

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**WEDNESDAY, 19 JULY 1911**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

WEDNESDAY, 19 JULY, 1911.

---

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

QUESTIONS.

GRAZING FARM SELECTION IN ST. GEORGE AND CUNNAMULLA DISTRICTS.

Mr. LAND (*Balonne*) asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

“In view of the fact that there is a large number of desirable people anxious to select

land in the St. George and the Cunnamulla land agents' districts, will the Minister at the earliest opportunity resume and have thrown open to grazing farm selection all available lands in these districts?"

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

"Action is proceeding for the resumption of all lands likely to be selected, and which may be resumed without compensation for resumption. All possible expedition will be used."

#### BREACHES OF SHEARERS AND SUGAR WORKERS ACCOMMODATION ACT.

Mr. LAND asked the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock—

"Seeing that there are repeated and grave complaints regarding the non-observance of the provisions of the Shearers and Sugar Workers Accommodation Act in the St. George and the Cunnamulla districts, will he call for reports concerning these breaches from the inspectors under the Act in these districts?"

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE AND STOCK (Hon. J. Tolmie, *Drayton and Toowoomba*) replied—

"Repeated and grave complaints have not been received from the St. George and Cunnamulla districts regarding the non-observance of the provisions of the Shearers and Sugar Workers Accommodation Acts. Three complaints only have been received from these districts since the 1st January, 1910, none of which, after inquiry, were reported to be justifiable."

#### ORDER OF ASKING QUESTIONS.

Mr. THEODORE: I beg to ask questions 3 and 4 standing in my name.

The SPEAKER: Question No. 3.

#### CAIRNS RAILWAY—NO. 10 TUNNEL, ETC.

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

"From information now in the possession of his department, does he think that No. 10 Tunnel and other portions of the Cairns Railway were originally built in a safe and proper manner?"

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

"The fact that the tunnel stood firmly for twenty years shows that it was safe. The movement of ground which took place owing to the abnormal rainfall of a few months ago could not be foreseen when the line was constructed."

#### RAILWAY FROM PORT DOUGLAS TO MOUNT MOLLOY—STABILITY OF CAIRNS-KURANDA RAILWAY.

Mr. THEODORE asked the Secretary for Railways—

"Will he have a report made by competent engineers 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—

"(a) Mr. Parkinson's report is already in the hands of the department, but further inquiries into the whole of the suggested routes will be made.

"(b) When in the district in May last I requested the district engineer to furnish a report on the general condition of the line after the repairs are completed."

Mr. THEODORE asked the Secretary for Railways, without notice—

"In Engineer Parkinson's report on the proposed railway from Port Douglas to Mount Molloy was any reference made to the probable cost of such railway?"

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS replied—

"In reply to the hon. member, I cannot say whether Engineer Parkinson gave an estimate of cost or not."

#### GROS MICHAEL BANANA BULBS.

Mr. FERRICKS (*Bowen*) asked the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock—

"1. Did the Agricultural Department import last year a consignment of Gros Michael banana bulbs from Jamaica?"

"2. What was the date of arrival of the consignment?"

"3. What was the number of bulbs imported?"

"4. Has the department any record of the success of the importation?"

"5. (a) How many of the bulbs struck? (b) How many progressed to maturity?"

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE AND STOCK replied—

"1. Yes; two consignments.

"2. Eleventh and twenty-fifth July, 1910.

"3. Four thousand.

"4. Yes; so far as those who received the suckers have replied to the inquiries.

"5. The number cannot be accurately given, because all who received bananas have not replied to the questions asked. There were many failures attributable to the bad packing. Orders have been given for two further consignments."

#### SUGAR-MILL ON INKERMAN ESTATE.

Mr. FERRICKS asked the Chief Secretary—

"1. Did the Government, when he was Secretary for Public Lands, enter into an agreement with Mr. John Drysdale, or with Drysdale Brothers and Co., regarding the erection of a sugar-mill on the recently repurchased Inkerman Estate?"

"2. Will he lay a copy of such agreement on the table of the House?"

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

"1 and 2. On the completion of the negotiations, which are still proceeding, the agreement will be tabled."

#### INKERMAN ESTATE—PRIORITY TO THE PERPETUAL LEASEHOLD SYSTEM.

Mr. FERRICKS asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

"In view of the expected very keen competition for blocks of the repurchased Inkerman Estate, will he grant priority, other qualifications being equal, to those applicants who desire to select under the perpetual leasehold system, seeing that such power is conferred on him by the Land Act of 1910?"

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS replied—

"No. The terms of the Closer Settlement Act do not permit land acquired under its provisions being opened for perpetual lease-selection."

#### CAIRNS TECHNICAL COLLEGE SITE.

Mr. MANN (*Cairns*) asked the Secretary for Public Instruction—

"1. Is he aware that a vote was taken (with the consent of his predecessor in office) of the

parents of the children attending the State school in the town of Cairns re the site of the technical college?

"2. Is he further aware that the vote given was hostile to his present action in connection with the technical college site?

"3. Why was a vote taken if the department refuses to accept the verdict of the majority of the parents who voted?"

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. K. M. Grant, *Rockhampton*) replied—

"1. Yes.

"2. Yes.

"3. The local proposal was that the technical college should be erected on the drill-ground reserve, and that certain State land should be given to the Commonwealth in exchange for that reserve. A personal inspection by certain Ministers and officials disclosed that the proposed exchange would cost the State at least £1,100, whereas the proposal of the Education Department that about half an acre of the 5-acre school reserve should be devoted to technical college purposes will not involve the State in any expenditure on account of a site, and provides a much better site for technical college and high school purposes than the drill-ground site."

PROPOSED LIGHTSHIPS OR LIGHTHOUSES.

Mr. NEVITT (*Carpentaria*) asked the Treasurer—

"Is it the intention of the Government to place lightships or lighthouses at the following places, or in the vicinity of same, at an early date—Cape Gloucester, St. Bees or Bailey Island, Cheviot Island, Breaksea Spit, so as to reduce the risk to our coastal shipping?"

The TREASURER (Hon. W. H. Barnes, *Bulimba*) replied—

"No."

SANATORIUM FOR CENTRAL QUEENSLAND.

Mr. CRAWFORD (*Fitzroy*) asked the Home Secretary—

"Does he propose, during this session, to deal with the matter of erecting a sanatorium for Central Queensland?"

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

"The matter has received attention. The recent Royal Commission on health conditions in Queensland mines has made important recommendations for dealing with consumption on an organised basis. Inquiries are also being carried out by the Commissioner of Public Health with a view to the selection of a sanatorium site for Central Queensland."

MAPS FOR SCHOOLS OF ARTS.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked the Secretary for Public Instruction—

"Is his department taking any steps towards issuing new and up-to-date maps for the use of schools of arts and other similar institutions?"

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION replied—

"The department does not supply maps to schools of arts, but the Survey Department is now preparing a modern map of Queensland for school purposes. The maps supplied to schools are of the latest edition."

FINES OF RAILWAY MEN.

Mr. MAY asked the Secretary for Railways—

"1. When railway men are fined, where does the money go?

"2. Has the Railway Department power under the Railways Act to fine employees?"

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS replied—

"1. To revenue.

"2. Yes."

EIGHT-HOUR DAY IN GOVERNMENT SUGAR-MILLS.

Mr. LENNON (*Herbert*) asked the Treasurer, without notice—

"Is he yet in a position to furnish an official reply to the deputation which waited upon him early this month, asking for the establishment of an eight-hour day in the Government sugar-mills?"

The TREASURER replied—

"The hon. gentleman really furnished his own reply. The same conditions prevail in connection with Government sugar-works as prevail elsewhere—namely, that there is an eight-hour day."

Mr. LENNON: But you promised to furnish an official reply.

The TREASURER: The hon. gentleman will be furnished with a reply in a few days.

PAPERS.

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

Report upon the Government life insurance and annuity business for the year 1910.

Report of the board of inquiry upon the question of a harbour scheme for the port of Mackay.

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE ON ACCOUNT OF LIQUOR.

On the motion of Mr. BARBER (*Bundaberg*), it was formally resolved—

"That there be laid on the table of the House a return showing—

"1. The amount of revenue received by the Government for the three years—1st July to 30th June, 1908-9, 1909-10, and 1910-11 respectively—for licenses for the manufacture and sale of beer, stout, and spirituous liquors.

"2. The average amount spent per head of population for purchase of beer, stout, and spirituous liquors.

"3. The cost for maintenance of prison service of Queensland.

"4. Cost to State for police, law and justice.

"5. Charitable aid.

"6. Old-age pensions.

"7. Industrial schools.

"8. Hospitals.

"9. Hospitals for the insane.

"10. Homes, refuges, etc.

"11. Number of police warders in service of Queensland.

"12. Number of prisoners and patients in Government institutions during the three years mentioned above."

## NEW STANDING ORDERS.

## MOTION TO GO INTO COMMITTEE.

The PREMIER (Hon. D. F. Denham, *Oxley*): I move—

"That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the proposed new code of Standing Orders and Rules of Practice, as laid upon the table of the House on the 12th July."

I assume that the leader of the Opposition called "Not formal" to this motion in order that he might receive some information with respect to it, for I can hardly conceive of any objection being offered to going into Committee to consider the new Standing Orders submitted by the Standing Orders Committee.

Mr. LENNON: I believe in the open door during the discussion of the proposed new Standing Orders.

The PREMIER: Quite so. I apprehend that such is the case, and I anticipate that there will be a full discussion of the new code of Standing Orders and Rules of Practice by the House, and I shall offer no kind of objection to the fullest discussion of them.

Mr. LENNON (*Herbert*): I should like to suggest to the Premier the advisableness of postponing the discussion of the new Standing Orders until the Address in Reply is got rid of. I think hon. members have not had sufficient time to peruse the amendments contained in the report of the Standing Orders Committee. By postponing the discussion of the matter we can make ourselves familiar with the new proposals, and probably be able to compare them with other Standing Orders. At any rate, I am of opinion that it would tend to facilitate business if we thrashed out the Address in Reply before taking the discussion on the Standing Orders.

The PREMIER: I can assure the hon. gentleman that I have not the least intention of pressing this matter until the debate on the Address in Reply is finished.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Question put and passed.

## ADDRESS IN REPLY.

## RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on attaining to the high and honourable position of Speaker of this House. I feel sure that you will carry out the duties of the office not only with credit to yourself, but also with credit to the whole of the members of this Chamber. The programme submitted by the Government is one of progress, and if a number of the measures mentioned in that programme are placed on the statute-book I am of opinion that they will be of considerable benefit to Queensland generally. I do not intend to go into details regarding the various Bills to be submitted, but there are one or two matters to which I should like to devote a little attention. I should also like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply on the speeches delivered by them. But in one or two matters

[*Hon. D. F. Denham.*

I cannot wholly agree with the mover of the motion, the hon. member for Dalby, more particularly his remarks concerning prickly pear. The Liquor Bill will no doubt be one of the most important measures that we shall have to deal with this session. As a member sitting on the Government benches I wish to be left with an entirely free hand in dealing with any particular clause of that Bill, and I feel sure that it is the wish of a large majority of members on both sides of the House that that measure should be dealt with from a non-party standpoint. (Hear, hear!) The Police Jurisdiction Bill is also a measure that should be dealt with on non-party lines, and no doubt every hon. member will do his best to see that both measures are placed on the statute-book for the good of every class of the community, whether they be rich or poor. I have been very pleased to see in the daily Press that it is the intention of the Secretary for Agriculture to introduce considerable reforms in his department. I have always held that the Agricultural Department of Queensland is practically a defunct body. I have said this on previous occasions, and I say again that the Agricultural Department is not what it should be nor what the people of Queensland desire it to be.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MORGAN: The Secretary for Agriculture has a splendid chance of distinguishing himself, if ever any man who attained to ministerial rank had a chance of doing so. He is in charge of a department that practically requires turning completely inside out. If the hon. gentleman was taking up the work of a department that was all that was to be desired, we should not expect him to bring in any radical reforms, but the department requires numerous necessary reforms to make it the up-to-date department that the State is entitled to have, and I feel sure that the Hon. the Secretary for Agriculture will do his level best to bring it up to date. We have already seen in the Press references to reforms which are likely to take place, and, as one representing an agricultural district, I am very pleased to see that these reforms are likely to take practical shape. So far as the Agricultural Bank is concerned, I have had considerable experience of that institution during the short period I have been in Parliament, and I am very pleased to see that the trustees who have been controlling the concern for a number of years past are to be sent about their business and some different system introduced. I know that the Agricultural Bank has not been a success so far as the people whom it was instituted to benefit are concerned. The poor man has not had an opportunity of getting the assistance that we expected would be given to the man settling on the land, and I do hope that in this respect the system that has proved so successful in Western Australia will be followed to a great extent in Queensland. When an application is made here for a loan, it has to be accompanied by £3, which has to be sent to the office in Brisbane. Perhaps several months after the application is made, an officer is sent to inspect the land, and it may be six or nine months after you make your application before you receive any assistance, whilst in many instances—and deserving cases too—you are told that the bank cannot assist you, and they only return £1 10s. of the

£3 you were required to lodge, and you are given no satisfaction as to why the loan cannot be granted.

Mr. FERRICKS: You are charged £1 10s to be told you cannot get it.

Mr. MORGAN: We should adopt the system in force in Western Australia. If that were done, instead of having to send your application to the head office in Brisbane, it would be lodged with the land commissioner, and we have land commissioners all over Queensland. The commissioner will then send out a Crown land ranger to inspect the land, and in the course of two or three days a report is received, and the loan can be dealt with by the trustees, or whoever has control of the bank in Brisbane. Another very good thing they have in Western Australia which has proved very successful is that, instead of having to send an official out to inspect the improvements, it is quite sufficient if an adjoining farmer certifies that the improvements have been made, and then the money is sent along. That is a splendid idea, and one which could be worked very effectively in this State. Out of several hundred cases in Western Australia there has only been one case in which they have had to prosecute anybody for signing a document stating that certain improvements had been effected, when those improvements had not been made. We should do all we possibly can to bring the Agricultural Bank up to date, and make it as easy as possible for people to obtain the assistance they require, and not hinder or hamper them, as has been done in the past, and as is being done at the present time. There is another matter connected with the bank that requires remedying. I believe that the Crown Solicitor has ruled that settlers who have received from the Lands Department assistance so far as marsupial netting is concerned are not entitled to an advance from the Agricultural Bank, although the previous Crown Solicitor ruled differently. If that is so, it is time something was done to remedy the defect. I also intend touching upon certain matters connected with the administration of the Agricultural Department so far as State farms and stud farms are concerned. We have established in certain parts of Queensland stud farms, where high-priced stock are kept, whose services are made use of to a certain extent by settlers at a moderate charge. But it is only settlers who live alongside the farms who are able to avail themselves of the services of the stud stock. I think that people far distant from these places should also be placed in a position to make use of the stock for stud purposes. The reason why they are not able to do so at present is because of the high railway freight on stock. It should be the duty of the Government to allow stock travelling to and from these farms for stud purposes to receive at least the same concessions in regard to railway freight as are given to the owners of stock travelling to and from agricultural shows. There is no reason why people at a distance should be compelled to pay full rates—which are enormous—in order to get the services of the animals stationed at those stud farms, when those farms are being kept going by the community generally. I would also like to see the Government establish what are known as demonstration farms. We have throughout Queensland land that has been taken up, where the plough has never been

introduced, and people who come from other States and from foreign countries, not knowing exactly what the land is suitable for, are compelled to go to the cost—and often the expense is ruinous—of discovering for themselves exactly what class of agriculture the climatic conditions are suitable for. If we had demonstration farms in Queensland, the same as they have in New South Wales, and had them run on good commercial

principles, then they would prove [4 p.m.] to people round about what could be grown on them. I do not mean experimental farms. I know that experimental farms cannot be made to pay, and it would be a pity if they were made to pay. But we could get hold of a man to select a bit of land—he might take up land in a prickly-pear area if you like—let him take up a 1,280-acre block and work it and grow wheat on it or something of that description, and in time it would become profitable. After a certain time the value of that land would be bound to increase, so that it would be a profitable investment for the State, so much so that if they wanted to sell that land after, say, fifteen years they would get as many pounds for it then as they would only get shillings in the first place, before the land was proved. In Victoria at the present time they are selling up these demonstration farms because they have no further use for them. The people in the districts where they were established all know quite well what the district can produce, and what is best for them to grow, and the Government are now getting from £15 to £20 per acre for these farms, which, in the first instance, were only worth a few shillings. So from a business point of view it would be sound finance for the Government to undertake the establishment of these demonstration farms throughout Queensland. They ought to do it to give the people a lead as it were, to lead them on. At the present time we have no large wheat areas in Queensland. The people are afraid to tackle wheat-growing because they have not seen anyone else tackle it. They want to see someone else tackle it first, and the Government should do it in the way that I have suggested.

Mr. RYAN: That is socialism.

Mr. BRENNAN: It does not matter what "ism" it is.

Mr. MORGAN: I think that the Agricultural Department is going to benefit by having the senior member for Drayton and Toowoomba at its head. (Hear, hear!) At any rate, that is the opinion of the people on the Downs.

Mr. COLLINS: The Downs is not Queensland.

Mr. MORGAN: I am not acquainted with the opinions of the people up in the North—

Mr. COLLINS: Why not come up and have a look at the North.

Mr. MORGAN: If I were acquainted with the opinions of the people up North, I think they would be just as pleased to have Mr. Tolmie at the head of the Agricultural Department as they are on the Downs. I feel sure, as a representative of an agricultural district, that some good will result from it, and I hope that in that respect I will not be disappointed. There is one matter I would like to touch on here which comes under the department controlled by the

*Mr. Morgan.]*

Minister for Agriculture, and that is that there has been an enormous spread of the ticks in districts where they were not known before. In parts of my electorate the tick was unheard of until last year, and it spread so alarmingly that wires were sent down to the department to send up an officer in order to prevent the spread of the pest any further. I know that in one place in Central Queensland red water broke out amongst the cattle. They mustered all the cattle that could walk—or those that were not suffering from red water—and had them dipped in Taroom. They took them another 100 miles and had them dipped again, and then they were taken to Miles, and from there they were sent to Roma for sale. These were all red water cattle, and they were quite likely to spread the disease over that particular area, yet there was no officer of the Agricultural Department there to see that things were carried out properly. I consider that when the tick pest breaks out in any district, in the first instance it should be the duty of the department to station a man there permanently to prevent things of that description occurring. It is no use leaving it to the temporary men. We know that the clerks of our shire councils are appointed as temporary inspectors, but they are not able to fulfil their duties the same as the permanent men. I hope that something will be done by the department to cope with the tick pest, and not allow it to spread gradually without any notice being taken of it, like the case of the prickly pear, which was allowed to spread gradually until it has got over almost the whole of Queensland. We are told that the tick cannot live in certain areas in Queensland. It was said eight or nine years ago that the tick could not live in certain parts of my district, but to-day the ticks are living there and spreading rapidly in the very localities where the old hands said they could not live. It may be that ticks from the coast would not live there, but ticks bred in the district are living and thriving almost as well as in the coastal districts. I hope this matter will receive some consideration. There is another matter which affects the smaller settler in my district, and that is the matter of getting permits for the removal of stock for sale. At one time it may have been quite right—especially in the old squatting days—for inspectors to be stationed here and there when they were going to move large mobs of cattle, and they could send down to the inspectors and get the permits up in time. But now that the small settler has come, the conditions should be altered. I think that the police should be allowed to give the necessary permits for the removal of stock. If it were left to the police it would have a greater protective power for travelling, and would be much better in the case of cattle-stealing. It would be quite safe to leave it to the police to issue the permits, because whereas at the present time the inspector does not see the stock at all, in the case of the police they would see the stock, and it would be greater protection for the owners in cases of cattle-stealing.

Mr. COYNE: Don't the inspectors get the reports from the police now?

Mr. MORGAN: I hope that the department will give the police the power to issue permits for the removal of stock. I have a few words to say about the Railway Department. I notice by the Press that something like £100,000 is to be given to the poorer-paid

workmen in the Railway Department. I think that meets with the approval of every member in this House, or, at any rate, every member on this side.

Mr. FERRICKS: You voted against a minimum wage of 8s. a day, you know.

Mr. MORGAN: I did not vote against 8s. a day being paid. I voted against only 8s. a day being paid.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Ah!

Mr. COYNE: Too thin!

Mr. MORGAN: Yes. I consider that every man should get what he is worth. If a man can earn £1 a day on railway construction work he is entitled to it, and he has a perfect right to earn it.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MORGAN: I think that the Railway Department should also take into consideration the country people who have to pay the high and enormous freights on some particular classes of goods.

Mr. COLLINS: You ought to go to the Etheridge Railway.

