

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**WEDNESDAY, 26 JULY 1911**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

WEDNESDAY, 26 JULY, 1911.

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

## DEATH OF HON. J. T. BELL.

The SPEAKER: I have to report to the House that I this day presented to the widow of the late Hon. J. T. Bell a copy of the resolution of condolence passed by this House on the 12th instant, and that, in reply, Mrs. Bell asked me to convey to the House her deep sense of appreciation of the kindly expression of sympathy thus conveyed to her.

## QUESTION.

CLAIM BY OWNERS OF S.S. "WAIPARA."

Mr. DOUGLAS (*Cook*) asked the Premier, without notice—

"Has the action recently brought by the owners of the s.s. "Waipara" against the Government been settled? If so, what amount was paid to the owners of the ship?"

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

"The claim has been settled; the amount was £5,000."

## ADDRESS IN REPLY.

## RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. ALLAN (*Brisbane South*): In continuing this discussion I do not intend to take up the time of the House more than a very few minutes, and will express what I have to say in a very few sentences. I consider this debate as a great waste of time. It is certainly carrying on an old custom, but I fail to see that any practical good can result from such a waste of time. We all hope and desire to get on with the business of the session, and I, for one, would like very much if this debate were closed so as to allow the Estimates to be placed before us and discussed. We talk to the air. We fill *Hansard*, and all for what purpose? It is all empty talk so far as any good result is concerned. There was a time when the discussion on the Address in Reply was of some real value, but times have changed very much. Parliament has changed. A great wave of democracy has arisen, and I think some of the old customs that are still perpetuated might with advantage be done away with. It is not as if we had not sufficient opportunity in this House to express our grievances. I can fully sympathise with and support the action of the leader of the Opposition in moving the adjournment of the House to discuss a particular object. That is all as it should be, and results in some general usefulness. But this endless debate day after day, this academic fireworks, I look upon as a great waste of valuable time.

Mr. MULCAHY: Why don't you sit down?

Mr. ALLAN: We are now in the third week of the session, and might go on for some time, and when it is all over, judging by the experience of the past, we will get the same thing dished up to us on the Estimates, and during the discussion of the

various Bills. I could do as other hon. members have done—I could take the Address and refer to the different measures to be brought before the House. I have not seen the Bills, but that would not prevent me discussing them, as I could draw on my imagination as to what they may contain. But that is entirely a waste of time. I intend, from my place in the House, to fully discuss the various Bills and Estimates as opportunity arises, but I will reserve any remarks I have to make till the proper occasion, when I believe I shall be able to discuss the various matters more confidently.

Mr. MULCAHY (*Gympie*): The hon. member who has just sat down gave us a homily on waste of time, and said members will have ample opportunity to go fully into the various matters mentioned. Well, as far as my memory serves me, for a number of years we have not had any opportunity at all to discuss some of the most important Estimates brought down to the House. We have had millions of money rushed through in a very short time, and no opportunity to discuss the Estimates at all. I know that there is a reference in the Speech to an alteration in the Standing Orders, and that there will be a certain time set apart to discuss the different Estimates. If that is so, I hope it will be followed up by some provision being made so that each Estimate will get a reasonable amount of discussion, because in the ordinary way, if you fix a certain number of days—seventeen or eighteen, as the case may be—the whole of that time may be occupied in discussing the Home Secretary's and two or three other Estimates, and then all the other Estimates—Mines, Railways, and other Estimates towards the end of the list—there will be no opportunity afforded to discuss those.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: That is what happened last year.

Mr. MULCAHY: That is exactly what happened last year, and I do not want to see a recurrence. If there is any use for Parliament at all, this is the place where we have an opportunity to bring forward grievances and thresh them out, and just let me say at the outset that I think one very important industry in this State has not received the attention from this Government, or indeed from any Government, for a number of years, that it should receive. That is the mining industry. The total value of the gold yield is something like £72,100,196, and other minerals have given us £23,972,526, or a total of £96,072,722. That is to the end of 1910. and to the end of the present year, I suppose we can safely say the total yield will be £100,000,000. The Government, it seems to me, is not paying sufficient attention to this industry. Just look at the Mines report! The Government Geologist in his report says his staff is overworked, and will be so until his staff is doubled. Yet I see no reference to any increase in that staff, and if we are going to do anything for the mining industry, we must have a theoretical man as well as a practical man, and I think if you have a Government Geologist, and you put him at the head of the department, and he makes a plain statement of that kind, then this House should pay some attention to it. (Hear, hear!) It is not a bit of use having a Government Geologist or any important man at the head of any department—

Mr. LENNON: Highly-paid experts.

Mr. MULCAHY: No, not highly-paid experts. The experts are the worst paid of any in any State in Australia. I think the Government ought to give consideration to this matter. The mining industry is a great industry. I take the view that we are only just on the fringe of the industry. We have untold mineral wealth in Queensland. You may say, "What are you going to do for it?" You can do a lot for it. For instance, you can assist many of the old fields, and increase the production by encouraging mining in other ways. There has practically been nothing done for the industry. Then, coming to coalmines. We have great coalbeds in this State, and there is no move on the part of the Government to acquire any of that land. In other States they are going in for State coalmines, and I think it is a great pity that our Government are not going in the same direction.

Mr. MAUGHAN: South Australia has bought one in New South Wales.

Mr. MULCAHY: Yes. Our railways are run by the State, and it necessarily follows that we should acquire coalmines, and work them in the best interests of the State. In a few years the most of these coalbeds will be acquired by private enterprise, which some hon. members are always praising up. The position will be that later on we will have to pay whatever private enterprise charges us for coal. The Government would be wise to make provision in this direction. I would like to give an illustration to show why the Government should assist deep sinking. They have given some small grants on the Gympie Goldfield. Some few years ago, through the instrumentality of Mr. Dunstan, who gave a favourable report on the mine, the Government, after a great deal of pressing, gave £750 towards the sinking of a shaft. The sum was small, I will admit, but it induced people to put their money into it. It was not the amount given which weighed so much, but the favourable report of the Government Geologist. The shareholders contributed in calls £14,000. They got on to payable gold, and have repaid the Government with 5 per cent. interest—which I think was too much—for the whole of that period. They have declared £4,000 or £5,000 in dividends, and they are still on good payable stone.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: What mine is that?

Mr. MULCAHY: No. 3 North Columbia Smithfield. Another mine in the same locality paid the Government back money advanced a few years ago. Even if we have a number of failures, a few mines which turn out well give employment to scores of men, and induce settlement. There are no better settlers than the miners. I just mention this to show that the Government need have no fear about advancing a little money to assist prospecting and deep sinking, but they are not doing it at all. It is not my purpose this afternoon to make a long speech, but I want to say a word or two with regard to the commission which has just furnished its report. I recognise that the commission had a difficult task in getting evidence, and that is only natural, because a man might think it would affect his position in the mine if he voluntarily came along and gave evidence. Whilst there are many useful recommendations made, I would like to say in regard to men suffering from miners' phthisis and

Mr. Mulcahy.]

other chest complaints, that it would be very unfair to these men to be knocked off or to be interfered with in any way, unless the Government—and I contend that it is the duty of the State to do it—makes provision to settle them on the land or give them some other employment. I think it rather a good idea, as the commission suggest, to require men who have not been mining to be examined before they start. I am glad the commission has made some useful suggestions, but I think much more might have been done. I would like to say a word or two with regard to land settlement, because it has a great deal to do with the prosperity of my district. It is there going on with fairly rapid strides, and much more could be done if the Government made provision to have further land thrown open. Some time ago I was approached by a number of young men, who were anxious to go on the land, but the land is not made available. I communicated with the present Minister for Lands, pointing out that I had fifty young men ready to take up land in the district, and he said attention would be given to the matter when land was made available in my district. So far we have heard nothing more. I see statements in the Brisbane papers about so many people settling down. I have nothing to say against settling those people on the land who come out here, but it should be the first duty of the Government to see that young men who are willing and able, and have a little means from their parents, should have land provided for them. Then again, you see scrub land thrown open; there may be only 40 or 50 acres of scrub in it, and all the rest is forest land. You don't want any waste land if you are going to make a living on 100 acres. I think that the surveyors make a great mistake in putting in a lot of inferior land with the scrub land. Then the Government have a great idea of increasing the price of the land—asking boom prices in boom times. I think the object should be rather to get the men on the land, as they will be a good asset, and there would be a great deal more revenue to the State than by asking high prices. Along the North Coast line you can see thousands of acres of scrub held by men who are not putting the land to any practical use. They are leaving it to stand there for the unearned increment. That will not develop our State. We want to put men on the land who will put it to some use. I hope and trust that more land will be made available. There is another thing I notice frequently in land matters. So much land is opened at a certain Land Court—perhaps five or six blocks—and there are 100 applicants for them, and 90 of them are disappointed. Then later on in the same locality you will see another small lot put up. That is not fair to the people. If there are a lot of applicants for the land, you should make all the land you have available, so that all will have an opportunity of getting land. I know young men who have been seven or eight times in drawings, without securing land, and they have become disheartened. I think the Lands Department could do a great deal to obviate that.

Mr. LENNON: That prevails all over the State.

Mr. MULCAHY: Yes, and more so on the small holdings in the coastal districts. There is another matter which I would like

[Mr Mulcahy.

to say a word or two on—that is with regard to our land rangers and commissioners. They get small pay, and they are allowed to dabble in land. I do not think that is a good thing at all; I think it is a great mistake.

Mr. WALKER: They have as much right as members of Parliament.

Mr. MULCAHY: A member of Parliament may take up land, but he has to get it direct from the State. There is this difference—the land rangers and agents are receiving a salary, and they come between the State and its tenants for the purchase of the land. They know a great deal of the working of the lands, and if they get so many interests, they are only human. I am advocating that these men get better pay, because they only get about £150 a year, and horse allowance. The temptation is there. If a man sees a block of land that he can get hold of, it is only natural that he does it, and if he does not do it directly he will do it indirectly. Our wardens are not allowed to go into mining in the district they have jurisdiction over, and I think we might well consider the same matter as affecting Crown lands rangers and commissioners. This is a matter which has come under my notice. I do not wish to take the cover of this House to refer to any particular individual, I have several cases in my mind, but I am speaking now in general terms. I think it is a matter that should engage the attention of the Minister, because these men receive low pay, and therefore the temptation is very great. I would like to say a word or two with regard to the timber industry. The timber-getter has been literally wiped out by millowners. There may be a block of timber put up, and the millowner can come in and get it; it is worked in some way. I have four or five letters in my hand; I am not going to read them, but I will hand one or two of them over to my friend, the hon. member for Wide Bay. It is in his electorate where most of this trouble is taking place, and I think he knows it, but I must compliment him by saying that the sawmillers of Queensland have a splendid representative to look after their interests in the hon. member for Wide Bay.

Mr. WALKER: You know that is not fair.

Mr. MULCAHY: I well remember having been invited some time this year to attend a meeting of timber-getters called [4 p.m.] to consider the question of the exportation of log timber to the other States. There was a very large number of timber-getters present, and during the course of the meeting the chairman got a telephone message from the hon. member for Wide Bay, saying that he had all the sawmillers in Brisbane and Maryborough together, and that they wished to go to the meeting. The hon. member came there with a fine troupe of them. I advised the meeting to finish their business before they had the sawmillers there, and they acted on my advice. Afterwards they held an informal meeting, and then the hon. member for Wide Bay came along with quite a group of sawmillers.

Mr. WALKER: Five.

Mr. MULCAHY: I think you are wrong; at any rate, you came along with a number of sawmillers.

Mr. WALKER: I am proud of it.

Mr. MULCAHY: Quite so. I compliment the hon. member on being their representative. Those sawmillers said to the timber-getters that they had no right to send a log out of the State unless it had first passed through the hands of the sawmillers. That was the point they had to make, and there is a provision now in the contract made with each timber-getter that if he sends any timber out of the State his block may be cancelled. I believe that recently the Government had a little trouble in South Brisbane with regard to some timber which was about to be loaded on a steamer for the South. They seized the timber, but later on, acting on legal advice, I think, they returned the timber to the man and gave him some compensation. I have always contended that that agreement with the timber-getters is useless, if the timber-getters only knew it, and I believe they are now going to send timber out of the State. But of course the men are very timid about the matter, because although they might be able to defeat the Government, yet if one of those timber-getters sent timber out of the State he would not be able to get any more timber, as his block would be cancelled. They might have legal ground for an action against the Government, but these men do not care about legal actions. I trust that the Minister will take steps to do away with the existing form of agreement, so far as the sending of timber out of the State is concerned. If federation is to be of any benefit to us, then I maintain that we should allow timber or anything else to go from one State to another. If you make a regulation prohibiting the sending of timber from this State to another State, then you should apply the same principle to every other commodity. The sawmillers own large blocks of timber country, and they can send any timber they like to another State, and I wish to see all persons engaged in the industry put on the same footing. About six or seven years ago, Mr. Burnett, an old officer of the department, was sent up to a place in the Gympie district, in the electorate of the hon. member for Wide Bay, to make an estimate of the quantity of timber standing on a certain area, and he estimated the quantity at about 35,000,000 feet. Quite recently a sawmilling company—there is a mill there now—wished to acquire some of that timber, and another ranger—a Mr. Lawrence, an officer with very little experience, what you may call a simple man—was sent up to make an estimate of the quantity of timber on the land, and he reported that there were about 9,000,000 feet there. I was talking to a man who has had over thirty years' experience in the timber industry—the present chairman of the shire council, Mr. Zechariah Skyring—and he told me that he never knew of a more glaring case than this, because the timber was there. But it suited the Government to get the second estimate of the quantity of timber on the land. I asked Mr. Skyring if much timber had been taken off the land in the interval, and he replied, "No, not more than a couple of million feet." I mention this to show that an old officer of the department went up there, spent some weeks in the district, made an estimate—a pretty accurate estimate, I am informed—and then another officer was sent to make an estimate, which he did, reporting that there were 9,000,000 feet of timber on the land, though the previous officer had

estimated the quantity at 35,000,000. That is a big reduction, but of course the department can get its reports to suit.

The PREMIER: That is not the way the department does its work, though; that is your mind.

Mr. MULCAHY: I am quoting now from one of the hon. gentleman's own supporters.

The PREMIER: Yes; but you are insinuating that the department sent a man there for a special reason, and you are doing an injustice to the man.

Mr. MULCAHY: No, I am not. I am trying to do justice to Mr. Burnett. I asked the department ten times to get me a copy of Mr. Burnett's report, but Mr. Scott would not get it for me. He asked me what did I want it for, and I replied that I wanted to have a look at it. Mr. Scott then said I must see the Minister, but he would not give me the report.

Mr. WALKER: You could demand it.

