Brisbane might not be seen in New South Wales.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Oh, yes!

Mr. MAUGHAN: I should have liked to have seen the Minister rise to the occasion and have sent a special expert to New South Wales, and enter into a contract if possible.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: As a matter of fact, they could not supply them at the time.

Mr. MAUGHAN: All I know is they are laying down an enormous plant in New South Wales specially for steel rails.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: That is so.

Mr. MAUGHAN: As a matter of fact, these particular rails are wanted for the Western extension, and we also know it will be a long time before these rails are required, so there was no particular hurry.

The PREMIER: There was. The Agent-General advised us of the utmost importance of getting in early owing to a probable advance in price.

Mr. MAUGHAN: If that is so, all well and good. We will leave that for the time being. No doubt we will hear more about it on the Estimates. Reference has been made to the Commonwealth referendum proposals, and I have no desire just now to go into this matter, because ample opportunity will be given, when the Financial Statement is being considered, to go into Federal finance and matters of allied interests. At the same time, I should like to express my strong protest against the action of the Premier and other members of his party in what I regard as giving vent to a gross misrepresentation as to the actual aims and objects of the Federal Labour party in connection with the proposals submitted.

The PREMIER: Are you serious?

Mr. MAUGHAN: I am serious, and I may say also that the figures submitted to this House—

The PREMIER: Are correct.

Mr. MAUGHAN: I am not disputing that. I should just like to say this: The Premier must not forget the vote recorded was a miserable one.

The PREMIER: No.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Yes, a miserable vote—a miserable percentage. Not 50 per cent., and the people have themselves to blame for it. I am just coming to believe there are thousands of people in Australia who do not realise the great privilege of the franchise. I think myself if they do not exercise the franchise which has been won for them they ought to be disfranchised altogether.

The PREMIER: Wipe them off the roll.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Yes, I would go that far. If a person could not show just cause why he did not vote on a certain day, he should be disfranchised.

The PREMIER: They are amending the Commonwealth Act at present. You had better suggest that.

Mr. MAUGHAN: I do not know whether we should discuss that now. It is only my personal opinion. When we have regard to the fact that matters of enormous interest are settled at the ballot-box—I suppose the hon. member will not mind telling me when the next election will take place.

The PREMIER: October, 1912.

Mr. MAUGHAN: May or June, I suppose? Anyway, whenever it is we shall have in Queensland, as we have had before, thousands of people who will not bother to record their vote. I say to those people, they do not deserve the franchise if they cannot use it on important occasions of this sort. I trust that the session will be pro-

ductive of some good, and that many of the Bills foreshadowed will be carefully debated, and that if they do become law they will be properly administered. Take, for instance, the Liquor Bill. Supposing that becomes law, let us hope it will be administered better than many of the laws on our statute-book. If the Liquor Act to-day was properly administered, we should see a great change.

The PREMIER: In what respect is it not well administered?

Mr. MAUGHAN: I will deal with that when the Bill comes on. If the law relating to public health were more stringently administered in regard to impure liquor and impure food, we should hear less talk about liquor reform. If the people who run public-houses would keep clean public-houses, and supply clean, pure liquor, we should hear less about liquor reform. Somehow the big liquor traffic has got out of control.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Demoralised!

Mr. MAUGHAN: There are people running hotels in Queensland who are not fit to run a hotel for the public convenience. I am glad the Bill is coming forward, though I do not know what it contains. I notice that the Premier has invited his followers to a trip on the "Lucinda," where he will explain the measure. Could he not invite this party too? (Government laughter.) The hon. gentleman says distinctly that it is not a party measure.

The PREMIER: It is a Government measure.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Do I understand that the Government are going to sink or swim according to the fate of the measure? Whatever may be done, I agree that there is plenty of room for improvement in the trade. I trust once more that the session will be productive of great good to the people of Queensland. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): 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 to 10 o'clock.