Mr. MORGAN: I know one selector who brought up 16 cwt. of furniture from Brisbane. It was taken a distance of 187 miles, and the freight on that furniture alone amounted to £5 16s. 10d. It is something scandalous that people should be asked to pay that amount of freight for taking their furniture up the country. It does not affect the people in the cities so much, but it affects the country people a good deal because they are asked to pay this freight both ways. They have to pay freight on the necessities of life to go up the country, and they have to pay freight on their produce which they send down to the seaboard. I consider that they should receive some consideration so far as the freight on the necessities of life is concerned. (Hear, hear!) I know that you can buy flour for £10 per ton in Brisbane, but it costs £16 per ton by the time I get it to my own place, and we do not receive any concession from the department in that respect. I would also like to put in a plea for a better railway service so far as the South-western line is concerned. That is one of the best paying lines in Queensland, and yet the Railway Department has not recognised its responsibility so far as the increased traffic is concerned. The passenger traffic on that line is increasing, as we all know, day by day. Yet continually, after the train reaches Toowoomba the people are packed in the carriages like sardines, and they are compelled to travel for hundreds of miles without any comfort, while here in Brisbane the trains are running backwards and forwards half empty.

Mr. COLLINS: Is this a criticism of the Minister for Railways?

Mr. MORGAN: I think it is time some consideration was given to people who have to travel long distances on the railways.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: This is a city Government, you know.

Mr. MORGAN: I also think it is time we had another mail train. We only have, at the present time, two a week from Brisbane out West, and the service is now entitled to three. If we had three mail trains, it would lessen the crowds and perhaps meet the requirements, and the people, for a time at least, would be satisfied. The sleeping

[Mr. Morgan.]

accommodation, especially the first-class accommodation, is anything but satisfactory. The carriages are of the worst description, and in the summer time—well, they are not even clean. I think that the South-western people—perhaps the people in other parts of Queensland as well—deserve better treatment so far as travelling on the railways is concerned.

Mr. NEVITT: We want the railways first.

Mr. MORGAN: Especially so far as the country districts are concerned. Like numerous other members in the House, I also would like to see one or two new railways constructed in my district. I am pleased to say, notwithstanding the railway policy we passed last year in connection with the Western and Northern schemes, that it is not going to interfere with agricultural lines. The people in my district were afraid that those two schemes would interfere with their little local lines, but it is the intention of the Government, according to the remarks made by the Premier, that numerous agricultural lines are to be introduced this session, and that alone is sufficient proof that these agricultural lines are not to be sacrificed in order to construct the larger railways passed last year.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Did the Premier say "numerous"?

Mr. MORGAN: The word "numerous" perhaps is a little over-estimating it. (Laughter.)

Mr. MANN: Where are they going to get the men to construct the lines?

Mr. MORGAN: I would like to mention my opinion so far as the marsupial boards are concerned. I am sorry to say no Bill has been promised this session, but perhaps we might have time to introduce a small Bill to abolish these boards altogether. The whole of the work of those boards could be carried out by the shire councils, and there is no necessity to have separate boards to carry out the work. It is done in the other States, and it can be done in Queensland, and if it were made compulsory for shires to pay a certain amount on such things as dingoes, crows, and emus, then only those shires where these particular pests exist would be compelled to pay. They would not have to pay if the crows, emus, or dingoes did not exist in their particular locality.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Don't you think it is a national question?

Mr. MORGAN: I think the Government should go to the assistance of the shires and contribute at least one-half the amount paid away in bonuses.

Mr. NEVITT: Come over here.

Mr. MORGAN: It is done in every other State in Australia. When the rabbit was a big pest in Victoria, the Government did not put the whole of the responsibility on the man on the land. They said the destruction of the rabbits was a matter which affected every person in Victoria, and they came to the assistance of the man on the land and helped him to destroy the pest. I am pleased to say it is practically destroyed, at any rate so far as being a pest is concerned, in Victoria. As regards the Prickly Pear Board, I am pleased to see, as a representative of a prickly-pear area, that that board has been created. I remember, and other hon. members will remember, that we had a meeting of men interested in

the prickly-pear question, and headed by the late Speaker, Mr. Bell, we interviewed Mr. Kidston, and asked him to appoint a board, or commission, to inquire into the prickly-pear pest. The board appointed is somewhat similar to what we required, and the only thing I regret, so far as its constitution is concerned, is that two practical men were not included. The scientists, I believe, will do good work. At any rate, it is a step in the right direction, and, had a couple of practical men also been appointed to the board, they might have been able to assist the scientists from a practical standpoint. I am pleased to see that the board is now in a district adjoining my own, and is going amongst the farmers to see what they have done in regard to the destruction of pear, and I will be very disappointed if they eventually do not arrive at some solution, which will be considerably better than the methods now adopted. There is also a Prickly Pear Bill, I notice, on the list. What that Bill is, I have not the slightest notion, but I am pleased to see that at last Queensland has awakened to its responsibilities so far as that pest is concerned. They have practically been asleep, like Rip Van Winkle, for the last thirty or forty years. They have allowed this pest to spread, and, instead of treating it as a national question, they have placed the whole of the responsibility on the landowner or settler. It has now reached such an enormous extent and has spread over such a large area of country that the Government, no doubt, see it must be made a national question. I hope they do make it a national question and that the Bill will not put the whole of the responsibility upon the man on the land, as it is a matter which affects every man, woman, and child in Queensland. There are now thousands of acres of splendid land close to railways which are not productive, owing to the prickly pear. That land is lost to Queensland, and had the pest been taken in hand twenty or thirty years ago that land would now be carrying fine homesteads. But "it is never too late to mend," and I hope, so far as the pear question is concerned, if the Government do the proper thing on national lines, that the people on the land will co-operate and do their best; but the whole of the responsibility must not be placed on the settler.

Mr. RYAN: What about the suggestion of the hon. member for Dalby?

Mr. MORGAN: So far as poison is concerned, I have had considerable experience in that respect. I think I have used every poison that has been placed on the market, and I do not favour the suggestion made by the hon. member for Dalby, that the right particular poison should be bought at the present time. I had exceptionally good results from common arsenic and soda, and I think the bulk of the poisons now being sold consist of arsenic and soda, and I could demonstrate to any man who likes to accompany me to my home, and my neighbours as well, where the pear has been completely eradicated by the use of arsenic and soda. I believe this—perhaps the board may suggest it—I hope they do—that the Government should purchase the arsenic and soda, the same as they purchase wire-netting, and give it to the people, to be paid for in instalments—not absolutely free—the same as they do with wire netting, so as to assist the small man who has not the money to buy

*Mr. Morgan.]*



the poison, to put his labour into the work. That would considerably assist in the destruction of prickly pear so far as the small man is concerned. Another Bill to be introduced is one to amend the Elections Acts; and in my opinion an amendment is urgently necessary. I was astounded after the last election to learn that, as far as the ballot-papers which were supplied to polling-booths were concerned, there was no check. I believe in places known as group polling-places ballot-papers were taken charge of by men who had control of the booths, and after the votes were recorded they were put into the ballot-box with no seal on the top; and those men had to travel 15 or 20 miles, or more in some cases, to the head polling-place, and were not made to account for the papers issued to them. Those papers could have been used in any way; and, if that is the law, I hope it will be remedied.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: It is not the law

Mr. MORGAN: I believe it has been the practice; at any rate, it is what was done at the last election, as far as my electorate is concerned. Another alteration required is in respect to the qualification. At present a person may come here from Victoria or some other State, and he must reside here sixteen months before his name can be placed on the roll. He must reside in the State twelve months before he can apply, and it will be another four months before his name can be put on the roll. That may be all very well in the case of people coming from foreign countries or Great Britain.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Mr. MORGAN: But in the case of people coming from other States, who have resided in the Commonwealth for twelve months, it should be sufficient for them to reside in Queensland six months before they can apply—which would mean ten months before their names could be put on the roll. I think that would be a very fair thing.

Mr. COYNE: Hear, hear!

Mr. MORGAN: And I hope provisions to that effect will be embodied in the Bill. (Hear, hear!) I hope also that we shall have a clause dealing with people who are unable to attend the polling-places to record their votes, and allow them to vote by post.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Mr. MORGAN: One of the planks of the Labour party is to enable everybody to have an opportunity of recording his vote. That being so, I would ask what opportunity has an old man or an old woman situated 30 or 40 miles away from a polling-place of recording a vote? I do not say it should be applied to city electorates, where people can make use of trams, and so on, except in case of sickness or some reason of that sort.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Mr. MORGAN: What are Opposition members afraid of?

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: It would lead to corruption.

Mr. MORGAN: As far as corruption is concerned, I do not think it exists solely on this side.

Mr. COYNE: Yes, it does.

Mr. MORGAN: I also wish to touch on the question of some of our industries. I listened attentively to the remarks of the hon. member for Ipswich last night in regard to the shortage of timber and bricks.

[Mr. Morgan.

He did not give the reason; but perhaps speculators or men with money are afraid to establish industries of that description owing to the labour conditions existing throughout Australia. We know that at the present time there are people walking about with their pockets full of money, looking out for the opportunity to invest. People were never better off; but they are looking for investments that will not involve any labour difficulty—something that will give a decent interest, without any chance of that interest being interfered with, or their capital being interfered with, by reason of labour strikes. That is no doubt the reason why these two industries have not been established. We are also told that the Government sent to America or somewhere else for a dredge, without giving an opportunity to local industry. We read in the Press the other day where the Acting Minister for Defence, Senator McGregor, sent an order for 100 wagons for the Defence Department to England.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: He cancelled that.

Mr. MORGAN: The different firms in Australia could not fulfil the order because there were not the men to do the work in the stipulated time. It is true that he wired trying to cancel the order after a deputation of workmen waited on him with respect to the matter, but there is no definite information that the order has actually been cancelled. I wish to say a word now as to the taxes the farmer has to pay. In addition to the cow tax there is the factory registration tax, also the butter tax, the sheep tax, the brands tax, the cattle tax, and the marsupial tax. There is one tax he has to pay which, in my opinion, is altogether out of date—the diseases in sheep tax. At one time it may have been justifiable, but it is not so under existing conditions. The assessment is 5s. per 1,000, or any portion of 1,000, sheep; so that the farmer who keeps 10 or 100 or 200 sheep—a few killing sheep—even half a dozen sheep—if he has only one sheep he has to contribute 5s. as a tax. Perhaps the reason why we have so many goats in the West is owing to the tax on sheep.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: You don't blame this side for that?

Mr. MORGAN: We all know that the sheep is one of the most remunerative animals to keep on a farm, and we should encourage our farmers to go in for sheep as much as possible; but a tax of this sort causes irritation. It may be looked upon as trivial, but it is irritating all the same. I hope the Minister will take a note of these things, and try to rectify them if he can do so. I do not intend to continue my speech any longer, except to say that, when the various Bills promised come before us, I will do my best to see that they are made as favourable as they can be made, so that the people in the agricultural districts especially may get as fair a deal as it is possible to give them.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

\* Mr. CRAWFORD (*Fitzroy*): In venturing at this early stage of the debate to address a few remarks to the House, I [4.30 p.m.] wish to say that I do not intend going into any amount of detail concerning the various measures which have been mapped out for our consideration on

the Government programme. I am anxious to obtain copies of the various measures, so that we may have them for consideration and discussion straightaway in a practical manner, and for that reason I shall not venture to anticipate anything that may be contained in the measures which are promised. It is a pleasure to me, and I think to all of us, that the evidences of the country's progress are so manifest, and we can all hope that the country will continue to make very great progress; but we must prepare for the coming at the same time of days which will be regarded as times of adversity, and I believe the Government are not forgetting the probability of times arriving which will not be so prosperous as those which we are now experiencing. I am glad to learn that progress is being made in the construction of railways, and that a few more railways are promised in those parts of the country in which population is increasing, in those parts in which a denser population can be supported, and I was particularly pleased to hear the Premier state last night that the Government was prepared to carry out the broad-gauge railway as soon as New South Wales linked up its system with our border. I think it only right that we should give as much encouragement as possible towards getting rid of the various gauges that now militate against our rapid progress between the various States of the Commonwealth; and in regard to the North of our great State, I am sure that within a score of years that gauge of railway which is found most suitable for rapid transit throughout Australia will be extended a considerable distance in that direction. I do not wish to go into local matters too much, but I do think that one thing requiring the consideration of the Government in the electorate which I have the honour to represent is the abolition of the rack railway. I think the time has arrived, seeing that that railway line paid so well, is paying well, and promises to pay well, that that old system should be done away with, and that we should have on that line leading from Rockhampton into Mount Morgan the regular system of railways which obtain in all other parts of the State, and the necessity for a change is accentuated by the progress which is being made in the construction of the Dawson Valley line, along the course of which I am sure quite a number of new mines and other industries will be brought into existence, necessitating quicker transit between those centres and the various parts of Central Queensland. In travelling about the city, and looking upon the progress that has been made here, I venture to think that a mistake is being made in regard to the University site. I voted last session against the University having its situation where Government House was, and I am still of the opinion that the ground is not suitable for the erection of the colleges which will be necessarily affiliated with it. There will not be sufficient space, and when we hear, as we did a few weeks ago, that the Government, or some local body, proposed to take a slice of that tongue of land, the space will be considerably limited; and I think that before any greater expense is incurred in the erection of buildings in the Government Domain, the Government should consider the advisability of removing the whole of the University buildings, or the whole University scheme, into a more suitable district, and such a district certainly exists outside and beyond the

claims of the site which has been unfortunately chosen. The Government, I see, are proposing some large scheme of co-ordination of the various systems of education which now exist, and I think nothing will conduce more to the effectiveness of that co-ordination than having the University in a centre around which the affiliated buildings may be built—technical colleges and other colleges which will be found necessary from time to time. If we look forward—and I think we do look forward—to our University becoming a success, I think we ought to see to it that the site is placed in a centre which will allow of expansion. I am very glad that the commission which has gone round the country inquiring into the prevalence of phthisis among miners has sent in its report. I believe it is a fairly voluminous one, and one which will afford a number of us very pleasant reading, and very instructive reading when we come to that period when we will be called upon to frame some system of general insurance. I do not know, because I have not yet read through any large portion of the report, the general trend of its recommendations, but I think it will have a happy effect in leading our thoughts in the right direction at the right time. I see upon the list of measures a Liquor Bill, and this Bill has caused a great deal of consideration and discussion in anticipation throughout the whole of the country. Particularly has it been discussed in my electorate, where many of my constituents look without any degree of misgiving upon a pint of beer, and where a large number of others look without misgiving upon the wild and deadly lemonade—(laughter)—amongst all of whom the coming of this Bill is anticipated with a good deal of solicitude. I hope and believe that it will be based upon principles of justice, principles of toleration, for one of the worst things we can set ourselves to do here, or in any Parliament, is to attempt to eradicate every particle of evil from the community in which we live. We have to tolerate some degree of evil simply because we are human beings, but we have to do our best to so regulate all manner of evil that it may not bring about disastrous consequences, and I believe that the Bill which is to be introduced will be based upon principles such as will extend justice to all those engaged in the industry—an industry which is not likely to die through any legislation that may be passed by any Parliament, because it seems to be second nature. It has come down to us, I think, from the second generation of human beings, and will continue on to the last, and it is for us as representatives of the people to see that this measure, as well as all other measures, is based upon principles of justice. Some reference has been made to the referendum and to its results. All I will say upon the principle that was discussed during the referendum campaign amounts to this: That we ought to be very careful in handing over powers—indefinite powers—to any other power greater than our own. I think that we cannot have too much discussion in our own Parliaments before handing away any powers which we now possess. We want to see if we cannot make the very best possible use of those powers before admitting that in making the best use we can of them we cannot do what we want—we cannot effect all that we require. For the simple reason that having once handed over those powers to the Commonwealth

Parliament we are not likely to get them back again, we should be all the more careful in insisting upon a full, free, and non-party discussion of any proposal which is made for the alteration of our State or Federal Constitution. There has been a great deal of talk about the loan that was floated some time ago in London. Some persons have alleged that it was an utter failure. The Premier and others had stated that it was a success. Without venturing to go any further into this matter at the present moment, as we shall have an opportunity to discuss it when the Financial Statement is before us, I say that it would be very ill on the part of any party to welcome the failure of any loan raised by this State. We should all welcome the success of any loan which is required in the interest of the progress of the State, and it is for us to consider whether the requirements of the country necessitate our going to the London market—a market which is the centre of the financial world, a market about which we can know very little, as we live so very far away from it. Therefore, we have to trust to financial experts on the spot to get our loan business transacted successfully, and to the profit of the State. With regard to the programme submitted by the Government, as I said at the outset of my remarks, I do not intend to deal with them in detail. As the measures come before us, I shall endeavour to give them that attention which they deserve, and to exert myself to shape them as I think they should be shaped in the interest of justice. But as I proceed down the programme of measures I come to an old familiar friend. That is the State Education Acts Amendment Bill. Many of us will remember that we had some little trouble in connection with a measure with a similar title which was, fortunately or unfortunately, tabled last session. I, in particular, have occasion to remember the State Education Acts Amendment Bill which was introduced last session. I think I shall not forget it—it has made an indelible mark upon my memory, and it has also made a mark upon the memory of several other members. It will be remembered perfectly well by all members who were here last session and took part in the debate on that measure, that I took up an attitude with respect to it which was regarded by many people outside as being inconsistent with and altogether disloyal to the platform which I had signed previous to coming into this House. I simply wish to go over a few details in connection with that matter in anticipation of the next measure that is to come before us for consideration, because it is necessary for me to define the position which I have taken up, and which I consider to be in the interest of the progress of the essential principle of democracy. Last session I took up the position that the principle of majority rule justified me in the attitude I assumed with regard to the Religious Instruction in State Schools Bill. Many people outside disagreed with me, and attempted to flout me and induce me to go against a distinct promise I had made to support the Bill, supposing the referendum decided in its favour. But I persevered in my attitude. I was called up; I obeyed a request sent to me by several members of an organisation in my electorate, and proceeded to that centre and gave some explanation of my attitude with respect to the Bill. I went up there and found that they had practically decided that if I persevered in carrying out the promise which I had made I should be expelled from that

[*Mr. Crawford.*]

body. I told them straight out that it did not matter what they did, I had signed my name to a promise, and I would carry out that promise. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. LENNON: Did you not sign a pledge as well?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I did, but if any circumstance would release me from a promise, it would also release me from a pledge. I maintain that I adhered consistently to both, because I believe that, whether I had given a promise or not, I was perfectly consistent in voting for a measure demanded by a referendum, as the referendum is an essential plank of the Labour platform. I voted for that measure, and it was passed into law. Then some members of the Fitzroy Workers' Political Organisation came together and expelled me from that body—told me that I was no longer a member of that organisation—and thereby emphatically said that I was not to be regarded in future as a Labour member, and that I must not look again for nomination in the Labour interest. When that information came to me I arranged for a meeting in my electorate, and went up there and addressed one of the largest meetings ever held at Mount Morgan in justification of my conduct in standing up here as a representative, not as a delegate, of the people, and expressing my opinion and fulfilling my promise, and thus upholding the essential principle of democracy—that of majority rule. That meeting passed a vote of confidence in me by a very large majority. I came down here, and I found that the members of the party with whom I had been associated ever since I came into this House took another view of the matter, and regarded some expressions used by me in my attempt to defend myself as completely disloyal to the party. The effect is obvious from the fact that I am standing up on the back bench, and in my having taken up the position of one who will consider every measure from an independent standpoint, and as one who will do his best as a member unconnected with the Labour party to advance the principles of democracy. I do not wish to say severe things to my late comrades. My attitude towards them in this House is one largely of compassion—compassion for members who are struggling to emancipate themselves from a thralldom under which I know many of them are groaning.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and Opposition laughter.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That is all I wish to say in that respect, and I will not proceed any further. I have made what appears to me to be the necessary definition of the position which I shall hold for the future in this Parliament—that of being free to regard every measure brought in from the non-party point of view, and to support or oppose it according as I think it to be in the interests or against the interests of the people of Queensland.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. CRAWFORD: It is upon that principle that I shall take my stand for the future in this Parliament. Whether I come back here again or not, I shall take the stand here and outside that majority rule must prevail, and that no body, whether it be a Labour organisation or any other organisation, has the right to come between me and the majority of the people whom I represent.

That I conceive to be the essential principle of democracy, and upon that principle I take my stand.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOOKER (*Maryborough*): Before addressing myself to the question before the House, as a Queenslander I desire to pay a tribute to the late Speaker, the Hon. J. T. Bell. One of the brightest, if not the brightest, after the late Hon. T. J. Byrnes, he was in the first flight of Australians, and I desire to pay tribute to his memory. At the same time, I desire to convey my appreciation to you, Sir, upon seeing you where you are, for I am quite satisfied that the longer we know you in that chair as Speaker the more we shall appreciate your unbiassed conduct, and your general courtesy to both sides of the House. After listening to the hon. member for Fitzroy, I take off my hat, metaphorically, to a manly man, who made a manly speech in the conditions under which he found himself. (Hear, hear!) Listening to the attack of the acting leader of the Labor party, I think he paid a compliment to the Government by his speech. There was nothing in that speech that was damaging to the policy of the Government. He was particularly sympathetic towards the policy; but in that forensic way which is characteristic of the hon. member, he made a personal attack upon the Premier, and one reference—that to the "Yongala"—did not do the hon. member too much credit.