Mr. MULCAHY: The hon. member is a supporter of the Government, and might be able to demand the report, but I could not get it. The hon. member for Wide Bay made some reference recently to Labour members going with a deputation to the late Mr. Bell when he was Minister for Lands, and asking him that timber should not be allowed to go out of the State. I was one of that deputation, and I have taken the trouble to look up the report of the deputation in the files of the *Maryborough Chronicle*, and I find that my objection on that occasion was that they were going to give 2,000,000 feet of timber—

Mr. WALKER: But you supported the deputation.

Mr. MULCAHY: Yes; but on the ground that the timber was being given to a monopoly, not on the ground that the timber was going out of the State. I am against all monopolies.

The PREMIER: Your contention was that the timber should not go out of the State.

Mr. MULCAHY: I said nothing of the kind. I have given you my objection as stated in the *Maryborough Chronicle*, which is the Government organ. When I look up an opinion, I always go to a Government organ, because of course it must be right. The hon. member for Wide Bay knows, and the Government know, that there is more discontent and dissatisfaction among timber-getters to-day than there ever has been.

Mr. WALKER: Hear, hear! That is quite true.

Mr. MULCAHY: I will quote just one sentence from the conclusion of a letter that I have received from Yabba Vale—

"I hope you will inquire into this matter for me, because it is almost impossible for a timber-getter to get a block of pine anywhere near a sawmill."

That is quite true. I will hand the letter to the hon. member for Wide Bay.

Mr. WALKER: I know who wrote it without seeing it.

Mr. MULCAHY: The hon. member knows the writer very well. In all probability the writer asked the hon. member to bring up this grievance, and he would not.

Mr. WALKER: Oh, yes, I would. I bring up all grievances mentioned to me.

*Mr. Mulcahy.]*

Mr. MULCAHY: That letter shows that the timber-getters are dissatisfied, and that the administration is absolutely rotten to the core. Does the Minister say anything about it? Does the hon. member for Wide Bay say that they are dissatisfied? Not at all; they are both as silent as can be. I have several letters with regard to this matter, but I do not propose to read them to the House. I do hope, however, that steps will be taken to place the working of the timber industry on a better footing than it is at present. If that is not done, then I say, hand over the whole thing to the sawmillers, and do not have any timber-getters, do not let blocks of timber land to timber-getters. As the writer I quoted says, it is almost impossible for a timber-getter to get a block of pine near a sawmill. The sawmiller gets that land without competition.

Mr. WALKER: No, all the land is open to competition.

Mr. MULCAHY: The statement I have made I have here in writing, and if it is untrue I have no sympathy with the man who wrote the letter.

The PREMIER: It is all open to competition.

Mr. MULCAHY: They are getting it in my district without competition. Perhaps the hon. member wishes me to give him the name of the writer of that letter, but I am not going to do so, as it might injure him in his business as a timber-getter.

Mr. WALKER: That is an old cry.

Mr. MULCAHY: Let me say that the hon. member is a worthy representative of the sawmillers, and that I hope they will pay him well.

Mr. WALKER: I will reply to you.

Mr. MULCAHY: Of course the hon. member will reply. I will make him reply. Unless the hon. member serves the people better than he has done he will not work in the interests of the timber-getters; but he is a creature of a combine.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MULCAHY: Passing from that matter, I should like now to refer to the operations of the Agricultural Bank. I hope that in the Bill which it is proposed to introduce to amend the Agricultural Bank Act, the Minister will go into the matter of tenures peculiar to goldfields. I mentioned it to the Minister myself the other night. To-day, although we have in the district a great number of tenures peculiar to goldfields, on which there are large families living and carrying on dairy farms, under the provisions of the Agricultural Bank Act they do not value that land at a single penny. In fact, if they advance any money at all, they only advance on the improvements. I want the Minister in charge of the administration of that Act to see that there is a provision made to bring in mining tenures such as goldfields homesteads of 40 and 80 acre blocks—I want them to be treated the same as freeholds. The other banks will make advances on these lands, and the Agricultural Bank should also do it. If it is good enough for the ordinary banker to make advances on the land, then, in the name of common sense, why should not it be good enough for the Agricultural Bank to do the same? No one can disturb the title at all. The State gives the title

to the miner in the first place—it is a leasehold, certainly, but the State owns the title, and if the State makes advances on the land no one can disturb the title but the State itself. Surely that is a reasonable thing. I hope that the Minister when he goes into this matter will see the fairness of the request. It is not one holding, but hundreds of holdings, and many of them are very valuable holdings too.

Mr. LENNON: It is the same in Charters Towers.

Mr. MULCAHY: It is the same all over the State.

Mr. MULLAN: They represent in Charters Towers that they can do it.

Mr. MULCAHY: But they do not do it. I just rang up the manager of the Agricultural Bank on the telephone, and he told me that they made no advances on the value of the land at all, but only on the improvements. And when the men on the land are getting advances, how does it work out? If a man goes into the Bank of New South Wales, the Queensland National Bank, or any of the banks, and wants £100, as soon as he hands in the lease and signs the necessary forms, that money is available without any further bother, the first thing next morning. What happens in connection with the Agricultural Bank? A man applies for an advance, and it takes him anything from one to three months before he can get one penny of that money. Is that an inducement for people to apply to this bank for assistance? I do not think I can describe the operations of this bank better than it is described in an article in that very ably written column, the "Wild Cat Column," in the Sydney *Bulletin*.

Mr. CORSER: Is that a Government paper too?

Mr. MULCAHY: It is a paper that can very easily size up the hon. gentleman, but it has got no time for him. This column, I may say, is read right throughout the English-speaking world.

Mr. LENNON: It is a very ably written column.

Mr. CORSER: About the best that is written.

Mr. MULCAHY: This is what it says about the Agricultural Bank of Queensland in its issue of the 17th November, 1910. I will not quote it all. I will only quote a portion of it, as it makes quite clear what I also think about this Agricultural Bank. It says—

"This State bank is financed by advances from the Treasury at 3 per cent., which is a good deal less than the Treasury has to pay for its own borrowings. Having this cheap money, the bank ought to be able to offer such attractive terms that the doormat should be worn out in about twelve months. But the doormat is in no danger, for the bank is so tied up and tied down that it has no hope of competing with the private banks. If a man is in the hands of a private money-lender, the State bank can only advance 10s. in the £1 of the value of the property; and it cannot lend at all for "unspecified purposes," so that if a man, having used up all his means in improvements, wants a trifle to carry on with, the bank cannot apparently do business with him at all. "One hundred and fifty-two advances have been repaid during the year," the trustees say, "and the properties have been released. We are glad to think that the recent good seasons have enabled some farmers to pay off their loans. In other instances, as our Acts do not permit us to make advances for unspecified purposes, the

[Mr. Mulcahy.]

loans have been taken up by other financial institutions." Progressive men get sick and tired of continually tripping over red tape; and the bank probably loses its best clients. And in connection with this class of business especially, the man, if he is the right sort, is a much better security than the block of land."

While I could read the whole lot in support of my argument, I do not wish to read any more. During its whole career the Queensland Agricultural Bank has advanced altogether £163,641, as against £602,642 advanced by South Australia in less time. The thing is really tied up with red tape. I know that to some extent the Government is to blame, but the House is also to blame for letting the Act go through in that form. When the Bill was going through we pointed out many defects, and we have been hoping to have had them amended long ago. I am glad to see that Act is going to be amended now. I want to see what the amendments are before I say anything about them. Unless the amendments go in the direction I have indicated and allow a man to get money from the bank in the same way that he can get it from a private institution, then it would be better to wipe it out altogether.

Mr. LENNON: Wipe out the red tape.

Mr. MULCAHY: In the case of a private institution, as soon as the deeds are placed in the hands of the bank the money is available. But in the case of the Agricultural Bank, a man has to go through a lot of forms and he never knows when he is going to get his money. He knows if he applies in May that he might get it in three or four months' time. But with the private bank he gets the money straight away. That is practical business.

Mr. LENNON: The private banks do not charge an inspection fee either.

Mr. MULCAHY: I do not object to the inspection fee so much if they would only put the institution on a working foundation. My opinion is that there are so many people guiding the destinies of the State at the present time that they do not want to interfere with the working and profits and the dividends of the private banks. That is the view I take of it. If the Government want to do the work of the Agricultural Bank in a sympathetic way they must make a radical alteration in their methods. I hope the Minister will pay some attention to what I say about the mining tenures. I know cases where mining tenures are held, and from thirty to forty cows are milked on them, and they have good homesteads there too. They should be able to get advances as easy as they get from private banks. We have a long list of Bills before us, but I do not see one Bill which we have been fighting for for years, and that is an amendment of the Workers' Compensation Act. We should bring contractors under the provisions of that Act. We had a promise from the late Premier, the Hon. Mr. Kidston—

Mr. ALLEN: Dr. Kidston.

Mr. MULCAHY: I do not call things out of their proper names. We had a promise from him that there would be an amendment of that measure. Another thing we want in connection with it is State insurance. (Hear, hear!) If we had State insurance to go with it, it would be a benefit to both the employer and employee. In the privately-run insurance companies, if there is the slightest loophole, the lawyers take a man and drag him through the courts.

Mr. MURPHY: They fight nearly every case.

Mr. MULCAHY: Yes; they fight nearly every case and put them to endless expense, and not only that, but they have agents with blank forms ready, and they are always trying to get the men to sign a release. If a man gets injured and gets a fortnight's pay, he is asked to come into the office, and they say to him, "Now, sign this," and all the time they are trying to get him to sign something. I have a case in my mind where they got a young fellow to sign for £7 10s. His eye was badly injured, and he came to a doctor after he had signed the paper he had been asked to sign. He had really given them a clearance, but I do not think he understood what he was signing at all, as they got at him and made him sign it. The case was so glaring that when he saw his friends they advised him to take an action; in fact, I advised him to take an action myself. He threatened them with an action, but they were so afraid of the exposure of their crooked case that they eventually agreed to give him £100. We do not want that kind of thing at all. We want State insurance, where actuaries can work it out under the law of averages, and see what it will cost to keep things going. We should then charge accordingly without allowing for any profits. When these new private companies are formed it costs a certain amount to get new business. It always costs 15 per cent., and it costs as much as 40 per cent. with their advertising and agents and salaries. Why should that be allowed at all in a State like this? We want State insurance, where the men will be treated properly and the employers will not have to pay exorbitant rates. I expressed my regret that it has not come before this. There are many measures mentioned in the Speech, but I am not going to say anything about any of them. I have seen an attractive looking list before, but we did not get what we thought we were going to get. In fact, we got a lot of objectionable Bills that were not in the list at all. I want to see the Bills themselves first, and I can approve or disapprove of them according to what they are worth. I hope that the Government will do something for the mining industry. The senior member for Townsville, Mr. Philp, who has always been sympathetic towards the mining industry, suggested last year that we should put forward some proposal. It is no use anyone on this side putting forward any suggestion. Unless we have the Government ear, or the assistance of the Government, we can do nothing. I would suggest that the officers of the

[4.30 p.m.] Government and the officials of the department should put their heads together and see if they cannot make some suggestion to try and revive the mining industry. It is a great industry, and it is not receiving any attention at all. I hope before long to see someone on the front Treasury bench that will give better attention and better administration to all our great primary industries. Before I sit down I would like to say a word or two with regard to matters of great importance to our State, and Australia generally. It is in regard to the late referendum, and the State-righters, as they are generally called. I regret the referendum taken recently was not carried, and our friends on the other side know that in the near future, when the people understand the questions, and when all those false issues and bogeys raised by the capitalistic Press—when the people get time to consider them, they

Mr. Mulcahy.]

will say we must give the national Parliament full and ample powers over all these great questions.

Mr. WALKER (*Wide Bay*): I had not intended to speak on this debate as, like the hon. member for Brisbane South, I consider it is a waste of time. Consequently, I have not prepared a speech, like the hon. member who has just sat down—that is, I have not a pocketful of papers. However, I have just taken a note or two. First of all, let me congratulate you, Sir, on attaining the very high position of Speaker. As far as I am concerned, I have every confidence that you will carry out the duties appertaining to that high office with credit. I have noticed during this debate several remarks referring to our late leader, and I think they are very unfair, more particularly when that gentleman is not here to reply to them.

Mr. MURPHY: We never turned him out. He went out himself.

Mr. WALKER: I am not talking about him going out; I am talking about the remarks that dropped from that side, and I say they are unfair. It would have been far better to have left that matter out of the debate.

Mr. LENNON: Nothing unfair was said about him on this side.

Mr. WALKER: I would also like to point out that that gentleman was considered a very great friend of hon. members opposite when they thought they could make use of him. I think his loss is decidedly a very great loss and one that we can ill afford at the present time.

Mr. LENNON: That is a reflection on the present Premier.

Mr. WALKER: I would also like to congratulate the present Premier—

Mr. LENNON: What is the good of doing that after what you have just said?

Mr. WALKER: On attaining the high position of leader of this party, and I am quite satisfied that the energy he displayed as Minister for Lands will be continued, and that it will be for the benefit of Queensland, which has been, up to the present time, well catered for with regard to leaders. We have a very large programme of work, and I also heard a remark just now about the promises that have not been fulfilled. Now, take the last programme of work and the number of measures that were passed last session. They constitute, I believe, a record, and I believe they were good measures, ones that appealed to the country, and I think, if hon. members will turn up *Hansard* and study the debates of last session, they will find those measures also appealed to most members as well.

Mr. MURPHY: The Interest Bill was a good one.

Mr. WALKER: This year we have a somewhat similar programme, and if there is not too much waste of time, I feel quite satisfied the Bills will be passed, and will do a lot of good.

Mr. LENNON: Which Bill?

Mr. WALKER: The whole programme of work.

Mr. LENNON: The Liquor Bill. How do you know it is a good Bill?

[*Mr. Mulcahy.*

Mr. WALKER: I know the hon. member does not like the Liquor Bill, because he is always catering for the publican, and I am quite satisfied he will continue to do so.

Mr. LENNON: He has not always catered for the publican.

Mr. WALKER: With regard to the remarks passed by the hon. member who has just sat down in connection with the Agricultural Bank, I think that he and many members on this side have hit the administrative head of the Agricultural Bank rather too hard. I know there are numbers of settlers in my electorate who have dealt largely with the Agricultural Bank, and I do not think they have any cause of complaint, except with the delay in having inspections made.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: That is the trouble.

Mr. WALKER: That, of course, is owing a great deal to the fact of not having many inspectors.

Mr. LENNON: It is an utterly fossilised institution.

Mr. WALKER: It has given universal satisfaction with that one exception.

Mr. LENNON: It is utterly fossilised; you can't mend it.