Mr. LENNON: It did not do your leader too much credit.

Mr. BOOKER: That episode was too sad to attempt to make political capital out of, and I believe that the hon. member is sorry now for taking up the attitude he did in connection with the matter. The whole of his speech appeared to me to be a matter of fighting a shadow. The main feature of the present Administration under its new leadership—the leadership of Mr. Denham—is on the lines of the policy laid down by the late Premier, Mr. Kidston, and after listening to the speech of the Premier last night, I am quite satisfied that the hon. gentleman has grasped the essentials of the government of this country. The essentials are development—the building up of a nation. We have all the resources to enable the Government to carry out a progressive policy and to foot the bill. The best indication of that is that when times were very hard and the country was suffering from adversity, more particularly because of drought and financial conditions—which were not peculiar to Queensland alone at that time but were common to the whole commercial world—there was a policy then of development, and it was identified with the name of the senior member for Townsville, the Hon. R. Philp. The hon. gentleman carried out a policy of development at that time which to-day stands to his credit and to the credit of this State. If it were not for the policy of railway construction we would to-day be in financial straits. It is easy to realise that it is the enhanced railway revenue that is financing this State to-day. Last year we were short by £380,000 in our receipts from the Federal Treasury, and at the same time we were approximately £1,000,000 to the good as against our railway revenue of five or seven years ago. When one realises those two facts, one can quite understand the benefits of the for-

ward policy of the Philp Administration and the wisdom of this Parliament doing likewise. And this Parliament is about to do likewise. We have made a start, and we are going to continue the policy of development, not only in regard to railways, but in opening up our ports to give shipping facilities for our exports. That just reminds me that there is a circumstance to which I would like to draw the attention of the Government, and it is this—that while they are opening up our lands by railways, and making the best possible use of those lands, that means further production, which necessitates finding new markets. I would just draw the attention of the members of the Government to the fact that the bulk of our produce is now being dumped into one market—the market of Great Britain, or, to be more correct, the market of London. Now, there are Continental markets that offer even brighter prospects to our producers. Take one instance—the port of Genoa. The port of Genoa could be made the feeder of something like 100,000,000 people in Central Europe—Northern Italy, Switzerland, and Austria, and even further north and west. I am quite certain that by giving a small subsidy to one of the steamship companies which have a service to the Gulf of Genoa, it would lead to an enormous development of our trade. Within the last six months there are firms in Australia—one firm notably—which have shipped over £96,000 worth of Australian meats, and, owing to the shipping facilities being better in the South, the bulk of the orders were secured in the South and were shipped from the South. Now, I desire to point out that the country or the individual which is first in a market to establish itself will derive considerable benefits afterwards, and I take it that if our Government can see their way to grant a subsidy to a service between here and Genoa, there is a possibility of an enormous expansion of our trade with Central Europe, more particularly in meats, hides, and by-products of meatworks, butter, cheese, and many other items of export. Where there are 100,000,000 people to feed, we can quite realise that if we once establish ourselves the producers of this country will have an immense future. To show the value of a judicious subsidy to a country, I need only refer to the Orient Company's boats coming to Queensland. Eighteen years ago Carl Zoeller, one of our Brisbane citizens, was importing Italian tinned butter for consumption in this State; last year our exports oversea of butter produced in this State amounted approximately to £1,000,000 in value, and at the present time there is so much butter being manufactured in Queensland—more particularly in the south-eastern portion of the State—that the Orient Company's boats cannot take the butter away from the port of Pinkenba. It was the granting of a judicious subsidy that developed that particular trade to an enormous extent. The subsidy also did this: Under the shipping conditions at the time the subsidy was arranged with the Orient Company Queensland butter in the London market stood at 7s. per cwt. lower than the butter from the Southern States and New Zealand. The result to-day is that owing to the facilities that the Orient Company

are giving to shippers, our [5 p.m.] butter now is within 1s. per 100 of par. That must appeal to the men of this Parliament who are directing

*Mr. Booker.*]

the destinies of our great producing industries. Notwithstanding the enormous increase and the improved quality of our butter, at the same time our shippers are prepared to pay something more by that ship than they are prepared to pay by other lines of steamers. The question has been raised to-day of the very admirable circumstances of the Government being in a position to give to the lower-grade officers of the Railway Department increased pay. I take the responsibility of what I am going to say now. It was passed across the Chamber this afternoon that one hon. member had voted for a lower wage for the men on the construction gangs. Now, we are about to employ many thousands of men on our construction works, and I just want to say this in all earnestness—and I accept the responsibility of saying it—if there is to be any increases to our railway workers, then we should give it to our permanent employees first before we handle any question of increases to the railway workers, who are, in a sense, nomadic workers—I mean those that come from the other States and from oversea. Our responsibility lies in giving the best conditions to the men in our permanent service. (Hear, hear!) Then if the country can manage it—if the country has not got it she cannot pay it—but if the country can manage it, and if we want to be liberal and big-hearted at the expense of somebody else, let us do it, but our first consideration is to our permanent employees.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The reclassification applies to the permanent employees.

Mr. BOOKER: That applies to what the Government have done. There are still men in the service that we, as the custodians of the public purse, should consider. There is room yet for the classification to spread itself out and bring reasonably fair conditions to a large circle of our employees. There are a lot of these things that want attending to in the railway service, and the Minister has spent a great deal of his time in straightening them out. The whole question of dealing with the classification of the Railway Department has been capably, sympathetically, and well managed, and I am quite certain, as time progresses, that there will be no fault to find with the railway administration of this country. (Hear, hear!) Dealing more particularly with the Speech, I might just mention the fact of the taking of the census, and my own particular electorate, for which I am the junior member, shows a small falling off as compared with the census taken ten years previously. The bright feature about that is this: That the people of this country are going back from the towns and cities on to the land, and that is the reason, and the legitimate reason, of Maryborough showing a slight falling off in its population. There are hundreds of young Maryborough men, and middle-aged men and old men, who have gone out from the town and settled in the far-famed Burnett district. That has gone on to a considerable extent, and it is one of the pleasing features in connection with the indication of the census. On the question of the erection of further sugar-mills, the Premier dealt with that in its fullness, and I may just say, in passing, that I do hope that, when the time arrives for the Government to deal with the construction of these mills, the conditions will be considered

[Mr. Booker.

of giving to our manufacturers the right to erect those mills. All things being equal, we have the legitimate right to give our own manufacturers and our own employees in the big foundries the opportunity to participate in the development that is taking place. I hope that the Australian manufacturers will have any preference, if any preference at all be given. As to the Liquor Bill, there can be only one expression of opinion—that that Bill cannot be treated in any sense as a party Bill. All members should have the right to say just what they think about an important question of that nature. It is a question that has to deal with men and women who understood that they had taken their responsibilities believing certain things, and should any drastic circumstance arise to in any sense interfere with their legitimate trade interests, well, these people should not be sacrificed in the interests of any other section. That Bill must be treated absolutely on its merits, and every member should have the right to speak and act according to his conscience and principles, and on a fair and honest basis. In connection with the proposal to make better provision for our State children, I may say that when I was in Canada three years ago I was struck with the system which is carried out in that country. A philanthropic lady named Mrs. Close has been carrying on for years a system of housing, and has been ameliorating the conditions of the State children. She selects areas which are climatically suitable and fertile, and farms are started, and—under the supervision of the State—the children are taken down to these farms, well fed, well clothed, and well looked after and taught agricultural pursuits. I take it that our State Government would do the right thing if they would deal with our State children somewhat in that respect. Instead of herding our State children in semi-reformatories, there should be established in different parts of the State—more particularly in the healthy and more salubrious parts of the State, where the land is good and the climate favourable—centres where children can be looked after under humane conditions, well clothed, well fed, taught agricultural pursuits, made good men and women fit to go on our lands, and they will then pay back by their increased physical and mental strength, and by their development of the country, something of what the State had to spend on them.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOOKER: I throw out that suggestion to the Government. I was very struck when in Canada at seeing what was done there, and I take this opportunity of passing it on. In referring to the railway policy of the Government I can only say that no Government in any part of Australia ever laid down a policy that means more to their country than the Government laid down last session and the session before, and which this House saw fit to support, and it is only a corollary that we should have into our settled districts railways to open up those districts and find land for the people who are coming into the country. I might just say this in passing: that the lands administration are straining all their resources to find land for the people, and no reflection upon the administration of the Lands Department is fair and reasonable. The resources of the Lands Department are taxed in every branch to do the best thing possible. I heard a remark passed that people could not find land. If there are any

hon. members who have friends who want land in the Burnett, I can show them no end of land—land that is available, and I think that is the best rebuttal of the statement made. It is not fair to the Administration, and it is not fair to the officers of the department, to say they are not doing all they can. There is no department in the State that is more strenuously endeavouring to find what the people want, and I say now across the Chamber, and to members on my own side as well, that if they have any friends who want land in the Burnett, I will show them land. I say the Burnett because I am more closely identified with that district. If they want land, I can find them land. The land is there, and I do not think it is fair, leaving the Administration out of the question altogether, to say there is not a strenuous endeavour by the officers of the Lands Department to deal with that great department as it ought to be dealt with.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. NEVITT (*Carpentaria*): The speeches so far upon this Address in Reply, if we are to take them as a guide, particularly those of the two new members, the proposer and seconder, as to their conduct in this House—well, I think they will continue to act in the capacity of the candid friends of the Government. Throughout I listened very carefully and attentively to the speech of the hon. member for Dalby, and it impressed me first of all as being a very parochial speech, and, secondly, as being a condemnation of the administration of the Government in pretty well all its branches. The hon. member for Enoggera did not go so far in his condemnation of the Government, but in several instances he condemned the Government in its administration. I interjected, during the time he was speaking, as to the wages the present Government were paying, or had paid in the past. He replied he had nothing to do with the past—it was the future he had to deal with. I then told the hon. member, and I tell him now, that the Queensland Government are paying the very lowest rate of wages of any Government in Australia. If that is a creditable position for any Government to find themselves in, then the hon. member for Enoggera is at liberty to follow them. That is an absolute fact, and I defy the Secretary for Railways to deny it. Then I come to the hon. member for Murilla—the farmers' representative. I notice he adopted a similar attitude. I do not know whether this session is going to be looked upon as an electioneering session or not. I am in a somewhat similar position to that of the hon. member for Gympie, who the other day said he was speaking from under the gallows.

Mr. RYLAND: The shadow of the gallows.

Mr. NEVITT: From under the shadow of the gallows. Still, that will not deter me from stating what I think is necessary and advisable. Then I come to the hon. member who has just resumed his seat. I listened very attentively to what he had to say, and I think he was not altogether happy when he made use of the expression he did in reference to the ill-fated "Yongala." As a proof of what my leader stated in connection with his leader on this question, I will read a few remarks that he passed, as an electioneering speech, or rather just prior to the referendum, and I am going to quote from the *Brisbane Courier* of the 12th April of the present year.

Mr. BRENNAN: Whose speech is that?

Mr. NEVITT: It is an interview with the present Premier. He said—

"Ten years have passed, and though the States are now being asked to give vastly increased powers and authority to the Commonwealth, we find that the Federal Government has failed to deal with this question of coast lighting, as it has, indeed, failed with respect to many other services which the framers of the Constitution deemed fit and desirable matters for Commonwealth control."

I say at that particular time the Premier knew that the "Yongala" had gone, and he practically placed the responsibility of the loss of that ship upon the shoulders of the Federal Government. What do we find? We find that it is the Premier and his Government, and past Governments, who are responsible for the lighting of the Queensland coasts to-day, and I say, if the hon. member had read that and been conversant with it, he would not have made the reference to it that he did. Proceeding further on the same question, the Premier said—

"I find that the masters of our ships have many anxious hours whilst navigating the waters of our picturesque and beautiful north-east coast line."

\* \* \* \* \*

"In view of these circumstances I purpose inquiring of the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth whether or not it is the intention of his Government to take over the responsibilities of the lights at an early date. At the same time I shall indicate a few places where lights are needed in order to insure greater public safety and relieve the strain now cast on shipmasters."

I placed upon the business-paper yesterday certain questions asking whether it was the intention of the Government to place further lights on our coasts. There are certain places, some a distance of 105 miles apart, where there are no lights at the present time, and I have it on the authority of shipping masters on the coast that they consider it is essential that lights should be placed somewhere in the vicinity of Cape Gloucester, Breaksea Spit, and St. Bees or Bailey Island. I placed that notice on the paper, and the Treasurer replied to-day it was not the intention of the Government to place any further lights on the coast. Still, the Premier said just prior to the referendum that our coast was dangerous, and it was necessary that more lights should be placed on the coast. Proceeding further in the same interview, he said—

"If it appears likely that there will be any delay in the matter of the Commonwealth taking over the lights, then the State will take the necessary action to improve the lighting along our coast."

It is over three months since that ship was lost and those valuable lives went down with it, and what has our Government done? They simply sent a letter to Melbourne. They complained about the Commonwealth not taking over the lights, but did they complain in the same way when the Commonwealth did not take over the note issue? Simply because they were receiving something like £20,000 or £30,000 a year there was no complaint there. As soon as the Commonwealth exercises the powers the people trusted them with, we find them lamenting all the time all through the country. Their responsibilities have been here ever since responsible government was established in Queensland, and yet we find they have neglected their

Mr. Nevitt ]

responsibilities, and the lighting of our coasts is not such as it should be. Proceeding further, the Premier said—

“During the past two weeks I have had an exceptional opportunity of making close investigation and inquiry into this question, and I have consulted reliable authorities and charts. These have led me to favour the early establishment of certain new lights which, while they do not meet all that might be wished for, will fill blanks in our coast lighting system that are now more or less perilous, and will supply bearings for our shipmasters that will be of material value to them.”

And so he goes on enumerating places where he considered it absolutely essential that further lights should be placed. That proves conclusively that the present Government and past Governments have neglected their responsibility in that direction. I listened very attentively to the Premier last night. Among other things, he said it was the intention of the Government to introduce a Health Bill; and I gathered from what he said that it is going to include a Pure Food and Drugs Bill. All I can say is that it is not before it was wanted. The hon. gentleman quoted from yesterday's *Telegraph* the fact that one of his departments was taking serious action in connection with the adulteration of foods. I have a quotation from the *Brisbane Courier*—unfortunately I have not got the date—and this is what it says—

“Before Lieutenant-Colonel R. A. Moore, P.M., in the Central Summons Court yesterday, Elias Cox, Mount Gravatt, was proceeded against by Stephen Dudley, inspector of the Health Department, on a charge that, on 9th April, he sold to Stephen Dudley a pint of milk not of the nature, substance, and quality demanded.

“Defendant pleaded guilty.”

“A clerk from the office of the Crown Law Department said that the milk contained 11.1 per cent. added water. He drew the attention of the bench to the fact that the defendant had been previously convicted of a similar offence, and on that occasion had been fined £5. The department, however, had no desire to be vindictive.”

Goodness knows, our infantile mortality is great enough; yet when a man is prosecuted for adulterating milk—which is the food of so many infants—by adding 11.1 per cent. of water, we find an officer of a Government department stating to the bench that there was no desire to be vindictive.

Mr. MULLAN: It might have been responsible for a baby's life.

Mr. NEVITT: More than likely for the lives of many babies. Everyone knows that many mothers are not able to supply their babies with their natural food, and the best substitute is cow's milk; yet the Government allow one of their officers to go into court and say there is no desire to be vindictive—no desire to press for a heavy penalty. A Government that allows such things is not worthy of the name of a Government, and should not be tolerated by the people of a respectable community. A day or two before the same gentleman was presiding on the bench when a woman was brought before him for pilfering in shops; and this is what is recorded in the *Telegraph* of the 16th May—

“The police magistrate (to the accused): What have you got to say?”

“I am very sorry,” the woman murmured.

“You are what is commonly called a shop-lifter,” said the police magistrate. “I have no

[*Mr. Nevitt.*

doubt in my own mind that there are half a dozen cases where you have purloined goods, and got off scot-free. This bench determined last year that in all cases of shoplifting terms of imprisonment were to be imposed. The thing must be stopped.” In this case the woman seemed to have no excuse whatever. Her case could not be just an accident, for there had been four cases against her before. Her husband ought to look after her more.

“A sentence of three months' imprisonment was imposed.”

That is the same gentleman who only imposed a fine of £8 in the case of a man who adulterated milk to the extent of 11.1 per cent.—a matter affecting the lives of many of our valuable citizens; and when a woman was charged with purloining goods he gave her three months without any option. Where is the justice in that? It is the old story—a law for the rich and a law for the poor. In connection with this matter, the Premier said last night that it was not possible for any Government to dictate to the magistrates; but, while that may be all very well, I say it is the duty of the Government not to allow any of their officers in a case of this kind to practically instruct the magistrate not to impose a severe penalty. There is only one way of dealing with this matter, and that is by nationalising or municipalising the milk business. Unfortunately the Lady Chelmsford Milk Institute, which has done good work up to date, has had to close its doors. I understand that at present it is run by a private individual. I do not know on what conditions; but I know it is very necessary that an institute of this kind should be established not only in Brisbane, but in every other community where large populations are gathered. It is absolutely essential, if the lives of infants are to be preserved, that they should be able to get chemically pure milk. Some little time ago Dr. Turner, who was one of the advisory staff of the Lady Chelmsford Milk Institute, put a letter in the *Courier* of the 30th May of the present year, in which he said—

“Of late years the problem of a milk supply for infants that shall be chemically pure and bacteriologically innocuous has much exercised the minds of those anxious to reduce the rate of infantile mortality in all civilised countries. More particularly in France and America have large and well-directed efforts been made to obtain this desirable result.”

It is a well-known fact that in our climate, which is all that can be desired as far as climate is concerned, unfortunately at certain periods of the year it is absolutely impossible to keep milk for any considerable length of time; and, considering present conditions under which milk is produced and distributed in Brisbane, it is absolutely impossible for it to be chemically pure. Dr. Turner says, further, speaking of the Lady Chelmsford Milk Institute—

“We have shown that such milk can be provided for infants in this city, even during the heat of a Queensland summer, and that by providing small ice chests, and distributing ice, it will keep well for twenty-four hours and longer, the cost being less than that of a double delivery daily. We have also shown that there is a public demand for such milk at a price considerably above that given for milk ordinarily supplied. Indeed, the increased demand has proved an embarrassment to us, for it has been too great for our means of delivery.”

I maintain that the Government should not have allowed the institute to go out of use

in the way it has done. If the Government had the welfare of the community at heart they would have taken over the institution and run it as a State institution until it could have been run municipally or otherwise. Proceeding further, he said—

“We are now supplying the food of fully 200 infants daily, of whom some twenty-five obtain the milk at a reduced price; and to twenty-four it is delivered free of cost.”

That shows the necessity for such an institution. I would like to know how those individuals are being provided [5.30 p.m.] for or cared for at the present time. I suppose they are simply getting along the best way they can—which is the way the present Government proceed in measures affecting the poorer classes of the community. Dr. Turner further proceeds—

“My personal observation of a number of infants so fed has demonstrated the value of our work. For the most part they are healthy, thriving, well-nourished infants. Many infants, at first sickly or partially starved, have been restored to health, and I have no doubt that many lives have been saved. A weekly clinic is held at the institute, where such cases, in default of other medical advice, may receive free advice as to the best methods of feeding.”

This is a letter by one of our most respected medical men in Brisbane, and he states that forty-four infants were receiving the pasteurised milk that year at a reduced cost, and at the present time they have to put up with it the best way they can, and the result will be an increased death rate amongst our infants in the future, if some methods are not adopted to keep the question of pasteurised milk before the people of Brisbane. Further, he said—

“We approached the Government on the question of the necessary capital, and have met with a refusal, and with a hint, which it would be foolish to ignore, that we cannot count on a continuance of the Government subsidy on which we depend for solvency, under present conditions—”

showing that the Government do not consider that this is a question in which they should take any action. They can find a considerable amount of money to bring people to our shores, but they will not raise their little finger to save the lives of the infants in our midst. (Hear, hear!) That is the position we have to recognise. Where is there a better asset than our native-born?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. NEVITT: It is the duty of those gentlemen over there to see that they get fair and proper treatment after they come into the world. If their parents are unable, or will not give it to them, then it is the duty of the Government in the one case to provide, and in the other to compel the parent to do it. (Hear, hear!) There is a further quotation by Dr. Turner, who says—

“Let me now briefly point out the lessons that I draw from our work. Happy are the infants whose mothers are able and willing to provide them with their natural food for the first year. Less happy, but still fortunate, are those whose mothers after the first month or two are able to feed them with the milk of their own cows, or of the cows of some neighbour. For the others there is but a choice of evils, a choice which they share with most infants during the second year of life. Cows' milk bought in the ordinary way is a liquid of uncertain composition—”

We know that, because it is borne out by

the records of our law courts. Then we have the report of our analytical chemist, which tells us the same as Dr. Turner now tells us—

“and extremely liable during the summer months especially to be contaminated with organisms that are fatal to infant life. Dried milk is a poor substitute. Many infants cannot extract from it the necessary nourishment. Many no doubt do indifferently or moderately well; none, I think, very well, though their mothers may think they do so. Apart from milk in some form there is no infant food.”

And yet we find this Government so hard-hearted and callous that they won't raise their little finger to protect the lives of our infants. That brings me to a quotation from one of the greatest political economists of the last century, in connection with the adulteration of foods—

“Penalties light or severe will not materially check that impulse. If the penalties are severe the courts will not enforce them.”

We have illustrations of that in Brisbane.

“And if they are light the trade will disregard them.”

That is the position, and there is only one method by which that can be rectified, and that is either by municipalisation or nationalisation. (Hear, hear!) I have another quotation from Herbert Spencer in connection with the adulteration of foods. He says—

“Swindle a man through forgery, and you get pinched; swindle him through misrepresentation of your goods, make money through deception, and you are a respectable citizen. Poison a man with arsenic, and you swing from the gallows; poison him with adulterated foods, quack medicines, and diseased meats, and no sleuth hound haunts your footsteps. Kill a man with a crowbar, and you swing for it; kill him by overwork, and you are called a captain of industry.”

That is exactly the condition which the gentlemen on the other side by their actions—I do not mean to infer that that is what they intend—but their action has been such as to bring about the conditions as stated by Herbert Spencer. Before leaving this subject, let me call the attention of the people of Queensland to the way this Government and past Governments have looked upon the fertiliser. What are the conditions imposed on those who dispense and sell fertilisers and distribute them through the length and breadth of Queensland? Every vendor must, within a stated period, forward to the Secretary for Agriculture samples of fertilisers on sale by him, together with name or brand by which they are known, also price he intends to sell at during the year; and every bag and package must be labelled. Do we find the Government taking the same interest where human life is at stake? Up to the present time, I believe that the quality of foods and drugs on sale in the city of Brisbane—aye, and throughout the length and breadth of Queensland—has been such as I do not think you can find in any other State of the Commonwealth. Further, the Fertiliser Act requires the number of net pounds contained in the parcel to be stated, and the brand or trade mark by which it is known, and the proportion per centum of nitrogen, phosphoric acid, and potash contained therein. In addition, the vendor must furnish every purchaser with a certificate, signed by himself or agent, with full name, place of business, and quantity sold. Why do the Government not take the same

Mr. Nevitt.]



interest and care where human food is concerned, as they take in the distribution of fertilisers? Am I to infer from that that this is a Government that is simply considering the interests of the farmers only? because that is what it means. It is a just and right law that, when you go into a store and ask for a certain article, you ought to be able to get it. It is a very good precaution, but if the precaution is necessary in connection with the dispensing of fertilisers, how much more necessary is it in connection with food and drugs that we have to consume? Last year I believe there were over a thousand tons of goods destroyed in Queensland as unfit for human consumption, yet the selling of food and drugs is not hedged round with the conditions which are required, and the time has arrived when more stringent conditions should be imposed on all distributors of food and drugs.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: If they are not hedged round by conditions, why was the food destroyed?

Mr. NEVITT: They are hedged round to a certain extent. The law lays down certain conditions, but they do not go far enough. Let the Minister look up the annual report of the Commissioner of Public Health for last year in connection with the Lady Chelmsford Milk Institute. He says milk is adulterated to the extent of 30 or 40 per cent. in some instances, and yet our Government has brought about only four or six prosecutions during the last year! I hold that if any man or woman has been guilty of adulterating food the second time they came before the court, they should go to gaol. If you send a man or woman to gaol for pilfering out of a shop, you should put far more severe punishment upon any man who puts adulterated goods in the shape of food upon the market. It should be dealt with far more stringently than any other crime, because it is a crime of the worst kind. I now come to the question of immigration. The Premier, when speaking on this question last night, tried to make a good deal of capital out of the attitude of this party to immigration. On the 4th of this month the Under Secretary to the Treasury stated that from the year 1900 to 1909, the Government of Queensland had introduced 9,760 immigrants into Queensland. That led me to go through the ABC tables supplied by our Mr. Weedon, the Treasurer's tables, and Knibbs's Year Book. The tables relating to the Treasurer's Financial Statement for 1909-10 show that in 1900-1 we spent £57,057 on immigration; in 1901-2, £21,726; in 1902-3, £13,377; in 1903-4, £9,456; in 1904-5, £8,458; in 1905-6, £7,645; in 1906-7, £5,332; 1907-8, £22,662; and in 1908-9, £46,946. The total amount spent on immigration during those nine years was £193,163 for bringing out 9,760 people, which is, roughly, an average cost of £19 15s. per head. Reading those figures, I was led to consider what became of the people who were brought out to Queensland. I find on looking at the Treasurer's tables for last year, page 12, that the estimated population of Queensland in 1899-1900 was 512,604, and that the following year it had dwindled down to 494,166. Evidently some corrections had to be made there because of some over-estimate, and the actual population in 1900-1 was 494,116. Therefore, I take those figures as a basis for my argument. From the year 1901 till 1909 the births which took place in Queensland numbered 127,791, and

[Mr. Nevitt.

the deaths during the same period amounted to 51,214, which leaves a net increase of births over deaths of 76,577 for those nine years, so that the population in 1909 should have been 570,704, taking into consideration only the excess of births over deaths. As a matter of fact, however, the population then was only 558,237. During that period the Government spent £193,000 of the public money in bringing people from other countries to Queensland, though we could not supply work for 12,000 native-born persons in the State. In other words, 12,000 of our native-born people, and the 9,700 people immigrants for whose passages we paid £193,000, left the State.

Mr. MORGAN: Didn't the Labour party keep the Government in power during that period?

Mr. NEVITT: That is the reason why we do not believe in the present form of immigration. Members on this side of the House are just as desirous of seeing this fair country of Queensland populated with a respectable class of people as anyone in the House. Nobody on this side of the House has ever attempted to keep anybody out, but we have said, and we still say, that the Government could utilise that money to far better advantage in opening up our natural resources, and thus attract people to our shores whom we should be able to keep, and who would not go to other countries.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: According to your figures our population must have increased by 58,000 up to last year.

Mr. NEVITT: No; if the hon. gentleman would pay attention he would see that the figures I have given are correct.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The census gave our population as 612,000.

Mr. NEVITT: I am quoting the figures for 1908-9 as a basis, because the Under-Secretary for the Treasury has stated that during the decade 1900 to 1909 we imported 9,760 people at a cost of £193,000. I am pointing out that during that period we lost 12,000 of our natural increase, besides those 9,760 immigrants, or a total of 21,760. The Treasurer's tables, Mr. Weedon's tables, and Mr. Knibbs's tables state the figures that I have quoted. Since Queensland initiated the system of assisted passages to immigrants we have spent no less a sum than £3,464,131 on immigration. The party with which I am associated maintain that if that £3,000,000 had been utilised in developing our latent resources, such as iron mines, we should not have had to send a contract worth £300,000 for rails and fastenings to the old country, as we have had to do; and that by developing that industry and giving fair and reasonable assistance to the mining industry, the conditions of the people in this State would be so attractive that people on the other side of the world would flock here without our having to pay their passages.

Mr. MORGAN: We are getting people from all over the world.

Mr. NEVITT: We are, but I think the money devoted to immigration could have been spent to much better advantage in the way I have indicated.

Mr. MORGAN: The inducements must be good, or the people would not come here.

Mr. NEVITT: No doubt members on the other side have read the speech delivered

the other day by Dr. Taylor in the Council. I am not going to vouch for the statements that gentleman made, because I do not know whether they are true or otherwise, but I say that a gentleman with the professional reputation of Dr. Taylor, and having the opportunities for observation which that gentleman possesses, would not have made the statements he did unless he had good reason for doing so. The fair and rational inference from his statements is that the Government are not exercising that supervision over the introduction of immigrants that they should exercise in the old country before they go on board. The other day I was reading an article by Professor Stephen Leacock, a patriotic American, and came across the following passage on the subject of immigrants introduced into the States of America:—

"They are in a great measure mere herds of the proletariat of Europe, the lowest class of industrial society, without home or work, fit objects indeed for philanthropic pity, but very indifferent material from which to build the Commonwealth of the future. In this great change of domicile the people of the lowest economic development are in the vanguard."

I sincerely hope that we are not going to drift into that condition; but, if we are to pay any attention to the remarks made by Dr. Taylor, I am afraid there is a good deal in connection with our system of immigration that is akin to conditions existing in the States of America. Some little time ago the Government brought 600 or 800 navvies from England, and what did our patriotic Government do on that occasion? I understand that the "Waipara," with 600 souls on board, was detained in Moreton Bay for three days, although the coronation celebrations were taking place in Brisbane at the time. I would like to know why those 600 people, after being on board ship for forty-two or forty-five days, were kept in Moreton Bay three days longer than there was any necessity for.

Mr. MORGAN: They were kept there for the good of their health.

Mr. LENNON: As if it were a slave ship.

Mr. NEVITT: That is the sort of intelligence the hon. member shows with regard to the question of immigration.

Mr. MORGAN: What would you do with them?

Mr. NEVITT: I would certainly have allowed them to come to Brisbane after being granted pratique, and it has never been asserted that any difficulty in regard to granting pratique was the reason why they were not allowed to land. When people are brought from oversea in the manner in which those people were brought, they should be given the same liberty as every other member of the community, and they should have been allowed to land and take part in the coronation celebrations which were then taking place.

Mr. MORGAN: Was not all the accommodation taken up by visitors from all parts of Queensland?

Mr. NEVITT: There is another intelligent interjection from the hon. member. This is the progressive policy of the present Government—introducing people here and then keeping them in the bay three days longer than there was any necessary for. Now I come to the so-called prosperity of Queensland. Whilst I rejoice that there is a great amount of pros-

perity in Queensland, unfortunately that prosperity is confined to far too few of our people at the present time. All you have to do is just to look at the last report of the Commissioner for Income Tax. The Commissioner tells us that only 2 per cent. of our population are in a position to pay income tax. It does not look as if there is much prosperity if only 2 per cent. of our total population are in receipt of incomes of over £200 per annum. We find that of those who are paying income tax 40 per cent. are pastoralists, 16 per cent. belong to the mercantile community, 8 per cent. to the mining community, 7½ per cent. to the manufacturing classes, 3½ per cent. by banks, 3 per cent. by absentees, and 3 per cent. by employees.

Mr. MORGAN: What about the farmers?

Mr. NEVITT: Your prosperous farmers are not even mentioned.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You will not allow them to get a chance.

Mr. NEVITT: According to the Commissioner for Income Tax, there is not one farmer in Queensland who is earning £200 a year. This brings me to another phase of the same question. The other day at the annual meeting of the Brisbane Chamber of Commerce the retiring chairman, Mr. Mackenzie, lamented that the mercantile community were paying so much in the shape of income tax, and he also lamented the fact that the pastoralists were paying so much. Well, if the mercantile community were not in a position to pay income tax in prosperous times, how could you expect them to pay anything when times are bad? I say that any man who asks to be relieved of taxation when they admit the times are more prosperous than they have ever been in the history of the mercantile community of Brisbane, is not prepared to pay his fair and reasonable share to the cost of the government of the country which gives them the protection under which they are able to earn a living.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: They did not get what they asked for.

Mr. NEVITT: Fortunately they did not get what they asked for, and I was glad to see that the Premier did not give them any encouragement. But the fact remains that they asked for it. Further, at the same meeting the chairman said—

Why do not the Government turn round and impose a land tax?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: We will have them fighting you at the next election.

Mr. NEVITT: That is what the late chairman of the Brisbane Chamber of Commerce recommended the Government to do. In fact, he went so far as to say that he did not understand why the Treasurer of Queensland in the past had not got some revenue from that source. It meant, "Tax the other fellow and let me go free." The mercantile community of Brisbane, who are living on the whole of Queensland, say, "Tax the fellow on the land, but let me go free."

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: And they are members of the People's Progressive League—the farmers' friend.

Mr. NEVITT: The same gentleman gave us another bit of logic. He complained that the regulations governing all exports had been made more stringent. The main trouble was the system of fining for short weight. They, as the trading community, were robbing

Mr. Nevitt.]

the people by giving them short weight, and this gentleman considered it was the duty of the Government, when they found it out, to allow them to make up the short weight. I wonder how that logic would act in the police court. Let the same logic be applied to the rest of the community.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Apply it to a burglar.

Mr. NEVITT: Men of that class are burglars of the worst type. At the present time the Federal Government are very modest in dealing with merchants. Through their legislation Australian goods have got a better name on the markets of the world than the goods of any other State. Buyers are satisfied with the Government certificate, and do not inquire for brands or the produce of any particular State—they are satisfied with the Government certificate, as they know from that what they are getting. But some of the gentlemen of the Brisbane Chamber of Commerce want that altered. They are allowed to adulterate their goods. They are allowed to adulterate butter, for instance, as much as ever they like.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: Up to 16 per cent.

Mr. NEVITT: They can adulterate it as much as ever they like if it is sold in the State. If it is intended to be exported overseas, they can only add up to 16 per cent. of water. But in the country where it is produced, and where we have only 2 per cent. of the total population paying income tax, they can add as much water as the butter will carry, and our Government look calmly on and allow them to make fortunes on that basis.

Mr. COYNE: Isn't this a butter Government?

Mr. NEVITT: The other day I rang up Mr. Weedon, the Government Statistician, and asked him whether it was possible for him to give me the purchasing power of a £1-note to-day compared with its purchasing power five or six years back. Unfortunately he had not the data at his disposal to enable him to do that, but he told me that the Commonwealth Statistician, Mr. Knibbs, had made arrangements in connection with the taking of the recent census to get data to enable him to compile a table showing the relative purchasing power of a £1-note to-day compared with its purchasing power a few years back. What caused me to ask for the information was that some little while ago I saw a table, supposed to have been compiled by the Victorian Statistician, showing that to-day a £1-note would only go as far as 14s. 6d. would go five years ago. That being so, I wish to call the attention of the Secretary for Railways to the fact that he is paying the same rate of wages to-day to a large number of the lower-paid servants of the State as had been paid for the past ten years.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: That is not so.

Mr. NEVITT: To a large number of them. Just before the tea adjournment I stated that a number of railway servants in Queensland were in receipt of wages from 6s.

[7 p.m.] per day upwards, and the Minister for Railways interjected that it was not true.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You said they were receiving the same wages that they received ten years ago.

Mr. NEVITT: During the tea hour I looked up the *Government Gazette* for last year, and I find there, "Casey, twenty-seven years, 6s. per day."

[Mr. Nevitt.]

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: What about the reclassification?

Mr. NEVITT: I also find watchman, 6s. 6d.; Chapman, porter, 7s. There is one man twenty-seven years of age who receives a salary of 6s. per day from the Railway Department. During the recent recess Mr. Mullan, the hon. member for Charters Towers; Mr. Coyne, the hon. member for Warrego, and myself, paid a visit to South Australia, and, during a conversation we had with Mr. Verran, the Premier of that State, I told him that I had once heard his predecessor, Mr. Tom Price, say it was one of the proudest moments of his life when he could say that there was not a man in the railway service who received less than 7s. a day. Mr. Verran said, "I can go one better than that. There is not one man in the South Australian railway service to-day who gets less than 8s. a day." (Hear, hear!) That statement has already been confirmed by Mr. Mullan, the hon. member for Charters Towers. I would like the Queensland Government to be in a position to say that there is not a man in their service who receives less than 8s. per day. We are frequently told that Queensland is the best State in the group, and I have frequently said so myself, but at the same time I am compelled to say that the Queensland Government pay a less rate of wages than any other State in the group. It is a disgrace to a Government that has got such resources as we have to keep paying such a scandalously low rate of wages as they are doing in the railway service. Wages generally in Queensland are lower than in any other State. That is borne out by Knibbs, page 539. We find from there in goldmining, for instance, that in Queensland they are paid as low as 6s. per day, the lowest minimum wage paid to goldminers of any State in Australia.

Mr. COLLINS: They are paid lower than that.

Mr. NEVITT: I am quoting from the latest figures given in Knibbs. Queensland pays as low as 6s. a day. Even little Tasmania pays 7s. a day; then we have Western Australia, 9s.; South Australia, 8s.; Victoria, 7s., and New South Wales, 6s. 6d. Those are the minimum rates paid. Then, for braccemen, New South Wales pays 7s.; Victoria, 7s., and Queensland 3s. 6d. per day. Just fancy the number of lives of men depending on the braccemen, and yet in Queensland they are paid as low as 3s. 6d. per day! In South Australia they are paid 8s.; Western Australia, 9s., and in Tasmania, 7s. 6d. Queensland is 50 per cent. lower than any other State in the group. Then, with regard to platemens, we find the same thing applies. Victoria is the only State which pays a minimum rate near to Queensland, and they both pay 7s. per day. New South Wales pays 7s. 6d.; South Australia, 8s.; Western Australia, 9s., and Tasmania, 7s. 6d. Miners are paid in New South Wales, 7s.; Victoria, 7s. 6d.; Queensland, 7s. 4d.; South Australia, 9s. 6d.; Western Australia, 10s., and Tasmania, 7s. 6d., one State only paying a less rate of wages than what they are paying in Queensland. Then, for blacksmiths in Queensland they pay 6s. a day; New South Wales, 9s.; Victoria, 8s. 4d.; South Australia, 9s. 6d.; no quotation from Western Australia; Tasmania, 8s. The rate paid in Queensland ranges from 50 to 20 per cent. less than the wages paid to blacksmiths in the other

States. The wages paid to carpenters are—New South Wales, 9s.; Victoria, 8s. 4d.; Queensland, 8s.; South Australia, 10s. 6d.; no quotation from Western Australia; Tasmania, 8s. Tasmania is the only State in the group which pays as low a rate for carpenters as Queensland.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: How many carpenters can you get for 10s. a day now?

Mr. NEVITT: I am taking my figures from the latest issue of Knibbs. Then, for shift bosses Queensland pays 1s. a day less than any other State. The figures are—New South Wales, 10s.; Queensland, 9s.; South Australia, 13s.; Western Australia, 11s. Then, for timbermen the figures are—New South Wales, 9s.; Victoria, 8s. 4d.; Queensland, 8s. 2d.; South Australia, 10s.; Western Australia, 12s.; Tasmania, 8s. 4d. That confirms what we have always said, that the worker is robbed more by the employers in Queensland than in any other State. Such a low rate of wages does not exist in any other State in Australia as in Queensland. We maintain that there are just as much and even more profits made in Queensland as in any of the other States. In the small State of Tasmania, where the conditions of life are supposed to be considerably better, and where the purchasing value of £1 is considerably more than it is in Queensland, yet we find men in Tasmania able to pay a better rate of wages than we have in Queensland. The average rates of wages paid to all employees throughout the length and breadth of the Commonwealth are as follows, according to Knibbs of 1909:—New South Wales, £87; Victoria, £73; Queensland, £82; South Australia, £83; Western Australia, £122; Tasmania, £87; Commonwealth, £85. Victoria is the only State in the group where the average amount of salaries is less than in Queensland, and what does Knibbs say in connection with that—

“In Victoria, where the average is the lowest, there is a large number of factory hands employed in class 7. That deals with clothing and textile fabric trade, where a large number of girls and women are employed.”