Mr. WALKER: If you will give me a show I will give you my opinion. (Laughter.) The people get an advance if it is wise to give an advance, and I say it is not always wise to give those advances, and the reason private banks can beat the Agricultural Bank is because they take that individual into consideration. They find out whether he is a good man—in other words, whether he is a good borrower, and one that will pay his debts. The Agricultural Bank dare not do that, and the protections we have in the Agricultural Bank are absolutely necessary, because we know perfectly well there is a very small percentage of people in this world who are able to handle borrowed money.

Mr. MURPHY: I could handle some if I could borrow it. (Laughter.)

Mr. WALKER: And it is wise the public should be protected by inspectors who go round repeatedly and see that the money is spent on the object for which it is borrowed, and that is the reason why the Agricultural Bank, as far as we are concerned, has given universal satisfaction. A good deal of criticism has been hurled at the Lands Department, but it is of a very trivial nature. There have been very few complaints as far as I am concerned. The senior member for Gympie has spoken about the delay in getting land opened for selection. The hon. member knows perfectly well that as far as my electorate is concerned—and we all know he has his eyes on the Wide Bay—the land is nearly all taken up: we have only a few reserves and a few isolated blocks unsettled, and it is necessary that the department should go slow for the simple reason that those blocks were reserved for timber time after time, and it is wise we should not allow that land to be taken up when it contains £1 10s. or £2 worth of timber to the acre, and that is the reason why these extra inspections have had to take place. Generally speaking, the department has done well. I have had dozens of requests since last year, and I can say this, and say it fairly and squarely to the officers of the department, that they have done their duty, and in every case where it was warranted, the land has been thrown open as quickly as possible. The senior



member for Gympie also spoke about the going over our local lads and giving encouragement to outside people to come and take up land. Now that is another unfair statement.

Mr. MULCAHY: It is true.

Mr. WALKER: Well, this is the other side of it. I have settled five groups in the Wide Bay district since last year, and in every case they have been local chaps.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MULCAHY: Unless they think as you do they are no good.

Mr. WALKER: I don't want to reply to interjections of that sort, because I do not think they are fair. I think we ought to be above that sort of thing. With regard to the Widgee Repurchased Estate, that was thrown open recently under priority conditions, and I say that is the finest form of settlement we can have, and it is very pleasing to know the department has carried that out since the passing of the last Land Act.

Mr. LENNON: Priority conditions—you refer to the group system?

Mr. WALKER: Yes, it is similar to the group system. In the Widgee Estate something like seventy blocks were thrown open, and I think fifty odd were taken up at the time or shortly after. That means fifty settlers, and I can safely say that out of those fifty settlers forty of them are from Gympie, and that is another proof that the local men are catered for in every shape or form, and in no case has the outsider had preference. (Hear, hear!) We have also heard a good deal about dummying on the North Coast line. There is not the slightest doubt but that there is dummying on the North Coast line, and it has been there for the last thirty years—before the railway was constructed to Gympie—and it is very difficult to prevent it. I said last year I would support any amendment in the Land Act which would compel those men to work on the selections. But we also have dummying in other parts of the State. The hon. member also referred to goldfield homesteads inside the Gympie area, and I say there is no more wilful description of dummying than what takes place inside that boundary which the hon. member represents.

Mr. MULCAHY: Hear, hear!

Mr. WALKER: And what is more, I would advise the hon. member to hunt up the names of those people who get those homesteads, and it would be really surprising, and I do not think the hon. member would say "Hear, hear!" It is something scandalous. It is not the fault of the administration, because the Act does not provide for personal residence. You can take up a homestead and put on a few improvements. That land is given to those people for £1 10s. an acre, and some of them put on those tin huts, and a little barbed wire around, and are selling them for £7 and £8 an acre at the present time.

Mr. HARDACRE: The only way is to make them pay the value to the State.

Mr. WALKER: They should compel those homestead lessees to reside on the land, and that would get over the difficulty to a great extent. We have also heard complaints with regard to the rangers and commissioners dabbling in land. Why should not the rangers and commissioners buy land?

Mr. HAMILTON: They should not be allowed to dabble in Crown land.

Mr. WALKER: Did the hon. member say they dabble in Crown land?

Mr. MULCAHY: Of course they do.

Mr. WALKER: I say it is not true. I know pretty well every man who has taken up land in the Wide Bay district, and I defy any hon. member to give the name of any ranger or commissioner who has selected land in that district. I know of one man who has bought land, and he has a perfect right to buy land, the same as any member of Parliament has the right to buy land. A good deal has been said about the timber business, and this is a matter on which I feel very sore indeed, when the hon. member for Gympie comes forward and makes the statement that I was the sawmillers' representative.

Mr. LENNON: You said you were proud of it just now.

Mr. WALKER: I say it is untrue, and I say a remark of that description is only worthy of the hon. member.

Mr. MULCAHY: Did you not bring the timber people together?

Mr. WALKER: I remember when the question of the stoppage of the export of block timber came up—this is a matter I was very keen on because I recognised that the timber-getter up to the last five or six years had been sweated and he has never got the full result of his labour, particularly when you take into consideration the long hours of work and the risk and expenditure for the upkeep of perhaps two teams. I fought very hard for those timber-getters, and I came down and interviewed the then Minister for Lands, Mr. Denham, to try and get over that difficulty, and if you ask the Premier, you will find that I was really in favour of the export of timber. I think the hon. member will admit that I put up a ten times better fight on that occasion than he did, and I am quite sure he disappointed his own supporters at that time. It was then decided to get the two bodies together—the timber-getters and the sawmillers. I communicated on the telephone with Mr. Gore, secretary to the timber-getters here, and asked him if he was prepared to meet the timber-getters, believing that by the two bodies coming together an understanding would be arrived at. Mr. Gore said, "Yes," so I brought five of them from Brisbane and we met the timber-getters there, and the hon. member, instead of keeping his seat, the same as any other person who has no interest in timber would have done, took the side of the timber-getters and advised them not to listen, and told them not to believe what was said. I do not know how far he would have gone if a little fellow, half his weight, had not threatened to pass him outside. (Laughter.)

Mr. MULCAHY: That is absolutely untrue; you know that.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WALKER: That is exactly the position, and I had one object in view in bringing these two bodies together to come to a settlement. You know the difficulty in regard to the matter of export, and it was good for the saw-miller and good for the timber-getter too. What is more, an employees' representative came to Gympie from the officials to organise the timber-getters, and he commended me for my action, and recommended the timber-getters and the sawmillers to come together as I had done. The export of timber is one of the

*Mr. Walker.*]

grievances which I have against the present Government, and I am very sorry that they stopped the export of timber, believing that the export was responsible for the good price timber-getters are securing at the present time. If we are going to stop the export of timber, it is quite possible that the price will go down, and these men would get back to the old position, which would be regrettable, because we do not want men to work for wages which are not fair for the work which they do. When I interviewed Mr. Denham, who was then Minister for Lands, he told me that if the price was pulled down by the timber-getter that embargo would be taken off. It was a fair proposition and a fair offer to make, and if the price does come down, I intend to ask his successor to agree to the offer which Mr. Denham made then—that is, to take the embargo off, and to allow the export of timber. The timber-getters, like myself, recognise that we would like to have all our timber cut up in the State, but if that cannot be done, what is to become of the surplus—are we going to allow it to lie in the scrub or on the railway sidings, which will probably be the case if the export of timber is not allowed. I recognise that the question of the export of timber is coming to a critical stage. Only last week I saw that a barque was lying in the Brisbane River with something like 1,400,000 feet of timber, and it is a serious question, and one which should be considered by the timber-getters and the sawmillers coming together. I have had a great deal of difficulty in getting blocks with timber thrown open. In the Wide Bay district the grievances are many and genuine. A good deal of delay takes place, and it is often necessary for one timber-getter to borrow logs from another one; but this mixing up is likely to lead to confusion. There is also a difficulty with regard to timber measurement. I understand that an order has been given that no timber must be loaded at a siding unless measured by a Government officer. A delay takes place, and timber will go blue when wet weather sets in. These are matters which I will not further deal with, because they are more for the officers of the department. The hon. member for Gympie spoke with regard to his not attending a deputation to stop the export of timber.

Mr. MULCAHY: I said I attended it.

Mr. WALKER: I say the hon. member did attend that deputation, and that deputation asked that the export of timber from Fraser Island should be not allowed, which is perfectly true.

Mr. MULCAHY: No, it is not true.

Mr. WALKER: If that deputation did not ask that, I will give £5 to the Brisbane General Hospital.

Mr. MULCAHY: You are flashing your money—you had it all given to you.

Mr. WALKER: You say that outside, and I will deal with you. Mr. Speaker, I do not think a remark of that sort is a fair one; it is really imputing that somebody has given me my money. If the hon. member says it outside I will have to deal with him.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope hon. members will refrain from interjecting across the Chamber. They should remember that we are an assembly of gentlemen and should act as gentlemen towards each other.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Walker.

Mr. WALKER: There is another matter which I took a note of while sitting down—that is the endowment to our shires. I think the time has come when we should have our shires better catered for, more particularly in coastal districts where they have very heavy scrub land, and a heavy rainfall. We have had many new shires constituted lately, and they are doing excellent work, but we find that the taxation is so great that they cannot make roads anything like they should be made. I think the Government should appoint a valuator to value the whole of the shires, and classify and give endowment to those who deserve it. All those which are taxed up to a maximum of 4d. in the £1 by a valuation of £2 or £3 an acre I think should get endowment. I recognise that many shires are working with a credit balance and a low valuation, but there are many quite the contrary; there is only one way to make Queensland successful, and that is to endow the shires so that they can be successfully peopled, and in that way we shall increase the revenue from our railways. There is another matter about which the hon. member for Gympie is so vexed.

Mr. MULCAHY interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the hon. member for Gympie to refrain from interjections. I shall not ask again, but refer him to the House to deal with.

Mr. WALKER: Last year I had an application for two mining homesteads in my electorate, and I was told that the Mines Department, under a mistake—I say that so as to clear the officer—said that it was not open to selection, but the hon. senior member for Gympie, who had his eye pretty keenly on these homesteads, went along a week afterwards, and found out it was available, and what was the result? The hon. member, with a particular friend of his, had taken up on Glastonbury something like ten of these homesteads, and they gave these people whose names they used the sum of £5 for each of them.

Mr. MULCAHY: I wish to give that an emphatic denial.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Wide Bay is addressing the Chair.

Mr. MULCAHY: It is only in keeping with all his other statements.

Mr. WALKER: I think it is very unfair for a member of Parliament to go to any officer of a department to find out these things and give them to his friends. It would have been much better if the hon. member had wired back to the Press stating that this land was open to selection as miners' homesteads, and not allow it to be done the way that it was done. I immediately got in touch with the Minister for Mines, who realised the seriousness of the position and upset the whole business, and at the present time that is still a miners' reserve. I thank the House for listening to me. I have made an impromptu speech, as I had no intention of speaking, if it had not been for the very unfair and very untruthful way in which the hon. senior member for Gympie spoke.

Mr. MULCAHY: Not nearly as untruthful as you.

Mr. HAMILTON (Gregory): I must join with the hon. member who last spoke in congratulating the Premier on attaining

the object of his life, or I might say ever since he entered this House. When we look across the House and see the changes on the front Treasury bench it makes one stop to consider what were the qualifications necessary for a man to reach the front Treasury bench.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: The candid friend.

Mr. HAMILTON: It seems a remarkable thing that ever since I have been a member of this House I have always noticed that the candid friend of to-day is generally a Minister of the Crown to-morrow. I could not help noticing the eulogistic remarks which the Premier used when he was proposing the hon. member for Logan as Chairman of Committees. I thoroughly endorse those remarks, but it seems rather late in the day that the Premier should recognise the qualifications and claims of such an old parliamentarian and a loyal supporter of the party as the hon. member for Logan is. It is a most remarkable thing that when the reconstruction of the whole Ministry was taking place, and when they wanted to put Ministers over departments on which the progress and prosperity of the State largely depends—especially the Lands Department—that there were gentlemen behind the Ministry who had been loyal supporters for very many years, who had a practical and personal knowledge of the primary industries of the State, and yet not one of them was ever taken into consideration at the time of the reconstruction of the Ministry. The hon. member for Woollongabba said that members on that side were allowed latitude, but that on this side members were allowed no latitude. It seems strange, if that is the case, how party loyalty is regarded by the different sides of the House. We have not far to look back to see which side of the House rewards party loyalty in the most honest manner. It seems to me that on the other side party loyalty is at a discount, and disloyalty at a premium, because we see the candid friends of the Government occupying positions on the front Treasury benches to-day. We see the Minister for Agriculture—we know the attitude he took last year.

Mr. MULLAN: He was pretty cautious.

Mr. HAMILTON: He was very cautious, but he made a speech in which he condemned the Government for over-riding the Audit Act, but any little lapse by the Government now would not be objected to by the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman sits in his place and smiles happily, like a little boy when he is taking his first ride on a merry-go-round. He has got a portfolio. (Laughter.) One would think that when forming a Ministry party loyalty and the qualifications of members for the different positions would be the first consideration with a Minister; but was that the case when the last reconstruction of this Cabinet took place? Where were hon. members who were associated with the primary industries of the country? Take the hon. member for Cunningham, the hon. member for Logan, the hon. member for Moreton, the hon. member for Bundamba, and the hon. member for Musgrave. These are old members, many of whom have not boxed the political compass, but have been loyal to the party from the time they entered the House, but they were not considered or consulted when the reconstruction of the Ministry took place. They were too loyal. Some of them informed

me I knew all about it just as soon as they did—that the first they knew about it was when they read it in the morning papers. Is that a fair way to treat their supporters?

Hon. R. PHILIP: Why need you complain?

Mr. HAMILTON: Was the country taken into their confidence at the time? No. Yet they will say that this is a Government that has the confidence of the country. They have never been before the country—the country was not consulted, their own followers were not consulted, the whole thing was done in camera, and the first thing members supporting them knew about it was when they read it in the morning papers. The whole of the reconstruction took place without any consideration at all being paid to them. We will take into consideration other members of the party. Where does the

hon. member for Maryborough [5 p.m.] come in in this shuffle? And

where does Maryborough, the seaport, I might almost say the capital, of a large important and fertile district—one of the most fertile districts in Queensland—come in in this reconstruction? Why, it is only Queen street and Toowoomba that have been considered. The senior member for Maryborough, Mr. Corser, sat there all last session, and said, "Hear, hear!" every time a member of the Government said anything in the House. Surely he should have been considered when this great reconstruction took place! Yet he knew nothing more about it than I did; he knew nothing about it until he saw the report in the morning newspapers. I think the hon. member for Maryborough, and Maryborough itself, have been slighted by the action of the Government on this occasion. The hon. member for Maryborough and the hon. member for Woollongabba said "Yes, yes" and "Hear, hear" to everything the Government said last session, and they ought to have been paid for their trouble. But it was purely Queen street interests that were considered when the reconstruction took place, and the Ministry may almost be called a Queen street or butter-box Ministry. I dare say that if I was engaged in litigation, and I wanted a legal opinion, I would go to the hon. member for Brisbane North, Mr. Macartney, as soon as anyone; but if I wanted a gentleman to preside over the Lands Department, perhaps the most important department in the public service, I should choose a gentleman who had a personal and practical knowledge of the industries doing business with that department and of the whole State of Queensland. I hold that those qualifications were never considered in selecting for Minister for Lands in the present Administration. We know, however, the attitude that the hon. member for Brisbane North took last year with regard to the Government, and we now see him in the position of Minister for Lands quite happy and contented. You cannot expect to get the best administration in a department like that when the Minister, no matter how honest he may be, knows nothing at all about the practical work of the department that he has to preside over. There is this difference between the hon. member for Brisbane North and the Premier and the Secretary for Agriculture—that the hon. gentleman has always supported his party, while the Premier and the Secretary for Agriculture have been continually going from one party to another ever since they have

*Mr. Hamilton.]*

been in the House. I notice that one of the members who used to say "Hear, hear" to the Government last session was a candid friend of the Government last night, which shows that he recognises that the way to the Treasury bench is not the one he adopted last session, but the one he adopted last night. There has been a lot said about the Government programme by members opposite, but their praise of that programme was about the most lukewarm praise I ever heard given to any Government programme. It is one of the most watery productions that have ever been presented to this House. There is nothing in it that is going to benefit greatly the people of the State. The programme consists largely of Bills to amend Acts passed in previous sessions. With regard to the paragraph in the Governor's Speech in which regret is expressed at the death of our late Speaker, I think we all regret his loss and that every member is sorry that Mr. Bell is not in the Speaker's chair at the present time. Another paragraph in the Speech reads as follows:—

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

When we consider the remarks made in another place concerning the character of some of the immigrants brought out, when we consider the assertions made by many of those immigrants themselves about the way in which they have been misled by agents in the old country as to conditions and rates of pay, I think it is about time the Government made a searching inquiry into the whole system of immigration. No one can accuse Dr. Taylor of being a partisan, or of being a Labour man, and we know what he said about the character of some immigrants when speaking in another place on facts which had come under his observation as a medical man. Yet the daily Press of Brisbane are silent on that matter, and make no reference to Dr. Taylor's remarks. It is high time that the Government inquired into the means by which immigrants are induced to come to Queensland and into the system of selecting immigrants. If what Dr. Taylor has said is true, how can we expect respectable and reputable people in the old country to allow their daughters to come all the distance from their home to Queensland alone? There should be a searching inquiry into those matters. I say that what we call the scalp-system of selecting immigrants in the old country is largely responsible for the class of people who are coming out to this State. The agents in the old country go round the different counties, and induce people to emigrate to Queensland, and being paid so much for each—£1 per head—for all they get to come, they do not care whether those persons are physically fit, or whether their moral character is all it should be. I know that a large number of respectable and worthy people are coming out, but there are others who are physically unfit to earn their own livelihood. We know that some of the immigrants brought out are now in a lunatic asylum. There was one immigrant in the

[Mr Hamilton.

Winton district who ought never to have been allowed to leave the old country, and we are told that some of the newcomers are physically and morally unfit for colonists. The Government ought to see that female immigrants who are brought out are not exposed to the temptations which it appears they are exposed to on board ship. Passing on now to another subject, I find that in the Opening Speech it is stated that—

"With the view of giving greater opportunities to our own people, and to newcomers who are willing to assist us in our work of nation-building, my advisers are proceeding with railways which were passed in the last session of Parliament, and the completion of which will make Crown lands available for close settlement on a scale not hitherto possible in Queensland."

I have listened to the remarks made by several speakers with regard to the demand for land in the coastal districts, and I can say confidently that if the Government threw open 10,000 square miles in the Central district for close settlement, it would be taken up to-morrow. There are from twenty to forty applicants for every block of land that is thrown open for settlement at the present time. The trouble is that the land is thrown open in a piecemeal fashion, instead of being thrown open in large quantities to meet the demand. If members will look at Schedule II. of the Land Act which was passed last year they will see that there is any amount of land available for resumption. Yet resumptions are not made. I was informed the other day that there was a difficulty in keeping surveyors employed. Four or five years ago the excuse for not throwing land open was that the department could not get surveyors. Certainly there is any amount of work for the surveyors we have in the State at the present time, and for double the number of surveyors available, if the Government made a determined effort to meet the general demand for land for close settlement. The Government ought to go in for a policy of resumption, and throw open the resumed lands for settlement. I know people in the Western district who have been trying for the last two or three years to get a piece of land, and have been in almost every ballot that has taken place, but have been unable to get a block. Yet here we have the Government saying that they are opening land all over the State in sufficient quantities to meet the requirements of newcomers of our own people. I say that in no part of the State is land thrown open in sufficient quantity. In every district the demand exceeds the supply, and the sooner some genuine attempt is made to meet the demand the better. There is one matter I wish the Minister would inquire into, and that is the system adopted by the Surveyor-General's Department in plotting out land thrown open for settlement. The surveys of some resumptions are not at all satisfactory. Hon. members will remember that last session I brought before the House a case in which difficulty arose through the manner in which land was surveyed. It is only the other day that I got that matter fixed up. The hon. member for Mitchell has another case which occurred in his district, in which a selector forfeited his land because the surveyor had cut him off from all the water. While other branches of the department are endeavouring to encourage close settlement, the action of that branch discourages it, and some alteration should be made in its

methods. When land is resumed and cut up into blocks, the surveyors should endeavour as far as possible to give every selector a water frontage, but it seems that in some cases the surveys make dry areas of some blocks unnecessarily. I trust that the Minister will look into this matter, and have it rectified. With regard to the routes of the railways to be constructed, especially the routes of the Western extensions passed last session, they are not giving satisfaction to the people resident in the district. There has been a petition sent down with reference to the route of the line from Winton to Springvale Junction. Take that line from Malbon to the Duchess, that line ought to be pushed on at once because it will open up a lot of mines out there, and will give a lot of employment.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You know that we have already made a start?

Mr. HAMILTON: Yes, the surveyors were up there when I was there. But with regard to the line from Winton to Springvale, that line should not cross the Western River at all. If it takes the route suggested in the petition sent down to the Minister the other day, then it will only have to cross one river—the Diamantina. It will open up far better country, and will be of far more use to the country than if they follow the route to Springvale marked out last year. There is a paragraph in the Speech which reads—

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

I do not know what the amendments of the electoral laws are, but I would certainly not like to see the Commonwealth Act copied in place of our own. I believe that the present system which we have got for carrying on elections and voting is far better than the Commonwealth system. I think there should be a conference between representatives of the Commonwealth and the States, and they should try to arrange a common system of carrying on elections, because with the two systems which we have at the present time—the State has one system and the Commonwealth has another altogether—it is puzzling to people, and leads to confusion at election times, and it would be far better to have one common system which we can both adopt. But do not copy the Commonwealth system as it is, because I consider that our State system is better. While on this subject I draw attention to the large electorates which have been brought about as a result of the redistribution of seats scheme. In my own electorate there will be something like 100,000 square miles of country. It was over 80,000 square miles before, but it has been increased to approximately 100,000 square miles. Then the Burke electorate, Cook electorate, and Warrego electorate have all been made very large electorates. They are such tremendous areas now that it will take a member months to get over them, and it will mean much greater expense for a member who has to travel over that additional area.

Hon. R. PHILP: It will be all the better for you.

Mr. HAMILTON: It might be all the better in one way, but not in another. There should be a special allowance made to members who represent the far Northern and far Western seats in order to compensate them for the extra expense they will be put to in travelling round such huge electorates. I do not care on what side a member sits, if he has to travel over such large areas of country, he should receive some extra allowance for it. It does not matter who the member is. If he does not represent the constituency properly, let him be put out and someone else put in his place. But whoever is there he should receive this extra remuneration, because there is no doubt that it costs a member much more to represent the Gregory, Cook, Burke, or Warrego electorates than it does one of the metropolitan electorates.

Mr. FORSYTH: The metropolitan electorates are far more expensive.

Mr. HAMILTON: The hon. member finds them expensive because he is not strong enough to say “No” to applicants; but the hon. member for Moreton knows quite well that £300 a year for a member representing a metropolitan constituency is worth much more than £300 a year for a member representing a Northern or Western constituency. The hon. gentleman says that the metropolitan constituency is expensive, but he knows quite well that if a member in the metropolis got £10,000 a year that some people would still try to drag it out of him. I have nothing to complain about so far as that is concerned in my electorate. In fact, I get far more requests down here from people who do not belong to my electorate at all. I consider that the remuneration for representing electorates should all be made of equal value. If any official is sent round the country to represent the Government they get a travelling allowance, and a member should get some increased allowance in accordance with the duties he is called upon to perform. The hon. member for Moreton knows the new electorate of Burke, and he knows what it will cost a man to get round that vast electorate.

Mr. FORSYTH: The expense of a metropolitan constituency is greater.

Mr. HAMILTON: That is because the hon. member is not strong enough to say “No.” Besides, his expense is not a necessary expense. He can refuse, but in the case of a member with a big electorate it is a necessary expense, and he has to pay it because he cannot get out of it; he has to travel over it. It says here—

“I am confident that you will readily approve of any measure which will better the conditions under which our miners are working, by making their surroundings as healthful as possible.”

I was up at Mount Elliott and Hampden and Duchess mining districts the other day, and one thing that was brought to my notice was that under the system of homesteads—they are really township allotments—they are let under a tenure on which the occupier pays 5s. a year to the Government. Now, epidemics of disease broke out there, and the Health Department called upon the local authority there to abate them, but the local authority could not get one penny in rates from these places, and was unable to do anything. I was at Hampden, and it promises to become a fine town, with fine buildings being erected there, and expensive buildings too. They want culverts, and

*Mr. Hamilton.]*

there is some footpath formation required to be carried out, but when they applied to the council to do the work the council refused because they could get no money from rates to carry out the work.

Mr. MURPHY: The council can tax them.

Mr. HAMILTON: The council cannot do it.

Mr. MURPHY: How do they do it in Croydon, where there is no freehold at all, and all the land is taken up under mining home-steads?

Mr. HAMILTON: I do not know how they do it. The annual rent of the land is only 5s. Multiplied twenty times is the capital value for rating purposes, and 2d. in the £1 on that sum would not give any rate at all worth speaking about. I believe that we should get whatever land value we may create. I saw several allotments there which the people took up at 5s. per annum; I know that they ran a two-wire fence around them and that they sold them at £300 each. The Government created that value building railways, and yet somebody else is allowed to take all the economic rent or enhanced value and profit from it. One man had an allotment and the railway went over a corner of it, and he sent in a claim for £1,500 for compensation. I believe the Government are going to give him something like £500 or £700, and all he paid to the Government for that land was 5s. a year.

Mr. MURPHY: It is practically freehold land, too.

Mr. HAMILTON: It becomes freehold after a term of years.

Hon. R. PHILP: Do you advocate selling it?

Mr. HAMILTON: No, it should be leased by perpetual lease. We have a clause in our Land Act which says that town and country lands may be put up to auction and 3 per cent. per annum on the price the land fetches in open competition is the rent payable to the Crown, and that sum realised at auction should be the capital value for the local authority for rating purposes.

Hon. R. PHILP: I would not advise you to repeat that on a goldfield.

Mr. HAMILTON: I did repeat it on a goldfield, because I consider it is only fair. Even if a new goldfield broke out to-morrow, the principle would be just the same. All the allotments could be put up at auction for perpetual lease, and whatever they realised at auction that would be the capital value, and they would have to pay 3 per cent. on the capital value as ascertained by public competition.

Hon. R. PHILP: What is the difference between perpetual lease and freehold?

Mr. HAMILTON: We get the reappraisal, and we get the economic rent. I see that the Government are going in for more central sugar-mills. I had a trip up to the sugar districts a few years ago, and I thought then that it was a mistake for the Government to say that they would not go in for any more central mills because the Federal Government had control of them. The interests and the progress of North Queensland—especially the coastal regions—are largely wrapped up in these central mills. I would sooner see co-operative central mills established where the Government had some hold on them than I would see the farmers get into the hands of the pri-

vate millowners, as I understand that this Government are going to do with the farmers and settlers in the vicinity of Jarvisfield and the Inkerman Estate. I think there is room there for central mills, and they should have been established long ago. Why I believe in the central mills is because if the farmers get into the hands of the privately-owned mills they are in their power altogether. I know of one family who had some sugar-cane farms, and one of the brothers had a quarrel with a man at the mill who is in charge of the weighing, and they told his other brother that they would not take a ton of cane from him while his brother was with them.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: They must take his cane according to the agreement.

Mr. HAMILTON: This young fellow is a young married man, and he had to clear out before they would take his brother's cane, and he had to leave his home on that account. I see there is to be a Rabbit Boards Bill introduced. That is badly wanted. There are other Bills which have been promised from time to time. I am not going to make any remarks on the Liquor Bill until I see what that measure contains. I do not intend to give any opinion on it until the Bill is before us.

Hon. R. PHILP: Before you commit yourself?

Mr. HAMILTON: Yes. I am not an extremist either one way or the other. I see there is an old friend here in the Leases to Aliens Bill. I think the hon. member for Townsville was the author of that Bill. It has been before us for the last ten years, at any rate.

Hon. R. PHILP: It was not introduced by me.

Mr. HAMILTON: I think it was introduced first in the hon. gentleman's time.

Hon. R. PHILP: No, it was first brought in when you were in charge.

Mr. HAMILTON: It has never come off yet. In running through this list I notice that they are pretty well all amendments of Bills. There is an amendment of the Agricultural Bank Act, and an amendment of the State Education Act. Well, looking at this programme from a democratic standpoint, it is just about as watery and colourless a production as ever I have seen introduced into this House.

Mr. CORSER: There is some spirit in it. (Laughter.)

Mr. HAMILTON: There might be some spirit in it when the Liquor Bill comes along. (Laughter). There is certainly no spirit in it now, and no Government supporter can say that there is. Now, there is one Bill mentioned on the notice-paper which is badly wanted. That is the Trade Disputes Bill, which was introduced by the hon. member for Woothakata, Mr. Theodore, the other day. That Bill has been promised by successive Governments and also by the late Government. It was promised by the late Premier, who, a few minutes ago, was extolled by an hon. member for about a quarter of an hour. It is the law in England, and it ought to be the law here to-day. There is no appearance of it in this programme, but if the Government wanted to prevent industrial disputes and settle the disputes like those that are taking place not

[Mr. Hamilton.]

only in Queensland but in other States and all over the world to-day, they had a right to come down and introduce this measure.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HAMILTON: I was only referring to an omission.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member is anticipating a discussion on the general business—Orders of the Day, No. 1.