We are now in the unenviable position in Queensland of paying a less rate of wages to our employees than any of the other States. I say the sooner Queensland can get out of that position the better. I say that the conditions in Queensland warrant her paying the highest rate of wages of any State in the group. Now I want to point out to the Secretary for Railways what he has been paying in the past—I do not know what he is paying to-day, because I understand some little time ago he increased the wages in certain cases. In the early part of the year I went through the goods-shed here, the steam-shed, the carriage-shop, and I then found the rate of wages I enumerated were being paid to some of the employees, and I was then told they were paying as low as 9<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>d. per hour for men who were loading refrigerated carcasses, while men who were employed in a similar operation on the wharves in private enterprise are being paid at the rate of 2s. per hour. I should like to know why there should be such a great disparity between the rates of pay in the railway service and in private enterprise. I maintain it is the duty of the Government to provide those men with a particular dress whilst in that particular

employment. If the men who are engaged in that particular class of employment were regularly employed, then I say it would be unnecessary, but those men are only casually employed in this particular class of work. It is well known—you can ask any of our medical officers—that the men who are engaged casually in this class of work are amongst the men who are subject to phthisis and other chest troubles; and I say if the Government provided them with a dress suitable to be worn when following that particular employment, it would have a tendency to minimise the likelihood of chest troubles, and I think it is the duty of the Government to seriously consider the matter. Further, on the question of the prosperity of Queensland. The Savings Bank returns, we are told, is one of the best criterions as to the prosperity of any country. It is acknowledged by all political economists that the amount of money placed in the Savings Bank is a very fair criterion as to the wealth or condition of the workers in any country. We find that during the past nine years the State of Queensland has made the least rate of progress of any State in Australia. During the past nine years New South Wales has gained, for every 1,000 of the population, 73 new depositors in its Savings Bank. Victoria, during the same period, gained 103 depositors, while Queensland only gained 35 new depositors. South Australia gained 132, West Australia 102, and Tasmania 83. During the last ten years Queensland has made the least rate of progress, and we have paid the least rate of wages. In other words, the employee has been robbed to a greater extent throughout the length and breadth of Queensland than in any other State in the Commonwealth. That is what these figures prove. There is a further proof I will give in connection with the same matter. The Savings Bank deposit per head of the population in Queensland is the least, with one exception, of any in the whole of the Commonwealth group. During the same period—from 1901 to the present time—the depositors in New South Wales increased their deposits by £4 5s. per head; Victoria increased her deposits by £3 15s. per head; while Queensland only increased her deposits by £1 17s. 5d. South Australia increased by £5 15s., West Australia by £3 19s. 7d., and Tasmania by £3 2s. 9d. I think no further proof is needed that the employees in Queensland have been robbed to a greater extent than in any other country. The Premier said the other night that he was proud of the prosperity of Queensland. Now, what is the prosperity of Queensland? In September last the 3<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> per cent. stocks were quoted on the London money market at £93. After the Government introduced their great railway scheme, what was the result? Before the end of the year our 3<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> per cent. stocks sunk 2 per cent. Our 3<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> per cent. stocks were only worth £96 on the London money market in January, and were lower than any other Australian 3<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> per cent. stocks. This is what the Government call prosperity. I pointed out, and proved, that our credit was worse on the 31st December than that of any other Australian Government. The rate of wage paid to our employees was lower than in any other State. I do not think I need to quote anything further to show that the prosperity which we are said to be enjoying has only been enjoyed by a very small fraction of our population, and that social legislation

Mr. Nevitt.]

requires to be introduced in this Chamber so as to compel those who are now enjoying this exceptional prosperity to give a little more of it to those who are producing it, and until we do that we are never going to have a prosperous community. I mentioned the other night, when speaking on this matter, that bank balances do not always prove the prosperity of a nation. It is the individual condition of the people that proves whether a nation is prosperous or otherwise, and I proved that there is only 2 per cent. of the people in Queensland who are prosperous at the present time; and I say the sooner this Government is kicked out the better if they will not try and devise some means by which a little more of the fruits of the labour are given to the worker than what we are giving at the present time.

Mr. GRAYSON: More than 2 per cent.

Mr. NEVITT: If the hon. member had been in his place a little earlier he would have found that the figures I gave could not be contradicted by anybody. I quoted from the Commissioner of Income Tax, who states only 2 per cent. of the people of Queensland are in a position to pay income tax, and I take the figures of the Commissioner for Income Tax before I would take the figures or the words of the hon. member for Cunningham. Now I come to another matter. The Premier talked about what money is worth to-day. He was lamenting the fact that the Federal Government had only offered him 3 per cent. on the money that has been spent in properties taken over by the Federal Government, and in an interview a few days ago he said he considered 3½ per cent. was little enough to pay. Now I would like to call attention to what his Government, or the Savings Bank of Queensland, pays its depositors. If 3½ per cent. is little enough to pay for money, surely it is the duty of the Government to pay 3½ per cent. to its depositors. The Government of New South Wales pays its depositors 3 per cent. up to £500. In Queensland we only pay 3 per cent. up to £200. The Savings Bank of New South Wales pays 3½ per cent. up to £200, Victoria pays 3½ per cent. for the first £100, and 3 per cent. up to £250, showing again to the detriment of Queensland. South Australia pays 2½ per cent. on all accounts closed during the year, and 3½ per cent. up to £250. West Australia pays 3 per cent. up to £1,000. Tasmania, 3 per cent. up to £250. The Hobart Trustees Bank pays 3½ per cent. up to £150, and the Launceston Trustees Bank pays 3½ per cent. up to £150. Again, from the Savings Bank point of view, Queensland shows to the worst advantage of any Savings Banks we have in the Commonwealth group. During the recess some members on the Government side gloated over the fact that the average amount per depositor in the Queensland Savings Bank was greater than in any other State. That is all very well until you come to analyse it. I have already shown we are less by 50 per cent. of number of depositors than the average of the other States, and simply because we have a little more per depositor, it does not show that we are in as prosperous a position as the other States. I am exceedingly sorry to have to make these statements; but I must try to place before the public the conditions under which the Government are working, and the conditions they are dealing out to the people of Queensland in the shape of low wages and low interest in the Government Savings

[Mr. Nevitt.

Bank. The Government have shown great laxity in the administration of the Mines Department; and in every other State the Government have recognised their duty to the industry and assisted it to a greater extent than has been the case in Queensland. In New South Wales, up to 1909, they gave assistance to the extent of £404,000; in Victoria, £380,000; Queensland only £107,000; South Australia, £69,620; Northern Territory, three boring plants, two batteries, and cyanide plants; Western Australia, £275,320. It is well known that South Australia has never depended to any great extent on the mining industry, so that relatively that State shows far better than Queensland. In Western Australia, they have thirty-two State batteries, twenty-four cyanide plants, five slime treatment plants, and two tin-dressing plants; and out of those plants they recovered, up to the end of 1909, gold and tin to the value of £3,120,794. I commend to the Minister for Mines whether it would not be money well spent to erect State smelters on the Etheridge and Cloncurry fields. In the first speech I made in this House I said it would be a good thing. At that time, I believe, there were 1,000 copper-gaugers there making a good living, but, owing to the slump in copper, I do not suppose there are 100 now. Had the Government erected State smelters there then, that district would have been crowded with men making a good living. It is well known that the people who purchase ore deduct a great deal more than they should from the amount they give the miner; and the copper-gaugers' occupation, with a few exceptions, is not a profitable one. Coming to the Lands Department, though there is a new Minister, the administration continues on the old lines, particularly as far as my district is concerned. The tendency of the Government is to hunt out the small man and make room for the big man; and a great amount of land is going away from the Crown and becoming freehold. In days gone by a great deal of land became freehold by the auction method, but now that method is confined to town allotments. Notwithstanding that, there is a great deal more being brought under freehold tenure than in former years. Since 1905, there have been 1,039,241 acres converted into freehold—4,783 without payment, and the rest by purchase. This conversion of land into freehold means that the Government are not raising sufficient revenue through the ordinary channels to carry on the government of the country. For the last four or five years we have been receiving on an average £250,000 in the shape of revenue from land that is becoming freehold; in other words, the State is losing an asset to the value of £250,000 per annum, and is not creating another asset to take its place. A country should raise sufficient revenue through the ordinary channels of taxation to pay the cost of government; and if it is giving away an asset on one side, it should be prepared to create another asset to take its place. I do not believe in the freehold principle; I do not believe it is in the best interests of any community. What has been the result in all the nations where that principle has been followed? Unfortunately, in the whole of Europe the normal condition is for 16 per cent. of the population to be on the verge of starvation; and if that system is continued here it will be followed by like results. I want the Government to let the people have the value they create in the

land, and not let others take the unearned increment. A case that occurred in New South Wales came under my notice some time ago. A man paid £100 for an allotment, and shortly afterwards was sentenced to 21 years' imprisonment. When he came out of gaol, though he never put a farthing on it after he bought it, he found that it was worth £40,000. That was the unearned increment of 20 years. The same thing is taking place throughout Queensland to-day, though possibly the value is not increasing in so great a ratio; and I say that unearned increment should go to the people to whom it belongs—to the people who create the value (Hear, hear!) The value given to the land by the individual himself, by his own energy

and industry, belongs to him, [7.30 p.m.] but the value created by the public belongs to the public, and the sooner the Government recognise that the better it will be for the great majority of the people of Queensland. During the time that the Government have been allowing this enormous amount of land to become freehold, what have they been doing with it? Have they been utilising the land to the best advantage? I am going to prove that there is purely a speculative element in connection with the land to-day. From 1905 to 1909, nearly 5,000,000 acres of land have been made, or are in process of being made, freehold, and how much has been brought under cultivation? In 1905, there were 539,216 acres under cultivation in Queensland, and in 1910 only 606,790 acres under cultivation, or an increase of 67,574 acres.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: What about the increase in dairying?

Mr. NEVITT: That is the increase in dairying.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That is agricultural land, not increase in dairying.

Mr. NEVITT: That is the only land brought under cultivation during the years I have enumerated.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: But that is not the extent of agricultural development.

Mr. NEVITT: I will give you a little of your agricultural development directly. One acre only out of every 65 acres sold has come under cultivation. When the Land Bill was going through last year the hon. member for Maranoa tried to get an amendment inserted to the effect that a certain percentage of land under a certain tenure should be brought under cultivation. As long as we have freehold tenure I maintain that we should have such a provision as was desired by the hon. member for Maranoa. The land shark is rampant in Queensland to-day, and very little is being done by the Government of the day to prevent it. The hon. gentleman asked me what has been the result of agricultural development. Unfortunately, the same thing applies to Queensland as far as the acreage under cultivation or crop is concerned as applies to everything else. We are the worst State of the group, we have a less number of acres under cultivation per head of the population than they have in any other State. The figures are as follows:—For every 1,000 of the population New South Wales has 1,981, Victoria has 2,848, Queensland 1,074, South Australia 6,161, Western Australia 2,665, Tasmania 1,488, and the average for the whole Commonwealth is 2,539 acres, again

showing that Queensland is worse than any other State of the group. Now I am coming to what some of your agricultural gentlemen produce. In 1909 we imported into Queensland 142,217 bushels of wheat to the value of £32,310, showing the necessity for the insertion of a clause in the Land Bill, as desired by the hon. member for Maranoa. We cannot produce sufficient wheat for our own consumption, we have to send out £32,000 in order to buy wheat. During the same period we introduced 32,205 tons of flour, to the value of £331,896.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: And you sent away nearly a million pounds' worth of butter.

Mr. NEVITT: That is something to be proud of, but I maintain that in a country such as ours, which is the pride of the group, if we do not produce sufficient flour for our own consumption, there is something radically wrong with the Administration.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: You cannot live on butter alone. (Laughter.)

Mr. NEVITT: But this is not the only thing. I find that during the same time we introduced 358,000 bushels of bran, pollard, and chaff to the value of £16,000. We had to import 21,988 tons of potatoes, of the value of £100,000, and we are frequently told that we are the finest potato country in the group.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: So we are.

Mr. NEVITT: I believe we are, and I say it is a disgrace to any Government that these conditions should exist.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: And all that proves that people, like yourself, are doing something that is more congenial.

Mr. NEVITT: This might be suitable for the hon. gentleman. We find we imported 21,000 tons of hay and chaff, to the value of £68,000. Then we come to oats; there were 136,173 bushels, of the value of £14,000, purchased. In the five items I have mentioned we sent out £599,738 per annum. I say once again that when conditions like that prevail in connection with the administration of the Agricultural Department of Queensland, it is no credit to any Government. I could not help being amused by the Premier last night at the way he was finding work for Queenslanders. I went through a few papers this morning, and I find that since last recess we have had to send to Germany for a dredge. The Commissioner for Railways though it desirable to introduce auto-cars on our railways, with the result that we have not only to send to America for machinery, but also for the coaches. We have a shop at Ipswich that can turn out work equal to any shop in the world, and if we could not have manufactured the machinery for the auto-cars, the least we could have done was to manufacture the coaches, and it is a disgrace to the Government that they should have done what they did in connection with that matter. As I mentioned earlier, during the same time, they sent out a contract for £300,000 worth of rails and fittings. Did they make overtures to the Lithgow Company, as the New South Wales Government did, and ask them whether it was not possible for them to supply us with rails and fastenings in Australia? While I believe that it is necessary that we should make everything we

*Mr. Nevitt.]*

require in Queensland, if we cannot make it in Queensland our next choice should be any other State in the Commonwealth, and, failing that, we should go to Great Britain. Then I find that during the recess the Government let a contract for 1,000 tons of wire fencing to a Dutch firm. Then they found that the work of the Harbours and Rivers Department had increased to such an extent that it was necessary to provide two or three more steam launches. They had not time to give a contract to our local ship-builders to build boats, but they must go and buy second-hand boats from New South Wales. That is a further disgrace to the Government. Before I leave the dredge, I sincerely hope it is not going to be another Lindon Bates dredge fiasco such as we had before. As the money has to be spent, I sincerely hope that the dredge when it arrives here will be a success. Now I want to touch slightly on the railway policy of the Government. I have already stated that when people on the London market realised that Queensland would require another £10,000,000, or about that sum, to complete the railway scheme introduced and passed last session, the financial magnates buttoned up their pockets, and said that Queensland stock would be worth 2 per cent. less than it was before that scheme was adopted. This proves that the attitude taken up by members on this side of the House was a reasonable and right one. There are men on this side of the House who know that Western country better than any members opposite, with the exception of the hon. member for Townsville and a few others, but their opinions went for nought. There are very few members on the other side who know that country as they ought to know it before voting such a large sum of money for a railway scheme of that nature.

Mr. MURPHY: Members on that side did not object to the whole scheme.

Mr. NEVITT: I am not speaking of the whole scheme. But members on this side do not make the railway proposals a party question, as did hon. members opposite. Those proposals were made a party question by members opposite, and even a railway like the Port Alma Line was made a party question by them. Members on this side do not, however, make railways a party question, but every member votes as he thinks best in the interest of the people of Queensland. I believe that a very large majority of the members on this side, if not the whole of them, voted against the Great Western Railway.

Mr. MURPHY: They advocated the linking up of certain lines.

Mr. NEVITT: The linking up of those lines does not constitute the Great Western Railway scheme. While I was in favour of linking up the Central and Northern Railways, I was not in favour of going so far west. If the proposal had been to construct a railway much nearer the coast, I should have supported it heartily. I have had an opportunity of going over that country since last session, and many of the people settled there, so I discovered, say it was a great blunder, and that the line ought never to have been passed by the House.

Hon. R. PHILP: It can easily be altered yet.

Mr. NEVITT: It should be wiped out altogether. As a matter of fact it should never have been introduced. If the hon. member

[Mr. Nevitt.

for Townsville, who knows the country, would speak his mind on the subject, he would say that a railway going through that country cannot pay for the next twenty years at least. The railway from Hughenden to Winton, which goes through country equal to any country out there, is not paying interest on the money invested, though it has the advantage of being much nearer the coast. Then how is it possible for a railway 300 or 400 miles further west to pay interest on the money invested in its construction? The Premier spoke last night about the Drayton deviation. Railways are required much more urgently in other parts of the State than the Drayton deviation is required. The Premier stated that our South Coast Railway would soon be connected with Sydney. When that takes place our Western Railway will be relieved of a large amount of traffic, and, that being so, there is no necessity for the Drayton deviation at the present time. The money which that deviation would cost can be spent to much better advantage in other parts of the State. The hon. member for Murilla complained this afternoon of the freights charged on the railways. Speaking generally, I think our railway freights compare favourably with those of other States. But my trouble is that we cannot get a railway at all in my electorate, much less get reduced railway freights. The hon. member for Enoggera, when speaking the other day, said he remembered the time when, if a man wanted to go from Brisbane 30 miles up country, he had to shoulder his "bluey" or get somebody to lend him a horse. Well, that is the condition of things in my electorate to-day. There is practically not one railway in the whole electorate, which comprises an area of 70,000 square miles.

Hon. R. PHILP: You have the Croydon Railway.

Mr. NEVITT: The Croydon Railway certainly goes through a portion of Carpentaria, but it scarcely serves any portion of the 70,000 square miles I have mentioned. During last session the then Premier, Mr. Kidston, said that during the recess he intended to send a marine surveyor to the Gulf to find out which was the best port to open up there. Considering that a railway from a certain point in the Gulf to Cloncurry was passed through this House thirty years ago, I should think there was no necessity to send a marine surveyor to find out which was the best port to open. Ten years ago, when the railway from Burketown to Lilydale was passed, it was not considered necessary to send a marine surveyor to see whether Burketown was a sufficiently good port for ships to go into. When I interviewed the present Premier, and asked him if he was going to fulfil that promise to send a marine surveyor to the Gulf, he said he did not know anything about it. I assured him that it was really made, and that if he consulted the responsible officers of the department he would find that such was the case. After looking into the matter the hon. gentleman said he found that the promise was made. That was early in February last, about the time when the change was made in the Ministry. The Premier said he could not send up a surveyor because the north-west season was on, and he could not work during that season. The north-west season finishes there on the 21st of March, when the equinoctial change takes place, and yet here we are in the middle of July, when the best part of the south-west season is over, and no surveyor has been

sent to the Gulf. I maintain that when a promise is made by a Premier on the floor of this House it is the duty of his successor to carry out that promise in its entirety. (Hear, hear!) Nautical men have written to me asking when the Government intended to send up a marine surveyor, and pointing out that the best part of the season was gone.

**THE SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS:** The Premier said last night that he was going to send a surveyor.

**MR. NEVITT:** I am pointing out that the Government have neglected to do so up to the present time.

**THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE:** There are three months yet.

**MR. NEVITT:** The Government do not take notice of such things in the Southern part of Queensland, and I can see no reason why they should have delayed this matter until the best part of the season is gone. The hon. member for Ipswich stated last night that he was going to move for a return showing the amount of money spent out of revenue, from trust funds, and from loan fund in every electorate in Queensland, and the amount promised to be spent during the past three months. I sincerely hope he will move in that direction. It will prove a very interesting return, but I expect that when it comes to be analysed it will be found that every Government has been placating its own friends and giving little or nothing to those opposed to it. I maintain that every part of Queensland should have expended within its borders the revenue collected therein, and that it should also get its share of both trust and loan fund expenditure, which has not been by any means the practice of this and past Governments. Every member of this House should insist on that, irrespective of party. As far as I am concerned, I ask for nothing more than a fair deal, and every portion of Queensland is entitled to a fair deal from the Government. (Hear, hear!) As a result of the neglect of this Government and past Governments to give a fair deal, the people are leaving the district that I represent all the time. They are dwindling, dwindling, dwindling, until, if it goes on much longer, there will be nobody left but a few pastoralists. That brings me to a little matter in connection with the same point. Lord Kitchener pointed out to the defence people of the Commonwealth that the Japanese could land troops in the Gulf of Carpentaria quicker than the Federal Government could send troops there from Melbourne; and yet this is a portion of Queensland that this Government and past Governments have neglected to such an extent simply because some of them say it is the back door. I would point out, as Lord Kitchener pointed out, that it is the front door. It is the first point at which we are likely to be attacked by any Asiatic race. Yet we find that the Government, instead of trying to settle people in that part of the country, have been doing all they possibly can to drive away the few people who are there. As far back as 1889 they received £1,500 for ¼-acre allotments in the town of Normanton.

**MR. MURPHY:** What are they worth to-day?

**MR. NEVITT:** People to-day will give you allotments almost for the cost of transfer, or if you will take over the liability on them in the shape of rates. I think that the

Government of those days received that money under false pretences, because the Governments that followed them did not do what the Government of that day led the people to believe they were going to do. I was reading an article in the "Lone Hand" some little time ago, in which the writer pointed out that at the present time there are 2,500 Japanese in New Caledonia, and that before the end of this year there will be 3,500 more, and he predicted that within eighteen months there will be over 6,000 Japanese fighting men in New Caledonia.

**HON. R. PHILP:** They are Javanese—not Japanese at all.

**MR. NEVITT:** If the hon. gentleman reads the article in the "Lone Hand," he will find that they are Japanese. In this morning's paper he will see that the "Guthrie" arrived here yesterday with a considerable number of Japanese on board.

**HON. R. PHILP:** They are all Javanese. (Laughter.)

**MR. NEVITT:** I am not infallible like some people, but the writer of the article in the "Lone Hand" stated that they were Japanese, and he could not be making a mistake, because he pointed out that the majority of those men had fought through the Russo-Japanese war, and he was on the ground. However, it does not affect my argument one iota. The fact remains that there is a great number of Japanese there in very close proximity to our shores. It is the duty of the Government at the earliest possible opportunity to build a railway to some port on the Gulf of Carpentaria—I do not care where it goes to—so that if ever the time should come that that part of the country requires to be protected, we shall be able to put troops there quickly. The action of all Governments so far has been rather in the nature of an invitation for the people from the eastern coast of Asia to take possession of that part of Queensland.

**MR. MURPHY:** Do you not think that a purely defence railway like that should be built by the Federal Government—looking at it purely from the defence point of view?

**MR. NEVITT:** I am not looking at it from the purely defence point of view at all. I am looking at it from the point of view that there is just as good country in that portion of the State as there is in any other portion of Queensland; and, that being so, the people there are entitled to the revenue collected there, and they are also entitled to a portion of the trust and loan fund expenditure. If they got what they are entitled to, instead of there being only a handful of people there, there would be thousands upon thousands. On looking through the Appropriation Bill which was passed the other day, I noticed that the expenditure from the trust fund authorised by the Bill is £30,000 and the expenditure from the loan fund is £250,000. In reply to an interjection, the Premier intimated that the Bill provided for two months' Supply. From that we can infer that the expenditure from loan money is to be £3,000,000 for the present financial year. With all due respect to the Premier or any other man, I think that Queensland is not in a position to spend £3,000,000 of loan money per annum.