Mr. HAMILTON: I beg your pardon, Sir.

Hon. R. PHILP: Have there been no strikes since that Act was passed?

Mr. HAMILTON: There are strikes all over the world—there are industrial disturbances all over the world to-day for better conditions. Hon. members talk [5.30 p.m.] about the great prosperity of this State. Where is the prosperity when the workers have to strike in order to get better conditions and better rates of pay? I was struck with some of the remarks passed last night by the hon. member for Woolloongabba. I suppose last year, although he had that information, he would not make use of it, but he made use of it this year, as circumstances have altered, and that is the information contained in the report of the Scottish Agricultural Commission about the accommodation amongst the farmers for married people, or for married couples. It is just the same on stations. We see it every day. If there is an advertisement for a married couple, it is generally for a married couple without encumbrance. I say married men with children are handicapped at every turn of life. They are not wanted. Let a married man with four or five children try to rent a house. The first question asked is, "How many children have you?" If the man has four or five children, the owner of the property will tell him he does not believe in letting his houses to men with a lot of children. He can do so now, simply because there is such a demand for houses that he can pick and choose. There is a great difficulty in Brisbane in getting houses on account of so many new arrivals, and house rents are going up every day. You see rooms to let here and rooms to let there; families are taking a house with four or five rooms, and they have to let two rooms in order to help pay the rent. If a married man has to go to the country and has to take his children with him, in nine cases out of ten there are no means whatever to get them educated. The Scottish Agricultural Commission pointed out the very great lack amongst our farmers to give housing accommodation for the men who are in their employ. The farmers are always crying out for immigrants, that they want more farm labourers in the country. Yet, as has been pointed out time after time, it is only for a few weeks in the year they want those men. They may want ten or twelve men to-day, and in five or six weeks' time, when harvest is over, a couple will do, but they have no accommodation even for the two or three working for them. I was reading the report of a meeting which has just been called in Toowoomba to form what they call "The Darling Downs Farmers' New Protective Union," and with the first six or seven objects in the constitution of this union I thoroughly agree. I think it would be a good thing for the farmers and a good thing for the community at large. The constitution reads—

"4. To affiliate with kindred societies if thought desirable. 5. To promote co-operative

enterprise and consistently support the manufacture and distribution of farm produce on co-operative lines. 6. To eliminate, as far as possible, speculation in farm produce, and control the methods of placing those commodities, either raw or manufactured, on the markets."

Now, I think those are good objects. When we come down to clause 12 we read this—

"To secure employment for all, and fair remuneration for all employees, Mr. A. T. Taylor moved, Mr. C. Benn (Cambooya) seconded, and Mr. Dempsey (Kingshorpe) supported an amendment to omit it altogether, and the amendment was carried."

Mr. LENNON: It was omitted?

Mr. HAMILTON: It was omitted, and yet those gentlemen are singing out for more farm labourers. The Scottish Agricultural Commission, who were not partisans in any way, during their travels noticed there was no accommodation amongst the farmers for their employees. There must have been one or two members of the farming community amongst the men who drew up this constitution who wanted fair conditions, as it says here, "to secure employment for all and a fair remuneration for all," but the majority wiped this clause out. Is that fair treatment? How can the farmers' representatives stand up in this House and justify a thing of that sort? How can the hon. member for Cambooya and the hon. member for Fassifern, who represent the farming community, stand up and justify that action? Crying for labourers and refusing to guarantee fair conditions.

Mr. MACKINTOSH: I sent two married couples up last week, and one had seven children and the other five.

Mr. HAMILTON: I say there were men amongst those farmers who are willing to give fair conditions and fair rates of pay to their employees, but it shows the majority of those present were not willing to do so. I say it is cruel to bring out married couples and men with families when you penalise a man with children when he comes here. When you see a station advertising for a married couple, nine times out of ten it is for a married couple without encumbrance. I do not want to mention names, but I know one instance where a very old manager, who had a family of six or seven children, was discharged. He was a manager of very high repute, and I was talking to him, and asked him how it was he was discharged, and he said, "Too many children." That was a few years ago. He had too many children and had to go. Subsequently his daughters got married, and, as his family got smaller, he was able to find employment. I know of another manager whose wife died and left two children, and he was told by the owner he would have to get rid of his children or go himself.

Hon. R. PHILP: That is not a general thing.

Mr. HAMILTON: Those are isolated instances, but they occur in nine cases out of ten. When they want married couples they do not want them with children. I do not want to speak at any further length on this question. All I can say is I hope those members sitting behind the Government are satisfied with the new shuffle. I know the Secretary for Agriculture is satisfied, and I suppose the hon. members for Rockhampton and Brisbane North are satisfied, and I hope all the hon. members sitting behind them

*Mr. Hamilton.]*

are satisfied with the shuffle. It came as a big surprise to them, and caused a lot of heartburning, as it did to the country.

Mr. MACKINTOSH: Not at all.

Mr. HAMILTON: I know it came as a surprise to the hon. member and many others, and with these few remarks I will conclude what I have to say on the Address in Reply.

\* HON. R. PHILP (*Townsville*): I have listened to a good many debates in the House on the Address in Reply, and I must admit that I never heard weaker criticism than has fallen from the other side of the House on the present occasion—weak as water. We have been promised a very good programme, and I believe, before the House rises, every member will admit that a good deal of useful work has been done. What appears to annoy hon. members opposite is that no members from this side have gone over to them. (Laughter.) They do not want good men here; they want men they can turn out, and they are disappointed ever so much because they found, when the House met, a number of men on this side of the House did not go over to that side. That is all the trouble. (Laughter.) The Labour party is the last party that should talk about loyalty. They would support any party that would go across from this side of the House and join them. They have done so before, and will do so again. I do not want to go into the past—"Let the dead bury its dead." What happened last session or the previous session does not concern us very much. The leader of the Opposition did that, and dwelt a long time on the action of Mr. Macartney last session. We had a division in the House last year on that particular matter, and that is an end of it. Now we want to address ourselves to what is going to be good for the country. What are we going to do this year? I hope that both sides of the House want to see the country prosperous, and want to see the people in the country prosperous. With others, I regret very much, Sir, the death of the late Speaker, Mr. Bell. (Hear, hear!) I have already spoken on that matter, and I have also to refer to the death of another very old servant of this House—Mr. Baldwin—who was here for forty years, and I think he was held in the highest respect by all members of this House and of the other House too. (Hear, hear!) At the same time, Sir, I am very pleased to see you in the chair, and I will always support you in every way possible to keep order in this House, and I trust you will sit there a long time and be an ornament to that chair, as many of your predecessors have been. We have heard a good deal about land settlement, and the absence of any Land Act. Personally, I think we ought to have had an amending Land Act this session. We find defects in the present Act already, notwithstanding the great skill displayed by the Premier, Mr. Denham, and Mr. Hardacre, the representative of the Labour party, on that measure. In one of the clauses we prevented a lessee taking up grazing farms. A very wise thing to do; but now the department, I understand, read that to mean that a grazing farmer cannot take up a lease. I think that was never intended by this House. We want to see people rise in the world if possible.

Mr. HAMILTON: The intention was to prevent pastoral lessees dummifying their resumptions.

[*Mr. Hamilton.*]

HON. R. PHILP: It was intended that no lessee should take up a grazing farm, but it is twisted the other way about, and now a grazing farmer cannot take up a lease. A banking company or a loan company can hold a thousand leases if they like, but according to the department's reading of the Land Act no grazing farmer can buy a lease. I think that was never intended, and it should not be read by the department in that way. I think we should encourage everyone we can to buy leases. As I said before, a loan company with headquarters in London can own a thousand leases in Queensland if they like, but a grazing farmer cannot buy one lease. That is not the wish of this House, and I certainly think an amendment of the Land Act should be brought in at once to remedy that defect.

Mr. HARDACRE: It is certainly what the Land Act says—"No lessee can apply for or hold a grazing farm."

HON. R. PHILP: He cannot apply for it.

Mr. HARDACRE: That is the reading of the Act.

HON. R. PHILP: I know of several leases being held up at the present time on account of that action. When the present Act will allow one firm or one man to hold as many leases as he likes, there should be nothing to prevent a grazing farmer buying a lease.

Mr. LENNON: Would it not involve a forfeiture of his grazing farm?

HON. R. PHILP: It ought not to do, because there are plenty of leaseholders holding grazing farms now.

Mr. HARDACRE: Why should a man who has got a maximum selection want to go in for a pastoral lease too?

HON. R. PHILP: Then why do you allow a man who holds one lease now to acquire another lease? Why should a man who holds a grazing farm now not be enabled to acquire a lease? A man can go on a mining field, and get as many leases as he likes, so long as he complies with the conditions. There is no maximum at all on a mining field, so long as a man complies with the conditions, and employs so many men to the acre, and I do not see any objection to it. A good deal of debate has taken place about land settlement. If we compare Queensland with New South Wales and other States, we find more land being applied for in Queensland than anywhere else, showing that our conditions are better, and we have more land. I deplore, with other hon. members, that we have not more land under cultivation in comparison with the land taken up, but I am assured by farmers that it is because they cannot get sufficient labour. I know it is the case in North Queensland. We are told that since this strike men cannot get their crops off.

Mr. LENNON: The newspapers say that they are getting them off all right.

HON. R. PHILP: They are in some cases; but you know different.

Mr. HAMILTON: If they will pay fair prices they will get their crops off.

HON. R. PHILP: The sugar farmers in Queensland have a special benefit in the shape of bounty, but they cannot grow sugar with a bounty to export out of Australia—they can only grow sugar for Australia. But there are other farmers in Queensland and Australia who have to grow wheat, which they have to send to London, and compete with the



wheatgrower in Asia and Europe, at ever so much lower wages than we are paying here to-day. We also export a great deal of butter, which has to come into competition with that produced by much cheaper labour, in the markets in London, than we have here.

Mr. HARDACRE: And they are getting £50 an acre for dairying land in Queensland.

HON. R. PHILP: There is no land in Queensland fetching £50 an acre for dairying purposes. I like to pay as big wages as anybody, but you cannot pay a bigger wage than the product can afford to pay. If you export butter in large quantities—or wheat in large quantities, as I hope we will some day in Queensland—you can only afford to pay a wage that will enable you to export, otherwise you cannot do it.

Mr. HARDACRE: Hear, hear! You cannot pay big prices for land, and big wages too.

HON. R. PHILP: I notice some people who talk about that won't take up land themselves and try it. I know the hon. member for Leichhardt farmed land, but did not succeed, I am sorry to say.

Mr. HARDACRE: It was in a time of drought. (Laughter.)

HON. R. PHILP: I do not think he was paying more wages than his neighbour was paying.

Mr. HARDACRE: I never paid less than 8s. a day.

HON. R. PHILP: That may be a reason why you did not succeed. (Laughter.)

Mr. HARDACRE: Purely the drought.

HON. R. PHILP: Other people got through the drought. I think the farmers went through the drought better than the pastoralists did. All these things have to be taken into consideration. You cannot meet in a hall in Brisbane, and say this product will pay so much wages if the farmer cannot afford to do it.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: There is more labour here now than there was five years ago, and there is less wheat grown.

HON. R. PHILP: That labour may be getting better employment than growing wheat. You must remember that everyone is prosperous in Queensland to-day. Pastoralists are very prosperous, and can afford to pay more for labour.

Mr. ALLEN: Pastoralists do not pay big wages.

HON. R. PHILP: I think most of them pay as much as they can afford. Carriage and everything is pretty high, especially if you are a long way from a railway station, and if we had another drought people would either have to sack a number of their men or pay lower wages than they are paying now. Shearers are well paid, and I think you will find cancutters and dam-makers are very well paid.

Mr. ALLEN: What about boundary riders?

HON. R. PHILP: I believe they are very well paid too. I think that on the whole the men working in the bush can save a great deal more out of their wages than men working in the towns, and are much better off. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: And yet they are flocking into the city.

HON. R. PHILP: It may be that wages are higher in the city, but on the whole I think the working man is better off in the bush, if he will put up with the discomforts, than he is in the city.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: I quite agree with you, but they do not seem to think so.

HON. R. PHILP: I don't wonder, because you and some of your friends go about and urge them to drop their work to get higher wages. I have heard some of you say that the men are fed like dogs. I have been in the bush, and have always found working men exceedingly well fed; they live just the same as the boss. The food may be better served up to the manager, but it is the same class of food.

Mr. LENNON: Do you approve of the kit system?

HON. R. PHILP: I do not know what you mean.

Mr. LENNON: Poking the tucker through a hole in the wall.

HON. R. PHILP: I have never seen it done, and I always heard when I lived in the North that the Colonial Sugar Refining Company treated the men exceedingly well. On the whole, I think you will find the workers in Queensland are well paid. The cooking sometimes might be badly done, but the working classes in Queensland are better fed than the working classes in the old country.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. LENNON: They are on the borders of starvation in the old country.

HON. R. PHILP: I am sorry to hear it; they would be better out here, and I should be very pleased to bring them here. Hon. members on the other side say we do not get the best class of people here, but I think it is a libel on those who come here. I never saw a better lot of people coming than are coming here now. You will find one or two bad sheep in all communities.

Mr. LENNON: Under the scalp system you must get them.

HON. R. PHILP: If you want to get people you must pay so much per head. All the other States in Australia are doing it. I believe the Government are as careful as they can be, and that the immigrants must pass a medical examination; they must also have characters from the place where they are employed; but of course it is possible that some of them may not be genuine, but that does not condemn the policy of immigration. In going about, men who canvass for life insurance often tell very nice stories, and often make mistakes, but it does not follow that life insurance is not a good thing; it is a splendid thing, and so is immigration a good thing. I hope the Government will take care to only send out single girls in ships where there is a matron, and where they have a place to themselves.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. R. PHILP: I would not allow any single girls to come out in passenger ships—that ought to be stopped. They should come specially out in immigrant ships. That was the old form of immigration, and it was found the best, after years of trial, and we should stick to that.

Mr. HARDACRE: Even then there is a lot of scandal.

HON. R. PHILP: That may be so, but even then it is not from fellow-passengers

*Hon. R. Philp.]*

that there is trouble, but from the crew of the ship. If girls are in a place by themselves, and under a good matron, there is not the same fear. I think it is a libel on the people coming here at the present time, because there are one or two black sheep, to discredit them all as not the right class of people.

MR. LENNON: I do not think anyone on this side has gone so far as that; they have condemned the methods, but not the whole thing.

HON. R. PHILP: They are a splendid lot of people. It is only agricultural labourers and domestic servants, I understand, that the Government are paying the passages for. The majority are assisted passengers, who are nominated by people living in Queensland. You could not get a better class of people than this, because the people who nominate them are responsible for them when they come here. We want more people here, and why don't we in earnest on both sides of the House do all we can to perfect the present system? Do not let us condemn and decry a lot of good people who are coming here at the present time. (Hear, hear!) We were also told that married people were tabooed, but I do not know of any case. I know of dairy farms where married couples are wanted with families—in most cases they get the working of the dairy farm on shares. The owner of the farm finds the cows, implements, accommodation, and a house, and for that he gets one-half, and the other man takes the other half. During the season these people on shares do exceedingly well. I know that at the present time there is a great demand for couples under these conditions. I know of stations on which married couples are wanted—married boundary riders. People like him better if he is married.

MR. LENNON: That is not my experience.

HON. R. PHILP: Your experience is pretty ancient now; mine is more recent. We do not want to send our married people 200, 300, or 400 miles from a railway. When people come 14,000 miles away from their own homes to settle here, I think that instead of speaking disparagingly of them we should take them by the hand and assist them in every possible way to make homes for themselves;

[7 p.m.] and I hope that we shall hear no more talk about the right class of people not coming to Queensland. I must confess that I have never known a better class of people to come to Queensland than those who are coming at the present time, though some few that we do not want may have slipped in. I congratulate the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba on his being placed in charge of the Agricultural Department. I never knew before this evening that the hon. member belonged to Queen street. I thought he lived in Toowoomba, the centre of a very large agricultural district. Referring again to married couples coming here, I would suggest to the Secretary for Agriculture that his department might do a little more to encourage cotton-growing in Queensland than it is doing at the present time. I believe that if properly encouraged cotton-growing can be made one of the biggest export industries of the State. Cotton will grow along the coast from the Tweed River to the Gulf of Carpentaria, and I should like the Government to make a commercial test in cotton production, and give the facts concerning that test to the people of the State, so that they might learn whether cotton can be grown profitably. I

[Hon. R. Philp.

remember that in the old days the Government gave a bonus of £5 a bale for cotton grown in Queensland, and that one year 10,000 bales were exported from Queensland. At that time cotton seed had no marketable value and it was burnt; one shipment of it did not pay for the freight, but now it is worth from £5 to £8 per ton. If we could induce married couples with families to come here and engage in cotton-growing, there would be no difficulty about labour in the industry, as they would be able to harvest their own crops, and I believe that the cotton produced would easily be sold in Australia. I would suggest that the Government plant 50 or 100 acres with cotton for two or three years, with the view of showing the cost of production and the financial result of the experiment. If that was done, I believe that people would go in for cotton-growing, and that private enterprise would be even more successful than the Government.

MR. G. P. BARNES: It is being grown in Queensland successfully.

HON. R. PHILP: Only in very small quantities. But if it was demonstrated to the people that it could be grown successfully and profitably, I believe that we should have more people going in for its cultivation. The Department of Agriculture has charge of matters pertaining to stock as well as of matters pertaining to agriculture. Fortunately, stock are doing very well in Queensland at the present time, but in some cases I think the department might help stockowners more than it is doing. We should have in charge of stock a man who thoroughly understands stock. At the present time I know that some stockowners are harassed a good deal by inspectors in getting their stock to a meat-works. In some cases stock have to be dipped needlessly, and that takes off from 5s. to 10s. per head from the value of the cattle. There are some places where there are no ticks, and yet the cattle have to be dipped. It appears to me that sufficient attention is not paid to the stock industry in some respects, and I hope that the new Minister will see that more attention is devoted to it. I am hopeful that the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba will be successful in his department. Though not a farmer, he has been brought up in an agricultural community, and he knows a great deal about farming, and has every sympathy with the producers of Queensland. I have now discussed the question of immigration and land settlement, and have also said something about the Land Act that we passed last session. There is another Act that we passed last year about which I wish to say a few words, and that is the Water Conservation Act. I am sorry to say that the administration of that Act has not given universal satisfaction in Queensland. There is no Act that I know of with regard to the administration of which there has been so much dissatisfaction as there has been in connection with that Act.

MR. J. M. HUNTER: Want of administration.

HON. R. PHILP: I know that people who are prepared to spend large sums of money in putting down bores have been stopped, and are not going on with the work.

THE TREASURER: It is working very smoothly now.

HON. R. PHILP: Since the House last met I have had an opportunity of conversing with Mr. Jack, who knows more about artesian water than any man in Australia. He thinks:

that where the supply of water in a bore has diminished another bore should be put down, and is still of the opinion that the rainfall furnishes the artesian water supply in Queensland, and that defective piping is the cause of the trouble in many cases. It may suit a man with money to insist that he shall put down casing of 10 inches, 8 inches, and 6 inches, but such a condition will stop a man who possesses only a small amount of capital. Every encouragement should be given to people in the Western district to improve their properties by providing water, as that means improving the country for the advantage of Queensland generally. As far as I know, the Act and regulations are not working very satisfactorily. I know that the Minister is sympathetic, and I trust that he will do all he possibly can to assist those people in their efforts to develop the resources of this great State. Turning now to another matter, I am glad to see that the Government are going to give effect to the recommendations of the Sugar Commission with regard to the erection of central mills. I have been a consistent advocate of the erection of sugar-mills by the Government where private enterprise cannot or does not do it. When the original Act dealing with this matter was passed it was intended that mills should be erected in places where there was no chance of mills being built by the people engaged in the industry. It was not intended that central mills should be erected to compete with mills owned by private persons who had invested their money in that way. The Sugar Commission recommended that the Government should erect a 10,000-ton mill on the Russell, a 5,000-ton mill on the Johnstone, and an 8,000 mill on the South Johnstone. If growers are to be assisted to get the highest possible price for their cane, we should erect big mills. In other sugar-producing countries they have mills capable of crushing 3,000 tons of cane in twenty-four hours. That is about three times the size of any mill we have in Queensland. I think it would be a mistake to erect any more small mills, and that instead of putting up two or three mills in different localities it would be better to erect one large mill in a central situation. By doing this we should save expense in management, sugar would be produced at a cheaper rate, and as a consequence the grower would get more for his cane. For instance, instead of erecting a mill on the Babinda, as suggested by the commission, we might erect a large mill half way between the Babinda and the Johnstone Rivers—say on the Russell. I believe that the result would be more satisfactory than from two smaller mills. The Mulgrave Mill, I think, pays more per ton for cane than any other mill in Queensland. One of their managers made a visit to Formosa, and wrote a very instructive pamphlet on the mills that crush from 500 to 3,000 tons of cane in twenty-four hours. A large mill of that description would be sufficient for that district, and, as I have said, it could be worked more cheaply than two or three small mills. There has not been much said about mining during this debate. Though not a member for a mining constituency, I have taken a great interest in mining for many years. The Government should, I think, do something for the mining industry of Queensland. There may possibly be different opinions among members as to what should be done, but there is one thing which I think all will agree should be done, and that is to give railway communication to mining centres.

I have been waiting for a long time to see what could be done to assist the mining industry, but I believe that if we provided mining centres with railway facilities we should do a great deal for the industry. There are several mining centres without railway communication to-day, and if the Government are going to build lines in the North I hope they will not forget to build some lines in mining centres. I will not suggest where they should build those lines.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: One to Mount Mulligan.

HON. R. PHILP: I understand that the Chillagoe Company intend building a line to Mount Mulligan, which is a coalfield.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Why not the Government?

HON. R. PHILP: If other people are willing to build the railway, why should the Government do the work? The Chillagoe Company have spent a lot of money—over £1,000,000—in that district, and they have not paid any dividends yet. And if they can build the line to this coalfield, I, for one, will not object to them doing it. If that is done, I think it is about as much as we can do at the present time for our coalfields. If the recommendations of the Mining Commission which visited our State mines during the recess are carried out, that will also help the miners. If the Government will bring in a measure to that effect, I will give my sympathy to it. I understand that under the Mines Regulation Act which we passed last year, regulations can be framed to deal with all of the recommendations made by the Mining Commission. If that is so, it is a good thing, and it should be done. There is one other matter I wish to speak about before I sit down, and that is railways. Last session we passed a big scheme for the construction of a Great Western and a Great Northern Railway.

MR. LENNON: Also Port Alma Railway.

HON. R. PHILP: That was the session before last. That is done with now. In connection with our Great Western Railway, there is a great diversion of opinion as to how the routes should be carried out, and if hon. members will refer to the remarks which I made when that railway was going through the House, they will see that I advocated certain routes to be followed. With regard to the routes from Townsville, I had no fault to find with them. I found fault with both the Central and Southern routes. Since the House closed last session I took advantage of an opportunity of going out West and seeing for myself the proposed railway route from Wallal to Tobermory, which was the one we passed last year. The people west of Charleville are only of one opinion, and that is, that it would be a mistake to take the line to Tobermory at all. The line should have gone west from Charleville, and should have gone thence to Windorah. At any rate, it should not have gone further south than Eromanga.

MR. RYAN: You want the North and South to rob the Central district.

HON. R. PHILP: It would not rob the Central district one iota if the line went from Wallal to Eromanga. Personally, I do not think that the line should go from Blackall at all. It should really go from Longreach. (Hear, hear!) I said that last session, and I say so again. Before we spend too much money on that extension let us get experts'

*Hon. R. Philp.]*

opinion as to the best route. I voted for that Bill, and I would vote for it again, because I think it is a good thing to put railways in our Western districts, but if the line were taken from Charleville to Eromanga instead of from Charleville to Tobermory, it would be much better for the people west of Charleville. The further south you take the line the more difficult it is to build, the poorer the country becomes, and the less country you serve. I hope the Minister will make every inquiry before he spends too much money on this Western line. We passed that Western Railway on the report of Mr. Amos, who went over the country in a motor-car. No harm has been done so far. I think we have been wise to tell the people of Western Queensland that we are going to connect that part of the country with a railway.

Mr. RYAN: Brisbane.

HON. R. PHILP: No, not Brisbane. Brisbane gets less out of that extension than either Rockhampton or Townsville.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: That is so.

HON. R. PHILP: Townsville benefits most, Rockhampton next, and Brisbane next.

Mr. HARDACRE: Sydney comes third.

HON. R. PHILP: Sydney does not come in at all.

Mr. MURPHY: What if it does? As good Australians we should be glad that Sydney benefits by it.

HON. R. PHILP: Personally, I should like to see a line built from Cunnamulla to Bourke. (Hear, hear!) That is the proper line to build, notwithstanding what the newspapers say. I say that this House would be quite justified in building that line if New South Wales would build the line to the Tweed River. If that were done, then for every £1 of trade that we would lose through building the Cunnamulla line we would gain £10 of trade that would come in by the Tweed River. (Hear, hear!) I was pleased to hear the Premier say he intended to build that line from Coolangatta to South Brisbane on the 4 feet 8½ inches gauge. The Government of which I was a member built that last section of railway to the Tweed River, and we made provision in the formation and in connection with the bridges and tunnels for a 4 feet 8½ inches gauge to be carried over them. We recognised that it would be a good thing to join with New South Wales some day, and it would be better to have that 70 miles built on the 4 feet 8½ inches gauge. More than that I would not support. I think that the 3 feet 6 inches gauge is the best gauge for Queensland, and it will be good enough to develop Queensland with.

Mr. RYAN: You advocate that the Western line should not start from Blackall.

HON. R. PHILP: I think it would be better for Queensland and better for Rockhampton if that line started from Longreach instead of from Blackall. I said so last session, and I always said so. I hope that the Minister will make due inquiry before he goes too far with that extension. Of course the extension must go on, as we want to connect our Western lines, but let us make no mistake at the start.

Mr. RYAN: You want the line to go north and south from the Central division?

HON. R. PHILP: No; I want the North, Centre, and South to get their legitimate

[*Hon. R. Philp.*]

business—no more, no less. It would be a mistake to take the line from there to Windorah, as it would rob the South.

Mr. RYAN: Did not Winton rob the Central district?

HON. R. PHILP: No. I lived in Townsville before there was a mile of railway built there, and the trade of Winton came to Townsville then. I was a storekeeper in Townsville, and I started the first man who started in Winton. He shifted to Pelican Waterhole, which is now Winton, and set up in business. The trade on Winton always belonged to Townsville, and only went to Rockhampton for a few years after the extension of the line to Longreach was carried out. If you come to distances, Longreach is much nearer to Townsville than it is to Rockhampton. That may seem strange. Yet the Townsville people do not want the Longreach trade.

Mr. HARDACRE: And Charleville is nearer to Rockhampton than to Brisbane.

HON. R. PHILP: Quite so, and the Rockhampton people do not want the Charleville trade. If you carry the line to Tobermory you escape all the good sheep country, and the line will not pay. If you take it to Eromanga you get the bulk of the sheep traffic and the line will pay.

Mr. ALLEN: Why not go to Windorah?

HON. R. PHILP: That would be better still, but we cannot advocate Windorah, as our Central Queensland friends will say that we are robbing them.

Mr. RYAN: I should think so.

HON. R. PHILP: I would be satisfied to see the line go to Eromanga.

Mr. RYAN: The experts are against that connection altogether.

HON. R. PHILP: Mr. Amos was not sure whether to recommend Charleville to Windorah, or Charleville to Tobermory, but something between the two places might meet the objections of the South and Centre. It does not affect the North at all. Nor would it affect the Centre if they continued the line from Longreach south-west. Longreach is 60 miles west of Blackall, and you would save all that mileage if you adopted Longreach instead of Blackall. At the present time the Blackall line will only be in competition with the Longreach line. It is, perhaps, a serious thing to say that we made a mistake last year, but I am more convinced than ever that we made a mistake when we ran the line as we did last year. If you look up my speech you will see what I said on that occasion, and I repeat it now. Build the line to Eromanga now, and some day you will have to build another line from Cunnamulla to Thargomindah. If the line is taken to Tobermory, then that line to Thargomindah will never be built. I advise my Central friends to seriously consider if it would not be better to go from Longreach instead of from Blackall.

Mr. RYAN: There is room for both.

HON. R. PHILP: In time we will get both, but at the present time one is ample. I hope that the Minister will consult his officials, because they know more about it since they have been out there than they did when the line was passed.

Mr. HARDACRE: Would you advise him to accept this amendment, as it would mean an infringement of policy?

HON. R. PHILP: There is no infringement of policy about it. It is a matter of detail only.

Mr. RYAN: Make it more Queen street.

HON. R. PHILP: Queen street has nothing to do with it. One hon. gentleman on that side talked about Messrs. Tolmie, Grant, and Macartney being Queen-street Ministers. Why, Mr. Tolmie comes from Toowoomba, and Mr. Grant from Rockhampton, and Mr. Macartney from Brisbane.

Mr. FOLEY: No one from the North.