**THE SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS:** Six times £250,000 is not £3,000,000—it is only £1,500,000, as a matter of fact. (Laughter.)

*Mr. Nevitt.]*



Mr. NEVITT: Yes; that is one-half of £3,000,000.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Oh! that does not make any difference at all. (Laughter.)

Mr. NEVITT: I admit that I am subject to correction on that point. (Laughter.) It is rather a serious correction, I admit. (Laughter.)

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I am glad you admit it.

Mr. MURPHY: You had better get off that argument. (Laughter.)

Mr. NEVITT: No; I will continue in this way: While it is only £1,500,000, the Government are also expending considerable sums of money from the trust funds, which practically means loan money in the majority of instances.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: No.

Mr. NEVITT: I will admit that the University money was revenue, but, though I cannot give figures by way of example, it frequently happens that money is transferred from the loan fund to a trust fund and then spent. That is done to a very considerable extent in the course of the year. To bring my remarks to a close, I want briefly to mention what I consider the Government should have in their programme. They have some useful measures, so far as names are concerned, but I do not know what the measures contain until I see them, and I shall reserve my remarks on those Bills until I see them. But I would like to call attention to some social legislation and administration that I consider to be absolutely necessary at the present time. Whilst the Education Department is extending its usefulness in certain directions, there are other directions in which its usefulness can be still further extended. The industrial efficiency of any nation depends upon the physical and mental efficiency of its children. That being so, I say the Government should provide medical, dental, and ophthalmic attendance for all children. It might be a large order, but

I contend that if we are going to [8 p.m.] maintain a position in the world that we all desire we should attain, it is the duty of the Government to do their best to have a healthy, prosperous community; and in no better way can they have that healthy community than by seeing that all our State schools are periodically visited by the best medical attention we have got, by the best dental attention, and by the best ophthalmic attention. If the Government will proceed on these lines, then they will not only find this party behind them, but they will find the whole of Queensland behind them.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: We are doing that now.

Mr. NEVITT: To a limited extent you are doing it now. You are starting in the big cities. You are starting in Brisbane, where you have only to go across the road and you can get a doctor, a dentist, and an optician at any time of the day you wish to. I say that it is in the back blocks that you should try these experiments first.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: What have we done in the West?

Mr. NEVITT: I admit that you have done something as regards ophthalmia. I have admitted that already. And I might tell the hon. gentleman who occupies the position of Minister for Education to-day that it was men

[Mr. Nevitt.

on this side of the House who first brought that subject forward in this House.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. NEVITT: I do not wish to detract from the credit of the Minister who initiated the system, but the fact remains that members on this side were the first to bring it up, and I wish him to proceed further on those lines, so that our children may get the benefit of the best attention that is possible. There is another direction in which the Government can do good work, and that is in connection with the establishment of a radium bank. It is well known in therapeutics that radium is one of those things that is doing wonders in certain diseases, and so far as my knowledge goes I do not think we have got a fraction of radium in Queensland that is at the service of the suffering community. A thing of this kind, which takes a large amount of money to commence, is something which it is the duty of the Government to undertake. If a radium bank were established some revenue could be obtained from it by lending it out to the medical profession at a certain rate, or it might be lent out so that it could be used to alleviate suffering humanity. That is another way in which I think the Government can increase their usefulness. Another way is to establish a bush nursing scheme. During the recess a most pathetic incident came under my observation. In Queensland we go so far as to establish lock hospitals, which I admit are necessary—(hear, hear!)—but what I say here is that maternity hospitals are of far greater necessity than lock hospitals.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. NEVITT: A case came under my observation since the last recess. One poor mother out in the bush was confined, and before morning, because she could not get the medical assistance she required, both mother and child died. The Government should establish maternity hospitals in the bush districts, and should also see that there is a nurse within a radius so that these women could have the attention of those who are experienced in midwifery. In that way lives would be saved which had been neglected in the past. Such legislation as that would reflect credit on the Government, and would alleviate the sufferings of many in our midst to-day. Then I wish to emphasise the necessity of the Government nationalising our hospitals. (Hear, hear!) On Sunday last I went through the Diamantina Hospital, and no better illustration could be given of what a nationalised hospital is than is to be found there. It is a fine object lesson of State socialism. (Hear, hear!) It is an institution that I am proud of. Any man who has had any experience of hospitals at all—and even those who have not had any experience of hospitals—if they go to the Diamantina Hospital and compare it with many of our country hospitals, must come to the conclusion that the Diamantina Hospital is the finest institution he ever put his head into. I want to see all our hospitals run on similar lines and worked on the lines of that institution, and a much larger number of suffering humanity would get the benefit of them than do to-day. The Premier has promised to increase the hospital subsidy this year. The year before last it was £1 6s. 7d., last year it was £1 10s. to the £1, and the Premier promises that it will be £2 for £1 this year. While the smallest of mercies are always thankfully received, a large number of the hospitals in Queensland are always more

or less on the verge of insolvency, even with £2 for £1 subsidy, and the committee men have to do for the hospitals what no men would dare to do for themselves. Time out of number I have done it myself. I do not pretend to be any better than anyone else. I have done things for hospitals which if I had done for myself I might have found myself in St. Helena. Many other hospital committee men have to do it, and they are doing it to-day, and those conditions should not prevail in a State like Queensland. Once more I urge on the Government the necessity of nationalising our hospitals. Another thing which the Government might do is to have medical supervision of employees engaged in dangerous work, or work that is likely to cause them to contract serious disease. There should be periodical inspections at the expense of the State to see whether these people are degenerating physically, so that it can be remedied in the early stages of their trouble, and not become, as they do in many instances, a drag on the State. These are some of the things which the Government might have included in their programme. I do not think there is anything else I can say at the present time except to draw attention again to that milk depot. I feel so strongly on this point that I wish to force home to the Government the responsibility that should devolve upon them, and they should take up that responsibility and try to provide better food for our infants. I thank the House for the hearing it has given me. (Hear, hear!)

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. G. Appel, *Albert*), who was received with "Hear, hears!" said: I propose to address the greater portion of my remarks to certain statements, which practically amounted to charges against the present Administration, which were uttered by the deputy leader of the Opposition. The hon. member occupying so responsible a position, any statements which he makes in this House, and through this House to the electors of the State, must carry a certain amount of weight, and naturally so. And were those statements not refuted by the actual facts of the case, certain members of the public might naturally, and possibly, come to the conclusion that those statements, which are misstatements, were matters of fact. Now, I notice that the hon. member, in his address last night, lacked that fire and energy which he, as a rule, puts into any charges which he brings against the Administration and the democratic party on this side of the House. The only conclusion that I can come to is that he knew in his own heart that those charges were not correct. Undoubtedly it is the duty of the Opposition to criticise the Government, and I, as a member of this Administration, welcome criticism of any administrative action, or any legislation, which is proposed from this side of the House. But, at the same time, I think a certain duty devolves upon members sitting on the Opposition side, especially upon that hon. member who acts as its leader, and that is, that, as far as possible, in the first instance, he should make himself acquainted with the facts of the case, so that at least that criticism shall be founded on fact—on a sure and certain foundation. That to which I especially refer was the criticism which the hon. member offered in connection with hospitals for insane in this State, and more particularly in connection with the hospital for insane at Goodna. For the information of hon. mem-

bers, who possibly are not acquainted with the history of that particular institution, I may mention that when the two democratic parties in this House became united, and that Administration was formed of which I was chosen to be a member—just about that particular time the late superintendent, who was the senior officer in charge of the insane asylums, died. When the matter of a successor was considered by the Government a decision was come to that something must be done to bring our hospitals for the insane up to the modern standard which they should occupy, and it was then decided that a medical man, an expert in his particular line, should be selected from Great Britain to be placed in charge of those hospitals, for the purpose of putting them on the best possible basis. Now, I do not for one moment desire it to be understood that I propose to cast any reflection upon the gentlemen who occupied the position of medical superintendents at Goodna prior to that period.

Mr. LENNON: He was a very fine man.

The HOME SECRETARY: Of course, we must remember that during the latter part of the term of office of the late superintendent the State was in the unfortunate position that it had not the funds to expend upon the development of those institutions, nor, at the time, was it apparent, owing to the fact that there had not been such an increase among those so unfortunately afflicted—there had not been such an increase as to bring prominently before the Administration and the public the necessity of a different line of conduct being pursued in connection with those hospitals. The result of that determination was the appointment of the present Inspector of Hospitals for the Insane. Prior to his taking charge, hon. members may possibly remember that in a certain newspaper a certain sensational article—an article similar to the sensational article which the hon. member fathered last night—appeared wherein certain charges were made against the asylum attendants of gross cruelty practised towards the patients. I, as the administrative head of the Home Department, never for one moment placed any faith in the statements and charges which were then made, and, from inquiry since, my opinion has been amply justified. However, upon the present Inspector of Hospitals taking charge, a new chapter opened for our hospitals for insane, and about the month of October, 1910, a very large and representative body of attendants was introduced by members of Parliament—the present Chief Secretary, the senior member for Ipswich, the member for Bundamba, and the junior member for Ipswich accompanying those attendants. The whole question of the status of the attendants was discussed. The question of the regulations being antiquated was also discussed, and I then and there undertook that the whole matter would be gone into with the object of bringing the regulations up to date and doing all that was necessary to improve the status and condition of the attendants upon the lines which had been suggested by Dr. Ellerton, Inspector of Hospitals for the Insane. Now, it must be remembered that prior to the advent of the present inspector, attendants at that asylum were practically not required to have any particular knowledge. They never, during the time they had acted in the capacity of attendants, were placed in

the position of acquiring that knowledge, which, at the present time, is considered necessary that attendants should have. The result was that new regulations were drawn up. Those regulations were submitted to a committee of the attendants appointed for the purpose, and were finally agreed upon, passed by the Executive, and are now the regulations which are in force. Those regulations placed the attendants upon quite a different footing, the particulars of which I will presently give to hon. members. They placed them in connection with leave in practically the same position as other members of the public service, and also provided that, by attendance at lectures and gaining certain certificates, they would receive certain automatic increases. In connection with further wards, I decided, on the recommendation of the Inspector of Asylums, that it was necessary that he, the Under Secretary for Public Works, and the Under Secretary for the Home Department, should proceed to inspect the asylums in the other States of the Commonwealth, and the recommendations of that commission with regard to construction are being carried out in the building of the new wards. Prior to the departure of those gentlemen the Chief Secretary and the hon. member for Bundamba waited upon myself and asked me to request that commission to make further inquiry as to the wages and emoluments which were paid to asylum attendants in the Southern States. This was done, with the result, as was stated by the Premier last night, that a further increase, in addition to those already arranged for in the regulations, was passed—an increase in the remuneration of the attendants in the hospitals for the insane in the State of Queensland. These amounts I propose to give particularly before I sit down. Neither I, as the administrative head of this particular department, nor do the Government, claim any particular credit for the action that has been taken, because it is simply in conformity with the democratic policy which we profess, and which we are carrying out for the benefit of the people of the State and the prosperity of the State as a whole.

Mr. MURPHY: There was a strike, was there not?

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member for Croydon says there was a strike. I also notice that the deputy leader of the Opposition made the same statement last night in his address.

Mr. LENNON: Excuse me—it was made by the same interjector as made it to-night.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. gentleman said, "We are told by the hon. member for Croydon that there is a strike on at Goodna in regard to the food." I can only say the foundation for that is of equal value with that of other statements made by the hon. gentleman last night in connection with this matter.

Mr. LENNON: Very offensive to the hon. member for Croydon.

Mr. MURPHY: Not at all. I take it as a joke.

The HOME SECRETARY: For the information of hon. members, I propose to detail the additional advantages which have been given to the asylum attendants since the proclaiming of the new regulations. Attendants and nurses receive weekly leave of one and a-half days, or its equivalent; annual leave ten to twenty-one days accord-

ing to rank and service; sick leave the same as public servants; further leave—not less than five years' service, one month on full pay, one month on half pay, one month without pay; after ten years' service two months on full pay, two months on half pay, two months without pay; after fifteen years' service, three months on full pay, three months on half pay, three months without pay; after twenty years' service, four months on full pay, four months on half pay, four months without pay; after twenty-five years' service, five months on full pay, five months on half pay, five months without pay; after thirty years' service, six months on full pay, six months on half pay, six months without pay.

Mr. LENNON: I suppose they could have more than six months without pay.

The HOME SECRETARY: No. The hon. member must remember that their position cannot be held open for them beyond the time allowed; but they are entitled to that leave, after which they may return and take up their positions again.

Mr. McLAHLAN: When did that come into force?

The HOME SECRETARY: These regulations have been in force for six months at least. Annual recreation leave not taken may be added to sick leave; and extended leave is given in the same manner as to public servants under the Public Service Act. After not less than fifteen years' continuous service, three months may be granted on full pay or six months on half pay; after twenty years' continuous service, four and a-half months on full pay or nine months on half pay; after twenty-five years' continuous service, six months on full pay or twelve months on half pay. Retiring allowances and gratuities to dependants are the same as are given to members of the public service under the Public Service Act. In the case of service of not less than fifteen years a gratuity equal to three months' pay; service of not less than twenty years, a gratuity equal to four months' pay; service of not less than twenty-five years, a gratuity equal to five months' pay; service of not less than thirty years, a gratuity equal to six months' pay. Pay while at military camps is the same as to public servants, and they are furthermore provided with uniforms. Time and a-half is allowed for public holidays; and instead of leave with pay on account of sickness and retiring allowance or gratuity, workers' compensation may be paid—which ever the person deems is the greater benefit to himself.

Mr. LENNON: Can the hon. gentleman justify retirement on half pay after fifteen years in the case of the judges, and only a gratuity equal to five months' pay to these people after twenty-five years' service?

The HOME SECRETARY: I am not dealing with that particular phase of the question. I do not for a moment contend that even the increased rates, which I will presently enumerate, are rates which could not be bettered; nor do I say I do not desire them to be bettered. I hope they will be—I hope the circumstances of the Treasury will enable us from time to time to improve the conditions and pay of the servants of the State. But we can only pay according to our ability; and we are acting where the hon. gentleman is suggesting. And it is only right that hon. members and the people of the State should know that the Government

[Hon. J. G. Appel.]

are doing something, and that we hope to continue to do something which will still more improve the condition of those employed in the service of the State of Queensland.

Mr. HARDACRE: They do it too slowly.

The HOME SECRETARY: If we were to go as slowly as I fancy the hon. member would go, it would be a very poor thing for the servants of the State. I hope hon. members will not treat the matter lightly—(hear, hear!)—because it is a very important matter. Undoubtedly the thanks of the community are due to those men and women who are giving their lives to this particular service. For the information of hon. [8.30 p.m.] members, I propose now to give the rates of pay, and first I will quote the rates prior to March, 1911. Prior to that time the rates of pay for males, for the first six months, while they were on probation, was £75, and for the second six months £100.

Mr. LENNON: And did they not have to find their own keep?

The HOME SECRETARY: That is so. I propose to tell you what they are now receiving. Warders who joined before March, 1911, for the first year now receive £110.

Mr. LENNON: That is the Federal minimum wage.

The HOME SECRETARY: The probationers who joined since March, 1911, receive £110; over one year's service and under five years' service, prior to the date mentioned, they received £120 under the new rate; at the end of the probationary period they will receive an increase of £20 for attending the course of instruction, which brings the pay to £130 per annum. Under the former rate attendants of over ten years received £140. They will now receive £150. On obtaining mental nursing certificates there is an increase, under the new regulations, of £10, which will bring those receiving £130 up to £140. A further increase of pay under the old conditions would depend upon officers themselves attending lectures and obtaining the mental nursing certificates. Night attendants with mental nursing certificates under the new rate will receive £150; deputy charge attendant with mental nursing certificate, £155; charge attendant with mental nursing certificate, £165; additional pay, after ten years' service, £10 increase. Head night and head day attendants, £200 per annum. The nurses formerly received, first year £55; they now receive the same amount on twelve months' probation; at the end of probationary period an increase of £10 for attending course of instruction, which makes the remuneration £65; on obtaining mental nursing certificate £10 increase, £75; night nursing certificate, £78. Deputy charge nurse with certificate, £81; charge nurse with certificate, £85; additional pay after ten years' service, automatically, £5 per annum. Assistant day matron, £110; assistant night matron, £110. Now those are the rates of pay which the hon. member, quoting from the sensational and incorrect newspaper report, described—

Mr. LENNON: That is the Government official organ.

The HOME SECRETARY: Well, I know nothing about it. I do not know, so far as these matters are concerned, any official organ, save, as administrative head, what I consider just and right, and what it is pos-

sible for the Treasury to pay to improve the position and condition of any employees who happen to be under the administration of the Home Department. That is the sole official paper, or organ, that I know or recognise.

Mr. RYAN: Are those rates of pay made after the sensational article appeared?

The HOME SECRETARY: Certainly not. I have detailed how, from October, 1909, these matters have progressed, and, so soon as the proclamation was made which legalised the new regulations, these rates became effective, and, in consequence of the representations which were made by the commission which I despatched to the South for the purpose I have already indicated, these rates of pay are now in existence and are being paid from the 1st of this month, and in accordance with the amounts detailed will so appear on the estimates of expenditure for hospitals for the insane.

Mr. LENNON: Is that the 10 per cent. increase to which you referred last night?

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes; that includes the approximate 10 per cent. increase, which puts attendants on as good a footing as members of the prisons service. I trust not to weary hon. members, but the details which I am giving cannot but be interesting to those who are concerned in the conditions of employees of the State. A statement was made by the hon. member who dealt with this matter last night, to the effect that the number of attendants had not been increased in accordance with the number of patients.

Mr. LENNON: The number is now alleged to be scandalously deficient by that paper.

The HOME SECRETARY: Quite so; and I understand from the remarks of the hon. gentleman that the only inference which could be drawn from that was that no attempt had been made by the Administration to cope with the matter by increasing the number of attendants.

Mr. LENNON: No; not adequately.

The HOME SECRETARY: I would like, for the information of hon. members, to give these figures. For the years 1907-8 the number of attendants at Goodna was—males 65, and nurses 35; for the years 1908-9, males 65, and nurses 38.

Mr. McLACHLAN: Can you give us the total number of inmates for the same period?

Mr. LENNON: That is all-important.

The HOME SECRETARY: I can get that. I may say that the increase in the number of patients during the five years is under 300.

Mr. LENNON: And the number of attendants is very slightly increased.

The HOME SECRETARY: For the years 1909-10, male attendants 65 and female attendants 38; for the years 1910-11, male attendants 76 and female attendants 45; for the current year, when the vacancies are filled, 80 male attendants and 45 female attendants. That is a comparison from 1907-8 of 80 to 65 and 45 to 35. In Ipswich, the male attendants for a similar period were: 1907-8, 10; for 1908-9, 18; for 1909-10, 18; for 1910-11, 20; and in 1911-12, 24 are provided for. In Toowoomba, for a similar period, the male attendants were 31, 31, 34, and 36; nurses 30, 30, 32, 32, and 34.

Mr. MULLAN: What is the number of patients per attendant?

*Hon. J. G. Appel.]*

The HOME SECRETARY: I am simply giving the number, because the number of patients who require an attendant is a matter of opinion, and a matter that depends largely upon the condition of the inmate. In some wards, where the inmates are violent, a larger number of attendants is required; where they are better behaved, a smaller number is necessary; but as I have endeavoured to point out, under the present conditions, and under the conditions which exist in Great Britain, and in those centres where they are endeavouring to improve the conditions of this particular class of service, it has been found necessary to train the attendants. The old idea that any person could act as an attendant is exploded. (Hear, hear!) An attendant requires a certain amount of training. Under the present Administration an endeavour is being made to train attendants. We are endeavouring to train attendants, and I may mention, for the information of hon. members, that it is the policy of the present Inspector of Asylums that the matrons in charge of nurses shall have, not alone a certificate as far as mental diseases are concerned, but also a certificate of proficiency in general surgical and medical work. The matron who has been appointed to the Ipswich Hospital for the Insane is at present undergoing a course of training at the Toowoomba General Hospital for the purpose of acquiring the necessary qualifications in this respect, and during the time that she is at the Toowoomba General Hospital gaining that experience the department is paying her the salary of matron which she will continue to receive when she takes charge of the nurses at the Ipswich Hospital for the Insane.

Mr. MULLAN: You have forgotten to prove that point about the increased attendants.

The HOME SECRETARY: I shall give that information now. For the year 1909, the last record which I have, the number of inmates was 2,227; for the year 1908 it was 2,184, for the year 1907 it was 2,069, for the year 1906 it was 2,029, and for the year 1905 it was 1,938.

Mr. LENNON: The hon. gentleman set out to prove that there was a higher percentage of attendants now than there was in past years. The hon. gentleman has not proved that.

The HOME SECRETARY: I have proved that.

Mr. LENNON: No; you are evading it all the time.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member must surely be indulging in sarcasm, seeing that I have given the number of inmates in each year from 1905 to 1909.