HON. R. PHILP: Mr. Paget comes from the North. There are not many on this side who represent Northern seats. There were only two, and Mr. Paget was selected, and I think they made a very good selection. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. FOLEY: What about yourself?

HON. R. PHILP: I was like you, I was not a candidate. (Laughter.) I do not think the Minister would be altering the Government policy to take the line the way I suggest. The trade in the Central district would not be injured at all.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: You advocated last year linking up closer, and that is what we wanted.

HON. R. PHILP: As we know the country better we can come in closer. I have an open mind on the matter. This House should not take sides on railways. Every railway brought in should be left for the House to decide. Every line I brought in in this House not one was made a party question. In fact, I brought in one railway that I voted against myself. (Laughter.) Sir Hugh Nelson always laid it down that there should be a distinct vote of the House on every railway, and they should not be party questions at all. I was defeated on railway proposals, but I did not look on them as defeats of the Government. I voted against several railways brought in by the Government—for instance, Port Alma. I also voted against the Childers Railway. I gave the Government good sound advice on that line, and they will find it out.

Mr. HARDACRE: You gave good advice about Port Alma too.

HON. R. PHILP: But I am only one individual in the House. I think it is my duty to tell the House what I know about railways and what I know about the country, and I know more about these lines now than I did when they were going through last year. I have seen Eromanga and consulted the people there, and they laugh at the idea of going to Tobermory. There is nothing in

Tobermory to go for, and I think [7.30 p.m.] the hon. member for Mitchell can tell you that too. There was a diversity of opinion on the other side of the House, too, about this matter; we were not all of the one opinion. A great deal of that trade is coming to Brisbane now, and will continue to come here no matter what line we build. I do not know that the Brisbane people want to get any trade belonging to the Central district, nor should the Central district want to get trade coming to Brisbane, and I believe in carrying that line to Eromanga. They want to take it to Eromanga, but by a roundabout way. It would be wise now to take the line from Wallal to Eromanga, and I think it would be wise also to consider the question of connecting it with Longreach instead of with Blackall. That is not so much my concern. It is a matter for the Western members in the House and

the Government themselves. I thought it was a bold scheme last year, and I think so now. I think it is a splendid idea to extend out our Western railways. All the Western railways pay well now. They are the best paying lines in Queensland, and there is no reason to doubt if they are carried further west on the proper lines, they will pay. I congratulate the Government in the programme they have put before us this year. I hope they will carry through most of their measures. In detail, I do not suppose all members will agree, but I say it is an honest endeavour to do something for the people of Queensland. I am glad also to be able to congratulate the people of Queensland on their present prosperous conditions. I hope the good seasons will be long continued, and I hope we shall continue to bring more people here to enjoy those conditions. (Hear, hear!) I hope the Government will keep up to their spirited public works policy. I am quite satisfied it is the policy we want. It is the policy we can carry out now, and perhaps in ten years' time, when the £1 5s. a head will cease, we may not be in a position to carry it out. We want something to fall back on when that £1 5s. a head ceases, and I say if a proper public works policy is carried out then we might be independent of any assistance we get from the Federal Government.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

\* Mr. PAYNE (*Mitchell*): I am going to open my remarks on this question by pointing out some of the measures that are omitted in the Government programme, and which I think should have been included. The statement of the Premier the other night in telling the House he was not prepared to introduce a Trade Disputes Bill seems to me an extraordinary thing. It is extraordinary when we recognise that a great number of members on the Government side of the House are pledged to a Trade Disputes Bill. At the last general election a number of members on that side of the House went before the electors of Queensland and made capital out of this particular measure. They went to great extremes, and I may say to a great expense, in boosting up the fact that they were supporting a Trade Disputes Bill.

HON. R. PHILP: Will you guarantee it will stop all disputes?

Mr. PAYNE: No, but I think it would go in that direction. It does seem extraordinary, after all the boasting, and all the talk about democracy in Queensland, for the leader of the Government to get up and say he is not prepared to place a measure that they have in England on the statute-book of Queensland. The hon. member who has just resumed his seat pointed out the great inconvenience that the Rights in Water and Water Conservation Act is creating in some parts of Queensland. I intend to have a good deal to say on that matter, because that particular question has been brought prominently before my notice during the recess. I find that that Act is creating great hardship in my electorate. Two selectors—Mr. Ferguson of Westbourne, and Mr. Blythe of Aramac—approached me and distinctly told me they have been waiting four or five months for permission to sink a bore. Any hon. member who has any common sense and who knows anything of the surroundings of Western Queensland, must know very well it is a great hardship for a man to be four or five months in securing water for his stock. As a matter:

*Mr. Payne.]*

of fact, the whole of his stock might have died in the meantime, or, apart from that, he would be put to the expense of shifting them somewhere else. Then again, a plant to do this work is not always available in Western Queensland, and the men who own plants are not going to wait four or five months to sink an artesian or a sub-artesian bore for any particular man, because the demand for that kind of work out there is pretty great just now. There is no doubt about the hardship that has been created in both those cases. Again, Mr. Ferguson, of Westbourne, who is a man of more than ordinary intelligence, distinctly told me that it would require a surveyor to fill up the form of application. I have seen one myself—a sketch plan, and the mode of applying for this permission, and I confess to this House that the whole thing was foreign to me, and I really would not have known how to fill in this form to make application for permission to sink a bore. The whole thing is ridiculous. I said last year, when the Act was being discussed, that it was the most lopsided measure ever introduced in the House, and I say so now. I think it is the duty of the Government, if they do not care about introducing an amending Bill, to at once alter the regulations in such a way that they will relieve the people who are suffering hardship at the present time.

Mr. HAMILTON: The regulations are the whole trouble.

Mr. PAYNE: It is said the regulations demand three cases from the surface to the bottom. I am not a man who knows everything, but I claim to have a little practical knowledge of artesian bores, and while it may be a wise thing for the Government to see that all artesian bores in the future are sunk in such a way that they will permit, if necessary, of them being closed down without injury—I say while that may be wise, I think it is altogether wrong for this Government or any other Government to enforce extra expense on anyone who is trying to develop this country. I am very doubtful whether it is necessary to have three cases from the surface. I have read portion of the matter that was sent along to Mr. Blythe, and I find the department are demanding a special brand of casing. That may be all right.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: They have allowed other casing to be used when there was not sufficient procurable of the special brand of casing.

Mr. PAYNE: They may have allowed it. I am telling the Minister what has actually taken place, and I am not adding one iota. While it may be a wise thing to demand a good quality of casing, still the matter should be considered when they talk about demanding three sets of casing from the surface to the bottom. The whole of the regulations want altering without a moment's delay. I do not think the present Government is wilfully putting obstacles in the way of people who want to get on in business. I do not think any sane body of men would want to do that, but I may tell the Government they have been doing that as far as this Act is concerned. What they are doing at the present moment I do not know.

The PREMIER: They are getting the regulations amended. I can tell you that.

Mr. PAYNE: I hope the Government will pay attention to this matter at once, because

[Mr. Payne.

what I have said I have said in an honest way, and I have got the information from the men direct. Something has also been said in reference to the railways that were passed last year. I remember on that occasion I pointed out that the routes were altogether wrong. As a matter of fact, I moved an amendment to substitute Longreach for Blackall, but it was defeated. I say again, after going over the country and listening to the men who have been there years and years, men not directly interested in the railways one way or the other—they say Longreach should be the starting place for that line, and not Blackall. I also pointed out that the line should go direct from Charleville.

The PREMIER: Direct from Charleville?

Mr. PAYNE: Direct from Charleville to Adavale. If you live long enough in Queensland, and meet me later on—

The PREMIER: Hereafter? (Loud laughter.)

Mr. PAYNE: I do not mean what the hon. gentleman means, although I do not mind if he meets me there. Western men who know the country and have no interest one way or the other—it does not matter a straw which way the railway runs—those men who have travelled and worked in that country laugh when they hear of a line being run from Wallal to Tobermory. I said last year it runs in a dog's hind leg kind of fashion, and will really be of no good to anyone. I say again that line should run direct from Charleville to Adavale, and straight on across the Cooper at the only good crossing on the Cooper—on the old Windorah crossing that has been there for thirty odd years. I do not know whether it is generally known that between that crossing and the South Australian border, six months after a heavy rain no man can cross the Cooper, yet you are running the line between that crossing and the South Australian border. It is a peculiar thing that in the old days, when they had no scientific knowledge, the bullock-drivers always discovered the best routes for our railways. What is known as the Seven-mile Crossing on the Cooper, which has been used for the last thirty years for road traffic, is practically the only crossing on the Cooper, and that is where the railway should cross. It is 7 miles on the Windorah road towards Charleville. I hope that the Government will, even at his late stage, give the matter earnest consideration, and, if possible, alter the route so as to serve the best interests of the people. I also notice the following paragraph in the Governor's Speech:—

“My advisers are therefore making earnest and, it is thought, successful efforts to encourage immigrants of the most suitable type to settle amongst us. It is confidently hoped that the recent appointment of special immigration agents in England, Scotland, and Ireland will have results in the highest degree satisfactory.”

I cannot pass over this matter without saying that this House should take some notice of Dr. Taylor's remarks in another place. I think it is the duty of the Government to see that our female immigrants on the voyage out are protected in such a way that they do not land here in the state which Dr. Taylor describes. As far as immigration is concerned, I have always thought that if the Government would make the conditions of the country better you would have the very best class of immigrants coming of

their own accord. If we were to devote the money spent in immigration to bettering the conditions of our own native population the result would be marvellous within five years. I have heard a good deal about placing immigrants on the land; year after year I have heard members on the Government side say that these immigrants are not coming to compete against the ordinary labourer, but to fill up our spare places. Why, there are hundreds of our native-born who cannot get land! Take the three selections which were opened in my electorate last year—one on Rodney and two on Beaconsfield, for which there were over 100 applicants for each block. The first thing the Government should do is to see that the people who are already here get a chance; as a matter of fact, I think the Government have been trying to push the people off the land. The hon. member for Gregory made some remarks in reference to a case that happened in my electorate. On the resumed portion of Evesham there was one man who was fortunate enough to draw last year, and when he got permission to occupy, he discovered that the boundaries were not those originally indicated. I am sorry that the Minister is not here. I have the maps here, and there is no doubt this was a very glaring case. The result was that the man was compelled to forfeit his selection, because they had taken every particle of water that was on the selection. That kind of thing speaks for itself. This is the map of the selection which I have here. Then I have another map, which I call a secret map, because it was never issued to the public; it was sent along to the shire council, and it shows that the whole of the stock route and this particular water was cut off. I will hand these maps to the Minister. I have made some inquiries, and find that the whole thing was done in the Surveyor-General's Office. I have never seen the Surveyor-General, but if he is going to stop people from going on the land in this way, what is the use of the officers of the Lands Department interfering in the matter at all? What is the use of their being anxious to place people on the land if there is an officer of the Survey Department who does this kind of thing? It is a great shame that a map should be issued to the general public defining the boundaries, and a map then comes out depriving a man of the whole of the watercourse. I understand that the selection is to be opened on the 8th of next month, with the water portion included. While speaking on land matters, there was an amendment suggested in the Land Bill last session which the Minister would not accept. It came from the other place, and appeared to me to be a good amendment, and I am sorry that members on our own side did not see their way to support it—that is, partnerships in selections. I have thought the matter over since, and am certain I was correct in what I said then. I am certain that it would have been one of the best means of getting some of our Western men settled on the land. There might be two or three shearers with sufficient money between them to take up a selection, and one might reside on it, and the other make good money until such time as they got a start. Someone said during the debate that it would get back into the hands of the big moneyed man. Let me say that there is not one selection in the whole of Central Queensland which has not started business with borrowed money from financial institutions. I can see no difference

between allowing a man to go to a financial institution to borrow money and allowing him to go in as a partner with a man who has the money, simply by giving him an interest in the holding. What difference is there between that and two men going into partnership in anything else? There is no argument in saying that if you have to go to a man for money that in the end he will lose the lot, because if that were true the banks would hold all the selections in Central Queensland. There is only one industry in Central Queensland, and that is grazing, and there is not one selector who has been able to start without assistance either from a financial institution or some friend who had money. I hope the Government will reconsider this matter of partnerships in selections. (Hear, hear!) There would be no corruption at all. Nearly all the Western members have a keen knowledge of that locality, and they know there would be nothing wrong to allow two workmen to legitimately go partners [8 p.m.] in a selection. I hope that the Government will consider the matter, and include that provision in the land laws of the State. There is one paragraph in the Speech on which I wish to say a few words, and that is the paragraph dealing with the recent referendum. It reads—

"It is a matter for rejoicing that at the recent referendum the Commonwealth Government's proposals, which, if adopted, would have made a serious inroad into the self-governing powers of the States, were rejected by an overwhelming majority. In consequence of this rejection, it has been suggested by the Government of New South Wales that a conference of State Premiers be held in order to discuss whether it might not be desirable to surrender to the Commonwealth certain legislative rights, which, it is contended, the States cannot exercise as effectively as the Commonwealth. My advisers have no objection to the holding of such a conference, and will welcome the fullest discussion of the subject referred to."