Mr. LENNON: How many attendants?

The HOME SECRETARY: I gave the hon. member the figures. The number of male attendants in 1905 was sixty-five, and we have made provision on this year's Estimates for eighty.

Mr. LENNON: But they are not yet appointed, you said.

The HOME SECRETARY: There are seventy-six actually appointed, and we have made provision for eighty. Unfortunately, in the past it was not apparently contemplated that a certain increase in the number of patients must be looked for. The increase which may be expected is four per thousand. That is about the average, and we must look

forward to that ratio of increase with our increase in native population and in the population coming from abroad.

Mr. RYLAND: There would be less if you had prohibition.

The HOME SECRETARY: I cannot go to the extent of vouching for that, nor am I prepared at the present time to enter into a discussion as to whether the percentage would be decreased if the views of the hon. member were carried into effect. I am now simply showing the House that the statements made by the deputy leader of the Opposition last night had no foundation in fact.

Mr. LENNON: And you have not succeeded.

The HOME SECRETARY: Possibly not, according to the view of the hon. gentleman. However, so long as I make these matters clear to those whom I wish to reach, I am satisfied. The hon. gentleman, in quoting from the article referred to, mentioned the fact that there was insufficient accommodation so far as the dining-room of one of the wards is concerned. On my first visit to that institution that became abundantly apparent to myself, but it was immediately remedied by instructions being given for the erection of a suitable dining-room to accommodate the inmates of that particular ward. If the hon. gentleman, who evinced such an amount of interest in this matter last night, had taken the trouble to make himself acquainted with the facts, he would have been able to give the Government credit for dealing with that matter at once. The new dining-room is now practically completed, and it is a room which would be a credit to any institution of a similar kind.

Mr. LENNON: Do you question my right to take notice of it?

The HOME SECRETARY: Comparing the remarks made by the hon. gentleman last night with the actual facts, I regret to say that I must come to the conclusion that he has taken very little interest in this matter. In view of the statements made by the hon. member, I should like to give the House some idea of the expenditure which has been incurred, which is being incurred at the present time, and which it is proposed to incur in the future, for the purpose of increasing and improving the accommodation in connection with this particular hospital.

Mr. LENNON: Be careful.

The HOME SECRETARY: I am about to give facts. The hon. member quoted from an article which, as I have already said, I do not believe he credited with being true himself. At the present time there are contracts in hand at Goodna, the cost of which will come to £16,832. In connection with water supply a contract amounting to £10,000 has been let; there are two additional houses being erected for the two assistant resident medical superintendents at a cost of £1,850; additions and alteration to No. 6 male ward, £1,539; installation of electric light, wiring, buildings, lines, £841; iron fire-escape stairs, £649; new dining-room, £515—that is the dining-room to which I have already referred—secondary installation of electric light, £370; colonial type steam boiler, £361; steam-engine and dynamo, £305; furniture for night nurses' quarters, £102—or a total of £16,832. Then there are works for which approval for tenders has been given: Ipswich Hospital for the Insane—administrative block, laundry, kitchen,

[Hon. J. G. Appel.]

matron's and nurses' quarters, stores, bath-rooms, etc., £25,000; Goodna Hospital for the Insane—two new wards, £30,000, the furniture for which will run into at least £4,000 or £5,000 in addition; or in connection with those two hospitals alone, a total of £55,000. In view of that, would it not have been well for the hon. member, before bringing a most serious charge—a charge which reflects upon the humanitarian policy of the Government—a charge which tends more than any other to damage the credit of any Government or any party in the country—would it not have been well—would it not have been at least honest—in this so important matter if the hon. member had taken the trouble to make a few inquiries as to whether the article which he fathered was true or not?

Mr. LENNON: Now, remember Yungaburra.

The HOME SECRETARY: Well, possibly I did better than the hon. member would have done under the same circumstances. I at least found that there were some honest men there, if they did only number thirteen. In addition to the works which are in hand and for which approval has been given, and for which tenders have been called, there are further projected works for which estimates are being prepared, the particulars of which I propose to give to the House: Toowoomba Hospital for the Insane—two reception wards and two hospital wards for male and female patients, and an operating theatre, £11,600; medical superintendent's quarters—additions—£700; Goodna Hospital for the Insane—two hospital wards for male and female patients, and one reception ward for females, and an operating theatre, £8,600; new corn store, £500; Ipswich Hospital for the Insane—two reception wards and two hospital wards, £6,200, or a total, in connection with hospitals for the insane, of £27,600. I am sure that the hon. member, if I have any knowledge of him, will be very gratified indeed that I have had the opportunity of showing the public of this State what a small amount of interest he takes in connection with these unfortunates who are sent to these hospitals suffering from a malady with which they are afflicted by the hand of God—

Mr. LENNON: Assume indignation, if you have it not—that is your text.

The HOME SECRETARY: We have in the hospital at Willowburn, at Toowoomba, one of the finest institutions of its kind which can be found throughout the Commonwealth. It is perhaps not altogether built upon the most up-to-date model so far as the position of the different wards is concerned. The wards at Willowburn run in parallel lines, whereas modern experts in this matter consider that it is better that the wards should radiate. Still, in the way it is laid out, in the character of the buildings and of the accommodation it affords, it is undoubtedly one of the finest hospitals for the accommodation of those unfortunates that can be found in the Commonwealth. In view of the charge of neglect which has been brought against the Government, it may be well if I once more give information to hon. members as to what those particular buildings have cost up to the present time. The expenditure on the Willowburn Hospital for the Insane so far by the Works Department amounts to £99,705 7s. 7d. The hospital for the insane at Ipswich is also of modern type. I have given the amounts we are expending and the amounts

to be expended there, and also the estimated amount to be expended at Goodna in order to place the latter institution in the forefront so far as its accommodation is concerned.

Mr. LENNON: How many additional patients will it accommodate when you have these additions made?

The HOME SECRETARY: Not taking into account at all the whole of the patients in No. 1 and No. 2 wards, it will accommodate something like 250 additional patients; but I was just about to say that we must recognise that, with the growth of our population, it will be necessary to make further arrangements for the accommodation of our insane, and already sites in the Northern portion of the State, in the vicinity of Herberton, have been suggested by the Department of Public Lands which will be available, and which the Inspector of Hospitals for the Insane proposes to inspect. Acting on his recommendation, it is proposed that the necessary plans and estimates shall be prepared, because it must be recognised that it is not desirable, with the growth of population, that the whole of the patients from all over this great State should be sent to the Southern portion of the State, more especially those from the North. Following out the same policy of decentralisation which this party believe in, we propose to follow it out so far as the additional requirements are concerned in connection with sanatoria and hospitals for the insane.

Mr. LENNON: You have not yet given any evidence of your belief in decentralisation.

The HOME SECRETARY: I do not propose to allow myself to be drawn off the track to-night. (Hear, hear!) I [9. p.m.] recognise that with the confidence which I have been enabled to give in connection with the statements made by the hon. member, undoubtedly he is very desirous to draw me off the line by which I have proved the incorrectness of his statements. (Hear, hear!) It was further recognised in connection with these improvements that the Government was under the same disability, so far as getting them completed was concerned, as any private individual. We are endeavouring to get all these works carried out so that they will be ready for the accommodation of these unfortunates as soon as possible. But, in spite of all we did, we could not obtain bricks, we could not obtain timber, or the necessary supplies. We could not even get the draftsmen necessary to draw the plans and make the specifications for some of these particular works. That is a matter which everyone who takes an interest in these things knows to be an absolute fact. Therefore, the present Administration is doing all, as I have, I trust, conclusively proved by figures, to improve in the first instance the condition of the attendants, and in the second instance to increase and improve the accommodation necessary to house and treat those unfortunates who are so afflicted. The hon. member, in quoting last night, drew attention to different matters appearing in that article. I think, in reading from the extract, that he drew special attention to the following:—

“I saw the women patients at tea. Long, narrow wooden tables spread with coarse unbleached cotton-damask, whose sole adornment

Hon. J. G. Appel.]

were plates of thick slices of brown bread and butter."

Now, we have in the person of the present Inspector of Asylums a thoroughly competent, conscientious, and zealous officer, an officer who is absolutely up to date so far as his profession is concerned; and, mark you, Sir, the whole matter of the diet of the patients is absolutely in the hands and under the control of the Inspector of Asylums, or of the different medical superintendents who are in charge of the hospitals. Replying to my interrogation to-day, the Inspector of Asylums tells me that the food is wholesome, sufficient, and good, and in every way suitable for the requirements, nourishment, and needs of the patients. So far as the tables are concerned, they are in every way similar to tables which are used for the same purpose. So far as the damask being unbleached is concerned, I consider that those of us who have purchased unbleached covers know that after the first washing they become bleached. But it seems a most extraordinary thing to me. I have inspected that asylum on different occasions, and I have seen that some of the tablecloths were unbleached, but it is a most singular thing that on that particular occasion every tablecloth should have been of unbleached damask. But what if it was? I can inform hon. members of this fact: The present inspector is doing all that he can to beautify the surroundings of these unfortunates. At the present time the bush-house is being very largely increased, and for what purpose? So that all the sitting-rooms and dining-rooms of the patients may be supplied with pot plants, because, even if a few plants and pots are destroyed, eventually the very beauty of the plant appeals to the inmate.

Mr. LENNON: Quite right.

The HOME SECRETARY: The beautifying of a room has a beneficial tendency so far as the mental condition of the patient is concerned. When the hon. member was quoting from the article last night, and spoke of the screams of the patients, I interjected, "What else would you expect to find in a mental hospital?" And I say the same thing again to-night. Unfortunately, it is a phase of those who are mentally afflicted, and I may tell you this: That the opinion expressed by the Inspector of Asylums to-day was that when any stranger visits a hospital that becomes more noticeable, and there is also a tendency, as is mentioned in the article, for the patients to tear their clothing and strip their clothing from their bodies. That is a condition that is peculiar to that form of disease, and it more particularly occurs with the advent of a stranger to an asylum. But after all said and done, because this is an unfortunate symptom which belongs to that form of malady, are the Government to be charged with that as a matter which they can avoid? I ask is that a matter for which any Government or any party in this House may be held responsible? I admit that had they not done as the present Administration have done in connection with this matter—taken all the necessary steps to improve the accommodation and to improve the status of the attendants so as to make them more fitted to nurse and attend those patients—then I admit myself that there would have been some justification for the charges which were made by the hon. member.

[*Hon. J. G. Appel.*]

Mr. LENNON: Do you propose to have the person who contributed that article brought before the bar of the House?

The HOME SECRETARY: That is a matter, I think, more for the hon. member to deal with. I think the hon. member himself must feel very small indeed—

Mr. LENNON: Not a bit of it.

The HOME SECRETARY: That he, without making any inquiry, took for granted the statements made in a sensational article—

Mr. COLLINS: In a Government newspaper.

The HOME SECRETARY: So written to procure a sale for the particular journal in which it appeared. I confess I do not like always to be vaunting what the Administration is doing in connection with its humanitarian policy.

Mr. LENNON: You cannot help it.

The HOME SECRETARY: As I have already stated, had the hon. member not made the statements which he did last night, I certainly would not have occupied the attention of the House this evening in connection with that particular policy which is being pursued by the present Administration. The hon. member alluded to the care which the State should take of those children whose parents are unable to attend to them, or who, from any other cause, happen to be thrown upon the State.

Mr. LENNON: Hear, hear! I repeat it.

The HOME SECRETARY: As has been already announced in the programme put before the House, we are making the necessary provision for taking greater care of those State children by an up-to-date measure, which will be laid upon the table of the House for the consideration of hon. members. Now already, although possibly some hon. members are not aware of it, we have an Infant Life Protection Act, which is being administered by the police, and in connection with which two lady inspectors, who are qualified as nurses, make regular inspection. Now, that Act is administered by the Home Department, and I give the House this assurance: that it is being carried out zealously and effectively, and the work which the two lady inspectors are carrying out deserves the highest commendation. Furthermore, in connection with the Orphanage Department, a large home has been built at a place called "Rowallan," at Kedron Brook, and every accommodation now exists for the purpose of utilising it as a nursery and dépôt for children; and infants of the tenderest age are received there when they are offered. No infant, however young it may be, is passed aside. We gladly receive every child, and do all that is possible to bring that child up so that it may attain to manhood or womanhood. These are simply matters that possibly some hon. members, who for some reason or other are not able to inquire into, are not aware of. I simply state it for the purpose of showing to hon. members, and for the information of those outside this House who are interested in this matter, that the present Administration are honestly and thoroughly carrying out that humane policy which they think it is their duty, as the democratic party in the State, to carry out. (Hear, hear! and Opposition laughter.) Unfortunately, there are a certain number of men—I do not know whether I

should really call them men—who, having taken unto themselves a wife, leave the whole care of looking after the household—supplying the house—to the unfortunate woman, who not alone has to undertake the duties of her motherhood, but has likewise to find all that is necessary for the maintaining of the man whom she has married. To do this, it is necessary for her to obtain employment outside her home. Unfortunately, or fortunately, from whichever point you regard it, while the husband is not attending to his manifest duties, yet the unfortunate woman, in many instances, has a family of two or three or four small children. Now, some benevolent ladies of the city of Brisbane formed an association called the Crèche and Kindergarten Association, and from small beginnings they have now establishments in Fortitude Valley, at Red Hill, at Woolloongabba, and it is also proposed to establish a similar institution in South Brisbane, where such a woman may leave her children, however young, at a place where those children are looked after, and where, when they are not sufficiently old to go to a State school, they are instructed according to the kindergarten plan.

Mr. McLACHLAN: It originated at the Institute of Social Service in Fortitude Valley.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is so. The ladies joined in with the Institute of Social Service, but they had really formed the association prior to that. However, the matter was brought prominently under the notice of the Administration, and it appealed to the present Administration to such an extent that we are providing the necessary accommodation at those different centres.

Mr. LENNON: Was it not the past Administration?

The HOME SECRETARY: It is being continued by the present Administration. It was initiated by the previous Administration representing the same democratic party undoubtedly.

Mr. LENNON: We want to get the facts, that is all.

The HOME SECRETARY: The first grant was given, I believe, by that same Administration to which I have already alluded, which was formed when the two democratic parties in this House united for the progress of the State and the benefit of its people. The Administration are providing also the necessary subsidies for each of those centres, recognising once more that it is the duty of the State, it is the duty of this Administration, to do all they can to safeguard and to improve the condition of those children, and in this and in other ways we claim that we are so doing. We hope, from time to time, similar associations may be started in other centres of population, and undoubtedly, if they are so started, they will receive the same kind of consideration that the present homes are receiving from this Administration. I am sorry that these matters are not sufficiently interesting to my friends on the other side of the House. I really thought, when they continually get up and say, "We want the Government to do this; the Government ought to do this; we forced the Government to do it"—why, Sir, you would naturally come to the conclusion that they would be only too glad to hear all the present Administration is doing and accomplishing for the poorer members of the State.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and laughter.

The HOME SECRETARY: The marvel to me always is that perhaps I have not yet acquired the feelings that a politician should have. (Laughter.) I have been wondering, when hon. members on the other side are so very anxious to point out the deficiencies of the Government, why, at least, they do not give them some credit for what they are accomplishing. Now, I notice that the hon. member last night said nothing about the Workers' Dwellings Act. Why, Sir, I at least expected the hon. member would have said, "We forced the Government to place that Act on the statute-book."

Mr. HARDACRE: We forced them to improve it.

The HOME SECRETARY: I really wonder, now that the Act is proving to be such a success and that so many persons are enabled, owing to the favourable conditions under that Act, to provide themselves with homes of their own—I wonder that they are not continually going round the country saying, "Yes; we claim credit for that. We forced them to do it." (Laughter.) No, they remain discreetly silent in connection with all other matters which the Government are consistently carrying out for the benefit of the community. Why, we had a few minutes ago commendation paid to the Government for the way we are conducting the Diamantina Hospital. Why did not the hon. gentleman last night, with the knowledge he has, or should have, tell this House that not alone are we carrying that hospital on effectively, but have expended over £3,000 to make additions so as to accommodate a larger number of patients?

Mr. LENNON: Will the hon. gentleman have the kindness to remember that we are physically incapable of saying things as he would have us say them?

The HOME SECRETARY: I quite admit that—(laughter)—but I am sorry the hon. gentleman has admitted that he is incapable of telling the truth. (Government laughter.)

Mr. LENNON: That is unfair.

The HOME SECRETARY: I regret it. Though I have every respect for the hon. gentleman—

Mr. LENNON: Mr. Speaker,—I ask you if the Home Secretary is justified in stating that I am incapable of telling the truth?

The SPEAKER: Had the Home Secretary said that, he would have been out of order; but I could not understand from what I heard that any imputation of that sort was made on the hon. gentleman.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: I have too great an admiration personally for the hon. gentleman to even imply that he would not tell the truth. (Laughter.) I only regret that, having the interests of the democracy of this State so much at heart, he does not tell that democracy at least what the Government are striving to do for the benefit of the poorer members of the community. He might at least have given some information as to what the State is doing in connection with the Dunwich Benevolent Asylum, where the accommodation is being improved by the erection of an up-to-date kitchen and steam laundry to make the condition of those

*Hon. J. G. Appel.]*



poor old pioneers more comfortable. Do we hear any complaints from the lazaret, where those unfortunate lepers are confined? Why not? The State is striving to do all it can—and properly so—to ameliorate the condition of those unfortunates.

Mr. RYAN: There is no nurse there now.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. gentleman knows that I have personally interviewed the clergy of different denominations and told them that, so far as salary is concerned, the amount is no object if they can only procure a nurse to look after the unfortunate females confined there.

Mr. RYAN: What salary was offered in the advertisement?

The HOME SECRETARY: I do not know.

Mr. LENNON: You ought to know.

The HOME SECRETARY: I have personally stated that salary is no object. If the hon. gentleman will send any nurse who is prepared to undertake the work, I give the assurance on the floor of the House that the amount of salary will be no object so long as we can procure someone.

Mr. LENNON: Why not state the amount?

Mr. RYAN: A salary of £70 was offered by advertisement.

The HOME SECRETARY: Up to £3 a week was offered, and we were prepared to go further.

Mr. RYAN: By advertisement?

The HOME SECRETARY: I do not know.

Mr. LENNON: You ought to know.

The HOME SECRETARY: I do not know what was in the advertisement, but, as administrative head of the department, I know what the department is prepared to pay. I can only say that if the hon. gentleman knows anyone who is prepared to take up the duties, salary will be no consideration as long as we can obtain the services of someone.

Mr. RYAN: Advertise a good salary.

The HOME SECRETARY: In connection with this same policy, I think the hon. gentleman opposite might at least have given the Administration credit for the commission appointed to investigate miners' phthisis. I do not like to continually have to blow the trumpet as far as the Government are concerned—(Opposition laughter)—I would rather hear members on the other side mention these matters. They more particularly are interested in the mining industry; and I think it would have come better from them if they had given the Government credit for the action taken in this matter. I may say that every recommendation made by the commission will be carried out as effectively as possible by altering, if necessary, any of the regulations under the Mining Act passed last year. In answer to the question of the hon. member for Fitzroy this afternoon, investigations are being carried out now in connection with a sanatorium, the commission having recommended that there should be one in the Central part of the State.

Mr. FERRICKS: What about one for the North?

The HOME SECRETARY: At the time the Dalby Jubilee Sanatorium was established, it  
[Hon. J. G. Appel.

was considered that it would be sufficient to cater for the whole of the State. To-day tenders are being called for two additional wards for that institution; but I have come to the conclusion that when these are completed practically we shall not be able to deal with any more patients there, and it will be necessary to erect a similar institution in the Central portion of the State. I think the hon. gentleman who interjected will find that the commission recommend the erection of a sanatorium in the Central portion. It is a matter that will receive consideration; and, if it is found necessary, either this Administration or another Administration carrying out a similar policy will take into consideration the necessity of constructing a sanatorium in the North. I have gone rather further than I intended to go in the first instance. I proposed more particularly to confine myself to matters affecting the administration of the Home Department; but while I am on my feet, and members are apparently in a particularly good-humoured state, perhaps I may add a word or two to the remarks I have already made. I do not propose [9.30 p.m.] to deal with any of those matters which were so ably replied to by the Premier last night, but the matter of State socialism was spoken of.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: If hon. members study the matter, they will find that those who advocate State socialism have simply and purely a desire for the advancement, prosperity, and happiness of the people as a whole.

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

The HOME SECRETARY: Taking the history of modern State legislation, it will be found that possibly, under the policy which the Right Hon. Lloyd-George is carrying out, Great Britain will very soon be, if not the first, in a similar position to that occupied by the Empire of Germany, which at the present time is the object lesson so far as State socialism is concerned. So effective has been that policy that practically no immigrants are to-day leaving Germany, and, furthermore, large numbers of Germans who emigrated to the United States of America are returning to the Fatherland, where the conditions are better than they can find anywhere else. The hon. member referred to the question of the State taking over insurance. So far as fire insurance is concerned, I am not of opinion that that is a matter which the State should take up, but, as has been done in Germany, I believe it is a proper policy for any democratic Government to take up the matter of insurance so far as it concerns the worker and his interests—the insurance under our Workers' Compensation Act, and insurance against unemployment. These are all matters which I am a thorough believer in, and which I hope to see taken up by the State of Queensland and made a part of its democratic policy within the next few years.

Mr. FOLEY: We will after the next election.

The HOME SECRETARY: Hon. members are always talking about after the next election. I can only express the hope that we shall all meet here again after the next election.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and laughter.

The HOME SECRETARY: Putting to one side the necessary division that there must be between parties, I hope we may agree that State socialism is a desirable object, and when any member of an Administration has the courage to stand up in this House and state that he is a State socialist, and that he will endeavour to carry out the policy which is allied to such a principle, he should at least receive the credit which his courage entitles him to.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: That leads me to this: That, so far as this Administration is concerned, they are carrying out such a policy. In connection with the Workers' Dwellings Act we have a policy which may be said to be a policy of State socialism, and which, as my friend, the Secretary for Public Instruction, interjects, was opposed by hon. members opposite, which might possibly arise from the fact that they have not made a study of that policy.

Mr. MURPHY: The Workers' Dwellings Act does not assist the really poor man—you have to have something in your pocket. It is a step in the right direction.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is a step in the right direction, as the hon. member says. We have on the list of measures a Sugar Works Bill, which hon. members will find embodies that State policy—a policy whereby the State endeavours to assist those who are prepared to assist themselves, and who desire to improve the conditions of themselves and their children. There is only one other matter that I wish to mention. Hon. members on the other side, when the question of immigration comes up, are very fond of saying, "We are not opposed to immigration, but we are opposed to spending money to enable those who desire to become citizens with us to come to the Commonwealth." How many of us and our fathers would have been able to come to Queensland if we and they had had to pay the passage money? Under even the improved conditions which exist in Great Britain and other countries of Europe to-day, how many workers would be able to break up their homes and pay the necessary passage money, if they had to do so, to become members of the State of Queensland? Hon. members, when they say they are not opposed to immigration, but are opposed to giving assistance to these men who have not the necessary means to come here, must know how hollow their professions are in that respect.

Mr. RYAN: "Charity begins at home."

The HOME SECRETARY: I consider it is our duty to assist those men and women of kindred blood to ourselves, and who are anxious and willing to improve their condition—it is a duty imposed on us under our more prosperous conditions here to provide them with the necessary assistance to come to Queensland, and I am thankful to say that they do in the majority of cases improve their condition, and raise themselves from the position they were in in the land of their birth.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: Last night the hon. senior member for Ipswich mentioned the matter of the appointment of a chief inspector in the Mines Department. This appointment has been rendered necessary by the Mining Act, and the regulations under which mining

is now conducted. The hon. member drew attention to the fact that there was a number of men in Queensland who had all the qualifications necessary to fill that position, and that the department, instead of going outside the State, should have obtained an officer within the State. For the information of hon. members who are interested in mining, I may say that the work of the particular officer who has been appointed will be in connection with coalmines. Unfortunately, firedamp and gas have commenced to make themselves apparent in some of our coalmines, and the permanent officials of the department considered that it was necessary under the new conditions of mining that an officer should be appointed who had had experience of firedamp and gas as well as of the improved electrical appliances which are now being used in coalmines, and who had had experience of regulations similar to those under which mining is carried on in Queensland. The gentleman who has been appointed has had a large experience in connection with coalmining in Great Britain, and holds a British mining manager's certificate. He has also had large experience in connection with coalmining in India, and holds a mining manager's certificate from the Government of India.

Mr. MURPHY: How many inspectors do you propose to appoint?

The HOME SECRETARY: We propose to appoint something like three more, but it was necessary that this appointment should be made immediately. I simply give this information so that hon. members may know why this gentleman was required to have the qualifications which the department considered necessary for such an officer. I do not intend to occupy the time of the House any longer. As usual, I have to thank hon. members for the courtesy which they have accorded to me in listening to the remarks I have made. I can only express the hope, which has been expressed by other speakers, that, however we may be divided in the House, when democratic measures which make for the improvement of the conditions of the people of the State are brought forward for our consideration, we may join together to make them law.

Mr. MURPHY: Don't you think that before you sit down you ought to deal with the missions you visited?

The HOME SECRETARY: I shall be very pleased to do that on another occasion. If I started on that question now I am afraid that some of us would be burning the midnight oil here, but I shall take the first opportunity which offers to deal with that particular matter, and I feel sure that when I do so it will be found that the matter is of interest to practically every member of this House.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. COLLINS (*Burke*): I have no intention of replying to the Home Secretary. I notice that in the first paragraph of the Governor's Speech reference is made to the coronation, and I understand that the Government spent a certain amount of money in a display of fireworks in Brisbane. In justice to the rest of the State, a similar amount should have been spent in places throughout Queensland. If it was a wise thing to have fireworks here in Brisbane to celebrate the crowning of a king and queen, it would have been just as well to have had fireworks in the electorate I represent, because the

*Mr. Collins.]*

people of that electorate have to contribute their proportion of the amount spent in Brisbane.

Mr. MULLAN: We have just had a display of fireworks from the Home Secretary.

The HOME SECRETARY: They were effective, at any rate.

Mr. COLLINS: The paragraph goes on to say—

"The people of Queensland joined in the thanksgiving and rejoicing that attended the coronation of our beloved King and Queen, and in the demonstrations of enthusiastic loyalty and devotion."

I do not know why fireworks should be required to create loyalty. People should be loyal without having a big display of fireworks. If similar means were adopted throughout the Empire for this wonderful display of loyalty, all I have to say is that it was a false loyalty. There should be no necessity for fireworks to create loyalty in any man. So far as I am concerned, I am loyal to this State and to the Commonwealth generally, and I cannot get enthusiastic over the crowning of either a king or queen. Therefore, the display of fireworks was unnecessary as far as I was concerned, and may have been unnecessary as far as a large number of people whom I represent are concerned. The Home Secretary made some reference to State socialism, and boasted that he was a State socialist. If I understand anything at all about socialism, it aims, or should aim, at bringing about a more equal distribution of the wealth that exists at the present time in the State of Queensland, and I cannot find anything in the programme of the Government which will tend to bring about a more equal distribution of wealth. There is a sentence in the Governor's Speech which reads as follows:—

"A succession of good seasons has produced unexampled prosperity, and there is every hope that this prosperity will continue."

What do the words "unexampled prosperity" really mean? Prosperity for whom? Do they mean prosperity for the mass of the people who produce the wealth of the State? They ought to do, but do they? As far as I can see, 2 per cent. of the population only enjoy the benefits of this prosperity, and the other 98 per cent. do not possess that prosperity. My attention was drawn to this matter by the remarks made by the chairman of the Brisbane Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Mackenzie, as reported in the *Courier* of the 7th June last. That gentleman, in referring to the income tax, stated that only 2 per cent. of the population were paying that tax. What does that mean? According to Knibbs, the wealth production in Queensland for 1909 was £26,565,000, and our estimated population 572,654. According to the income tax returns for 1909, there were 11,956 persons whose income from property and personal exertion amounted to £6,424,368. In other words, 11,956 persons took nearly one-fourth of the total wealth produced in Queensland. The persons who took that large amount can boast of the prosperity of Queensland. We find that each of those 11,956 persons received on an average an income of £537. Assuming that each income tax payer is the head of a family of five persons, we have 59,780 persons taking £6,424,368, or an average of £107 each. Then, again, we have 604 companies

[Mr. Collins.

whose incomes amounted to £2,763,478; so that we find 11,965 persons and 604 companies took as their share £9,187,846.

Mr. WIENHOLT: How many shareholders were there in those companies?

Mr. COLLINS: I rang up the Government Statistician and also the Commissioner of Income Tax to see if they could give me the information, but they were unable to do so; but, from my experience of the present economic system, I should say that the 11,956 payers of income tax are likely to be the principal shareholders in the companies I have mentioned. That leaves only £17,372,154 to be divided amongst the remainder of the population—namely, 512,874 persons—or, in other words, while the average income of the well-to-do in Queensland was £107 each, the average income of the remainder of the population was only £53 each. The Premier said last night that the people who leave the United Kingdom to come to this country have greater opportunities here than they had in the United Kingdom, but the hon. gentleman must recollect that the same economic system is going on here, which enables a little over 2 per cent. of the population of the State to take nearly one-fourth of the total national income. And there is nothing in the Government programme, so far as I can see, to bring about a more equal distribution of wealth. As Sir Samuel Griffith stated in the year 1888, the great social problem of the present age is not how to accumulate wealth, but how to get a more equal distribution of it. That is the problem that faces not only this State, but the whole of the civilised world.

Mr. MURPHY: Does not the Government recognise that?

Mr. COLLINS: It does not matter what the Government may do, the people are commencing to recognise it. The people are commencing to ask themselves, "Are we to remain for ever hewers of wood and drawers of water?" producing wealth in abundance, while 2 per cent. of the population take the largest proportion of that wealth. In 1910 the estimated population of the State was 593,234. I was unable to get from the Government Statistician the amount of wealth produced in the State during last year, but I have estimated it at £28,000,000. Now we find that in that year 12,776 persons, according to the income tax returns, took £7,178,080, or an average income of £560. Those figures show an increase for those well-to-do persons of £23 per head. Then there were 663 companies with a total income of £3,278,663. Thus we have 12,776 persons and 663 companies taking £10,456,743 out of an estimated total production of £28,000,000. Can you point to any country in the world that has anything worse than that to show? When such a few persons can take the bulk of the wealth in that way, it is time we had a change of Government; it is time that we had a change of thought in Queensland; it is time that the people commenced to understand economics better than they understand them to-day. Those figures show that the number of payers of income tax had increased during last year by 820 persons and 59 companies, and that the increase in the wealth of those persons and those companies amounted to £1,268,897. That is where our prosperity really is. The prosperity of the country is in the possession of those few persons. I can understand the chairman of the Brisbane Chamber of Commerce getting up and saying

that the country is prosperous. I can understand the great merchants in Brisbane saying that the country is prosperous. Certainly it is prosperous for those few persons. But that is not prosperity. What we want is to see the bulk of the people prosperous—the 500,000 odd persons whose incomes are under £200 per annum. Assuming that the total wealth production in 1910 was £28,000,000, we find that £17,543,257 had to be divided amongst the remainder of the population, which would give an average income of £33 for the poor people, while the average income of the well-to-do was £560. No wonder that these Chambers of Commerce talk about the prosperity of the country! They can afford to talk about the prosperity of the country. Allowing that each payer of income tax is the head of a family of five persons, 63,880 persons took £7,178,080, or an average of £112 each as compared with £33 for the rest of the population. Now, it may be pointed out again, when we examine these figures more closely, that there is one indus-

[10 p.m.] try in this State—namely, the pastoral industry—that is in a very high state of prosperity—(hear, hear!)—a very high state of prosperity indeed. What do we find, according to the income tax returns of 1910? We find that 1,603 pastoralists take £2,477,879, which is more than one-twelfth of the total wealth produced in the State of Queensland for the year 1910. Then, again, we have forty-four pastoral companies, which take £975,086, which makes the total taken by the pastoral industry, companies and individuals, £3,452,965, or nearly one-eighth of the total wealth produced. Just fancy nearly one-eighth of the total wealth of Queensland being taken by those few persons! No wonder the farmer wants to awaken from his long sleep. It will be a source of pleasure to me to go amongst the farmers and tell them that their interests do not lie with the present Government, which is supporting squattocracy, and makes no effort to bring about a more equitable distribution of wealth. (Hear, hear!) The hon. member for Carpentaria this afternoon, to my mind, made a slight mistake. He is well able to take care of himself, but the inference that may be taken from his remarks was that no farmer paid income tax as they were all below £200. I want to point out that he is entirely wrong there. The income tax returns for 1910 show that 1,400 farmers and fruitgrowers did pay income tax, and they had an average income of £316. I want the farmers' representatives to take notice of that. Their average income is £316, according to the income tax returns, while the average income of the pastoralist is £1,545. Yet they sit behind a Government that is supporting that particular class and looking after the interests of that particular class. Then we have the merchants. The Chamber of Commerce generally consists of merchants, and these are the gentlemen who talk about the prosperity of the country. They want immigration; they want thousands of people to be brought out here to buy their goods, so that they can become richer. What is the position of these merchants? They can talk about prosperity. They have an average income of £1,451. They are next to the pastoralists. No wonder they talk prosperity. No wonder they want a vigorous policy of immigration, and no wonder they support the present Government. Even in Great Britain, with

all her boast about the unequal distribution of wealth, I do not think there is any more unequal distribution of wealth in that country than there is in a young State like Queensland. It is to the interests of this Government to look after the well-to-do and not to look after the masses of the people. I am not concerned about the rich man at all.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You are not concerned about the poor man, either.

Mr. COLLINS: That is an unkind interjection to say that I am not concerned about the poor man.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You are not.

Mr. COLLINS: But I am. I am concerned about a better distribution of the wealth produced.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You are not concerned about the poor man whom you advised not to work.

Mr. COLLINS: If the hon. member refers to the speech I made to the sugar-workers at Bundaberg, I glory in it.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. COLLINS: I want to make a further reference to the pastoralists. We have a Federal Arbitration Court sitting to decide what wages shall be paid to the men in the pastoral industry on the one hand, and what wages the poor pastoralists can afford to give on the other hand. Just imagine these poor pastoralists fighting, as they have been fighting, so bitterly against an increase to the men, although they take nearly one-eighth of the wealth produced in the State themselves! Yet they are fighting the men in the Federal Arbitration Court. According to the wealth produced from that industry—and the figures for 1909 are similar to those for 1910, and for some years it has been the same—that particular industry is making enormous profits at the expense of the State by getting their lands so cheap and getting cheap transport for their produce. The Home Secretary talks a lot about State socialism, but I would remind him that there is another school of socialism, and that is called social democracy. I would point out that the income tax returns for this year, 1911, show a wonderful increase. Last year we received £304,693 from income tax, and this year we received £348,000. I expect that when we get the detailed account of the figures they will go to show that more wealth has gone into the hands of these few persons. And yet there is so much talk of prosperity! I am surprised myself at any farming representative sitting behind the present Government.

Mr. FERRICKS: It is a Government of middlemen.

Mr. COLLINS: I am surprised at farmers supporting the Government. I am surprised at so few farmers paying income tax in proportion to the total number of people in the State. The farmers and workers should be side by side. The present Government have made no effort in their programme to bring about a better state of things for the workers. The Government are desirous of allowing things to go on as they are going, and they are going on in the direction, as I have stated, of giving the wealth produced in this State to a few persons. That

*Mr. Collins.*]

is what it really amounts to. We heard a lot of talk about immigration. Of course, I can quite understand the pastoralists wishing for immigration. The Premier mentioned that the pastoralists had large sums of money to invest. I am quite willing to admit that the pastoralists have large sums of money to invest when 1,603 persons take one-twelfth of the wealth of Queensland. There is a lot of talk about shortage of labour, but there would be no shortage of labour in the West or anywhere else if the producer got his fair share of the wealth that he produced. The mercantile community on the one hand, and the pastoralists on the other, do not want the rest of the community to get a little more of that wealth. That is the reason they are in favour of this vigorous immigration policy. It may be, if I were a capitalist and lived solely for the acquiring of capital, I, too, would want a vigorous policy of immigration—more wealth-producers. That is what they really want, and that is not only so in this State of Queensland, but throughout the Commonwealth and the civilised world, but I am pleased to say we are on the eve of great changes. The workman is awakening, as it were, from his sleep, and I hope the Government will recognise that, and that they will make a move to bring about better conditions than we have at the present time. So far as I am concerned, I am opposed to the State system of immigration. I believe if you make conditions good here, as I have said before in this House, you can have a native-born population. I am inclined to think if you make the conditions good you could double the population of Queensland in about fifteen years. That is if we had good conditions, not conditions that exist in some of our industries in this State, which, as I said before, are only single-men industries. They are not industries which enable a man to keep a wife and family in comfort, and they are not likely to be while you have a few persons taking the bulk of the wealth, such as they are doing at the present time. I want to say a few words on what I term logrolling, which I find exists in political life. I am sorry to say it does exist. We have heard a lot about the railway policy of the Government. The Premier stated that several railways were to be built into agricultural centres. I interjected on two occasions, "How about the mining centres?" But there was no reply. Now, the part of Queensland I represent also desires a railway. We desire the linking up of the railway from Forsayth to Croydon, and the Minister for Railways is well aware that a deputation, consisting of the residents of that part of Queensland, waited on him when he visited my electorate, and I hope that is the railway that is mentioned in the programme.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Is that in Queensland?

Mr. COLLINS: The best thing the hon member for Woolloongabba can do is, the next time I visit my electorate, to take a trip with me. We all know, owing to the heavy fall of rain and the washaways on the Cairns Railway, the people in my electorate had a very anxious time. In fact, I had a very anxious time myself along with the rest, as we were afraid we would not be able to get food supplies, and no one knows the anxiety it caused except those persons who happened to be in that part of Queensland at that particular time. I would point out, if the railway was linked up from Forsayth to

[Mr. Collins.]

Croydon, that danger would be done away with, as we would then have an additional method of getting our food supplies on the Etheridge, and also they would be able to get through to Chillagoe and other parts that were affected. Therefore, I hope the Government will take that into consideration. I believe the construction of that railway would not only help to develop our mines, but I understand, and have seen it myself, that we have a fair amount of good land on the Gilbert River that is suitable for settlement. Therefore, I hope that is the one railway that is mentioned for the North. Since I have been in Parliament I have been making an effort to get land thrown open for selection in my electorate, and I notice that, on the 11th August, there is a certain amount of land to be thrown open at Einasleigh. I wish to point out that, to my mind, the Government have not resumed sufficient land about Einasleigh, nor have they resumed the best part of the run about Einasleigh. The resumption has taken place on Carpentaria Downs, which, I understand, is owned by the Queensland Meat Export Company. The land the Government has resumed is on the north side of the railway—that is, on the Etheridge Railway. There is no resumption, so far as I can see by the plans, on the south side of the railway. On the south side we have some of the most magnificent land, I suppose, there is in Queensland. It is situated between two rivers—Copperfield on the one hand and the Einasleigh on the other. Now, why that land has not been resumed I cannot say, because we all know the Minister can resume one-fourth of Carpentaria Downs at any time. I mention this because when I was in my electorate a number of people waited upon me and said that is the place they would like to get a selection, going out to what is known as Carpentaria Downs gate—a splendid piece of country; in fact, I am told you can go through magnificent country for a distance of 70 miles, and I just mention this so that the Minister will know that, so far as I am concerned, I am not satisfied, neither will the people living in that particular locality be satisfied. In fact, I had a letter from a gentleman the other day, and he said he had written down to New South Wales to inquire in reference to the Barren Jack—to see if he could acquire land there, as he was tired of waiting for the Government to throw land open in that particular district. At any rate, the Government has thrown open a small amount, and I want to point out now, in the event of that land not being taken up—I want this House to remember, if any of the Government supporters say, when the land was thrown open the people did not acquire it, that the land thrown open is not the best land by a long way.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Is there not good land to the north of the railway?

Mr. COLLINS: Yes, a portion of the land thrown open is very good. I am willing to admit that. Then, again, I want to point out there has been considerable delay in the building of a school at Kidston. Here is a place that has been in existence over three years, and it has a population of over 700 persons, and we have not got a school there yet. I believe it is being built at the present moment, but there has been a considerable delay that ought not to have taken place. The contractor was given an extension of time, and so on, and so on, and at the

present moment we have an increased population, and there is no doubt the school will prove too small when it is completed. Then, again, in reference to the taking over of the Etheridge Railway, in November last I asked the Minister for Railways when was the Etheridge Railway to be taken over, and he told me in February.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The 5th February.

Mr. COLLINS: It was not formally taken over on the 5th February.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: It was formally taken over.

Mr. COLLINS: I hope the Government made a thorough examination of the line before they took it over. During floods two bridges were washed away, and nearly a quarter of a mile of line, showing that the railway was constructed in a shoddy manner.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: It stood three wet seasons.

Mr. COLLINS: Some of the men who worked there told me that the line was not well built.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I think you can trust our railway officials.

Mr. COLLINS: I hope the Government made every inquiry before taking it over. Another thing, I do not see why the electorate I represent was ignored by the Miners' Phtibisis Commission. According to the official records, there are more miners in the Burke than there are on Gympie, yet the commission did not stop to make any inquiry into the condition of the miners on the Etheridge. Of course I understand that they had a large area of country to get over.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Did they ask the commission to go?

Mr. COLLINS: Of course they wanted the commission to go there. There is a large number of Croydon miners in that electorate, and there have been several deaths from phtibisis in the different hospitals. People were not satisfied at the commission not calling there, and I have received communications to that effect. I am not going to criticise the report of the commission at the present stage, but I will take the opportunity of doing so at a later period. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. GRAYSON (*Cunningham*): I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Question put and passed.

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

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

---