It is gratifying to know that even the Government of Queensland recognise that some of the powers which were asked for by the National Parliament last year can be better exercised by the Federal Parliament than by the State Parliament. But it appears to me a piece of front for any Government to make such a suggestion as is contained in that paragraph after the people of the Commonwealth had said at the ballot-box that they were against any such alteration. I am sorry that the referendum was not carried, but seeing that the people decided against the proposals submitted, I think the Government should wait in this matter until the people reverse or modify their expressed opinion. As far as I can judge, the Commonwealth Parliament last year simply asked powers which the framers believed the Commonwealth Parliament possessed under the Constitution. That opinion is borne out by facts. The framers of the Constitution were satisfied that the Federal Parliament had certain powers, until the High Court decided that they were not acting within the four corners of the Constitution. Even the Reid Government brought in a Bill providing that the National Parliament should determine what wages should be paid to persons employed on and around railways in the Commonwealth, and that measure was supported by Mr. Cook. But the High Court ruled that it was not constitutional. The Deakin Government, believing that the Commonwealth Parliament possessed certain powers, passed a measure dealing with

*Mr. Payne.*]

the new protection, and that, too, was ruled out by the High Court. Those facts show that members of the Federal Parliament were under the impression that the National Parliament had the power they asked for last year. The Act with reference to compensation to seamen is ridiculous as interpreted by the High Court. The court has ruled that if a seaman travelling between Melbourne and Sydney meets with an accident, he is entitled to compensation, but that if he meets with an accident travelling between Sydney and Newcastle he is not entitled to compensation, because he is travelling within the waters of one State. It would be far better to have no law at all providing for compensation to seamen than a law of that kind. Despite all that has been said about State rights, I hope that before very long the people of the Commonwealth will give this matter an honest consideration. If they do, I am satisfied that they will give the National Parliament the power to do national work. One would imagine when listening to the Premier that the National Parliament of Australia asked for powers which were not enjoyed by any National Parliament in the civilised world. I have looked up this matter, and I find that such powers are possessed by the National Parliaments in Canada, South Africa, Germany, and Switzerland. In Germany, whatever the Reichstag does is law. In Canada they have a court, but that court has the power of appointing officials who move the whole concern. South Africa is really a unification of States, because they have provinces with a national Parliament, which is the dictator in everything. It appears to me that the people of Australia made a great mistake in following too slavishly the American system of federation when framing the Commonwealth Constitution. The framers of the Constitution had the advantage of knowing the defects of the American Constitution, and of the great evils that exist there with reference to combines and trusts, which cannot be effectively dealt with by the States. The opinion I have expressed is confirmed by a letter I read in the *Courier* last year, in which a cattle-breeder from Australia who had visited America stated that if trusts got their hands on the herds of Australia as trusts had got their hands on the herds of America, it would be a sorry day for Australia. But while I say that if we are going to have a National Parliament we should give that Parliament power to do national work, I do not mean to intimate that it is possible for one Parliament to do the whole of the internal work of the different States. A Parliament sitting at Yass-Canberra could not do the whole of the internal work of Queensland as well as it could be done by a local Parliament. As a matter of fact, I am in favour of cutting up Queensland into a number of smaller States. Ever since we have been a separate State this Assembly has been controlled by Brisbane and the metropolitan area. As one representing a country district, I know only too well what that means. What amount of Government money is spent in country electorates compared with the amount spent in the Southern electorates? In my own electorate, which is absolutely one of the best revenue-producing districts in Queensland, the only Government money circulated is a few pounds now and then lent to the local shire councils, and that money is paid back with interest. I say the Longreach Railway Station is a disgrace to

[*Mr. Payne.*]

any Government, and I have been advocating the erection of a new station there for a long time, but with no success. I have pointed out the inconveniences of the present station, and the Government always say that they have no money available to make the necessary improvements and build a better station. The revenue from that place last year amounted to £60,000 or £70,000; and though the Government have no money to spend on a new railway station there, they can spend £7,000 or £8,000 in a district where the revenue does not amount to £8,000. That is not a fair thing, and I hope the Government will take the matter seriously into consideration, and give a better deal to the Western portions of the State. Very few Ministers bother their heads to go to those parts of the State. As long as they get revenue from them that is all they care about. I think it is the duty of the Government to take some notice of the petitions which have been sent in to the Railway Department with regard to this particular railway station.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: What railway is that?

Mr. PAYNE: I think the Minister will find a pile of papers in his office dealing with the matter.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You mean the Longreach Railway Station?

Mr. PAYNE: Yes.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I thought you wanted a railway?

Mr. PAYNE: Yes, I want a railway too. I moved an amendment on a railway proposal last year to take the extension from Longreach instead of from Blackall, and I should like to see that proposal adopted. In any case, I think the Government ought to attend to the matter of the Longreach Railway Station. I have brought the matter before successive Ministers, and they have always told me that there was no money available for the purpose. In reply I have asked, Where is all the money that the Government have drawn from the district? but have got no satisfactory answer to my query. The fact is they spend the money down here, which is not a fair thing. There is a list of measures in the Speech, including a Bill to amend the Agricultural Bank Act, a Bill to amend the State Education Act, and so forth, but I shall say nothing about them. I should, however, like to say a few words about the proposed Bill to amend the Workers' Dwellings Act. I have had a great many applications from persons who have already built a house, but not under the provisions of that Act, and who want money to make improvements to their houses. But I find that they cannot get advances under the present Workers' Dwellings Act. It appears to me that if a man has a decent building on the place it is really more of an asset to the Government than a bare allotment. I cannot see why that man should not have some consideration extended to him to improve a house that was not built under the provisions of this Act.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: That would be a dangerous thing to start.

Mr. PAYNE: How dangerous? I put it in my own way, and I would like you to point out where it is dangerous. The thing is as simple as walking out of this Chamber. Under the present Act if a man has an allotment of ground you will advance him a sum



of money to build a house, but if a man has got a house and a piece of ground and he wishes to enlarge that house, he cannot avail himself of the facilities of this Act. I say that the man with the house and land is a bigger asset than the man with the bare allotment. Where is the risk?

**THE SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS:** That is a different matter.

**Mr. PAYNE:** You said there was a risk. I reckon that the man with the house has a right to come to the Government and ask for money to put up two or three rooms. I hope the Government will give the matter consideration. I hope they will also give consideration to the administration of the Water Conservation Bill. I hope they will move in this matter of the Water Conservation Bill at once. It is an urgent matter so far as the Western people are concerned, especially those who want water. It is getting a dry time there now. I do not suppose any body of men would wilfully keep people from getting water, but that is exactly what this Government is doing.

**Mr. HARDACRE (Leichhardt):** We all listened with a great deal of pleasure to the speech of the senior member for Townsville. In his remarks he displayed a great deal of practical knowledge and a great deal of sagacious wisdom. The hon. gentleman's speech was very interesting, especially his strong comments which were in opposition to the views held by the party he is following. I do not intend to-night to discuss the various Bills mentioned in the Governor's Speech, because I think it will be much better to deal with them when they come forward. The Governor's Speech gives me a chance of making some general observations which I propose to take advantage of to-night. First of all I think it is due to myself to make some remarks about the death of the late Hon. J. T. Bell, as one who came into the House in the same year as he did. I have to express a few words as a tribute to his memory. I knew him in this Chamber as a private member, as a Minister, and as Speaker of this House. I think that as Minister for Lands he made a most excellent Minister. I have always said that he made perhaps one of the best Ministers for Lands who ever occupied that position since I have been in the Chamber. He carried out a real progressive administration of the department. As Speaker, I feel sure I am expressing the opinions of all when I say that he upheld the high dignity of that position as a Speaker should do. As a private member—in fact, in all capacities—although politically opposed to me, he was always courteous, and he always showed himself to be not only a scholar and an excellent administrator, but also a gentleman. I also wish to express my deep appreciation of the Chief Secretary's expression of deep sorrow at the ill-fated disaster which happened to the "Yongala," and I am glad to note that that sorrow is not felt merely by one party in this House but by all parties. I wish to offer my congratulations to the Chief Secretary on attaining the very high position he occupies to-day, a position which I believe came to him without any self-seeking on his own part. I also desire to say that I think he will be an improvement on his predecessor. I think he will bring in this House more kindness and courtesy towards members of the Opposition, which will conduce to the better carrying on of the business of the House. The late Pre-

mier, the Hon. W. Kidston, was alleged to be a strong man. Well, I am of the opinion that we have a man in the position of Chief Secretary who is in reality a much stronger man than the hon. gentleman who previously occupied that position. The Premier gave us a little story from Æsop's Fables the other day, and I hope he will not object to my eulogistic use of another of Æsop's Fables, which I might apply to him and his predecessor. The sun and the south wind had a dispute as to which was the stronger of the two, and they entered into a contest to prove it, the winner being the one who could soonest make a traveller take off his coat. The wind blew with great vigour, but this only had the effect of making the traveller wrap his coat more closely about him. Then the sun took a turn, and, shining out in all his kindness, his warm rays had the effect of making the traveller remove his coat. I am of opinion that the courtesy of the Chief Secretary will lead to a return of courtesy from members on this side of the House, and it will lead to the better conduct of the business of the Chamber rather than having continual irritation and antagonism and trouble such as was caused by the self-willed obstinacy and bad temper sometimes displayed by the late Premier, who, with all his many other qualities, had those defects. Whilst expressing my congratulations to the Premier, I should also like to express my wonder and surprise at the mysterious disappearance from the political life of this House of the late Premier, the Hon. W. Kidston. It is a remarkable thing and a strange thing indeed that the hon. gentleman, in the full vigour of his life and ambition, engaged with high schemes, great railway schemes, and other matters of policy, should suddenly disappear from political life.

**Mr. RYAN:** His party would not carry out the Rockhampton programme.

**Mr. HARDACRE:** He was here one day in the full vigour of political ambition, and another day he goes—whisked out of political life, as it were, by some power of necromancy; or, to put it in another way, as suddenly as if he fell through a trap-door. (Laughter.) I thought we would have had some explanation from the Premier as to how that sudden and mysterious disappearance came about.

**Mr. RYAN:** It was because they would not carry out the Rockhampton programme.

**Mr. HARDACRE:** There seems to be a dark and fearsome mystery about it, as dark and fearsome as the fate of the "Yongala," and I feel certain that it is the duty of the Premier to give this House and the country some explanation of it as to why the hon. gentleman so suddenly disappeared from political life. Hon. gentlemen opposite maintain a strange silence over this matter. Let me say that it is quite certain that the Hon. Mr. Kidston did not intend to retire from political life so suddenly, because we know that at the closing hours of the last session the leader of the Opposition asked Mr. Kidston if he was going to Great Britain, and he replied: "In any case if I do I will be here when the House meets next July." So it is certain that he did not intend to disappear as he did.

**Mr. RYAN:** He is condemning the present Government for their administration.

**Mr. HARDACRE:** We have from the inspired organ which the leader of the Opposition quoted the other night, an organ which

*Mr. Hardacre.]*

I believe is subsidised by the present Government, an account of the late Premier's intentions, and it expresses some surprise at his disappearance. In an article following the retirement of the late Premier the *Sun* had this commentary—

"When Mr. Kidston introduced his great railway policy, and passed the measures which place his name highest on the scroll of political fame, it was his intention to stay on and see those schemes carried to a conclusion. There were loans to be negotiated, and there was a splendid emigration scheme to be pushed, more especially in Scotland, and he had made up his mind to keep busy through the recess so that he might forget the buffets fate had dealt him. He went to Sydney and Melbourne, rousing the State politicians to the dangers that threatened the States by impending though disguised unification. In New South Wales and Victoria it was thought that the referenda would be rejected, and he manifested his belief that if Queensland were thoroughly roused to the danger she, too, would decide in the negative. There Mr. Kidston's public career stops short."

I think it is due to the House and the country that the Premier, or some one on the Government side, should give an explanation as to why, under these circumstances, the late Premier's political career suddenly stopped there. They remain silent, and as the Premier will not give any explanation of it, it is just as well that I should do so myself from the information which I have with regard to it.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HARDACRE: The information is rather startling. We know that the late Premier was a man who, whatever his merits may have been, somehow or other always caused trouble. I have said here, as was quoted by one of the Northern papers some years ago, that he was a man who would kill any party he belonged to. I predicted when he joined the present Conservative party that there would be trouble within six months if he did so, and I was not far out. We know what happened last session. We know that there was discontent over there, that he caused enemies amongst his own camp, as we are told by some little bird whispering in our ears, whether correct or not—if it is not correct, we might get a better explanation from those who know the circumstances. At any rate, we were told that, as a result of the dissension which was caused in the Government camp last year, after the session closed there was a caucus meeting—there were three caucus meetings amongst the discontented malcontents in his camp. They

formed a sort of cave of Adullam, [8.30 p.m.] and when the late Premier came back from Victoria with the intention of rousing Queensland to the danger that threatened them in the Federal proposals, he was informed by the present Premier as to the great danger that threatened him. There had been three caucus meetings of the discontents, who were determined to depose the late Premier. (Government laughter.) This happened on the Saturday after Mr. Kidston returned, and suddenly on the Sunday morning there was a great hurrying to and fro, like what happened on the eve of the battle of Waterloo. There was a great hurrying of cabs, motor-cars, and bicycles, and I understand from my informant—from an inspired source, I may tell hon. members—that the present Premier, who, I might say, had no

[Mr. Hardacre.

thought of occupying his present position, begged and prayed of the late Premier not to retire from the Premiership—he thought there might be grave danger. But the late Premier saw at that time that there was a job open for him, and he was inclined to take that job. Little did we think when we were criticising the late members of the Land Court last session that we were making a billet for life for the late Premier, Mr. Kidston. (Laughter.) It was that or nothing. He saw his game was up. However, the late Premier obtained the position in the long run, and the result was he retired from the Premiership, and then came the question as to who was to be his successor. We are told there were a number of aspirants for the position, that the malcontents did not want the present Premier to get the position. In fact, there were five or six malcontents, each of whom wanted the Premiership. It was a question of who was to be "top dog," and my confidential adviser tells me—

Hon. R. PHILP: Does he give you regular advice?

Mr. HARDACRE: That at this particular caucus meeting a few confidential friends of the geographic Minister for Rockhampton, the Minister for the Central district, wanted it, and the Home Secretary wanted it, and he said, "Well, if they wanted to be top dog, I might as well try and be the top dog too." (Laughter.) And then the late Premier, who was sitting on a back seat, said, "No, no, George, take my advice, and let the hon. member for Oxley be Premier at present. There will be trouble when the House meets, and we know you have always been a democrat. That will be your time. You can then take the Labour party's programme, and the position is yours." (Laughter.) Possibly that accounts for the Home Secretary's statement the other night that he was a State socialist. (Renewed laughter.) It appears to me it is the beginning of the hon. gentleman's intention to follow the advice of the late Premier. But there is also another little mystery about this matter that wants clearing up, and that is why, when the late Premier retired from the position, he did not go home and float that loan, which the newspapers said he was going to do.

Hon. R. PHILP: Were not you sent for?

Mr. HARDACRE: I am sorry to say I was not, but I understand the hon. member was very sore because he was not sent for. We know very well that the newspapers were full of accounts and predictions as to what was going to be done by the late Premier, and I must say, when I was told he was going to take a position on the Land Court, I simply could not believe it. It appeared to me to be incredible that the strong man, who had been practically emperor, who posed, at any rate, as the Napoleon of Queensland, should descend to the little miserable tin-pot position of becoming a member of the Land Court. It appeared to me very much like a lion becoming a mouse. It seemed a ridiculous absurdity, after the hon. gentleman's career, to come down and occupy that position—a very undignified ending to his political career.

Mr. FERRICKS: It is the best he could get.

Mr. HARDACRE: However, there is another mystery that wants clearing up—why he did not go home to float that loan? We know the newspapers were full of what

he was going to do in that respect. First he was, and then he wasn't. One day he was to go, and the next day it was not true—he was not going; and we have had no explanation how it was that, after it was proposed that he should go, he was asked, or compelled, as the case may be, to retire from that position. I have also information on that matter. I understand there was a condition attaching to his retirement—that he should be sent home to float the loan. But there had to be another caucus meeting on board the "Lucinda"—the new Premier had to meet his party and explain his position, and get them also to accept him as Premier. There was a caucus meeting on the "Lucinda," and there was a violent quarrel in that caucus, and the senior member for Townsville, I understand, when the position was put to him—that one of the conditions of retirement of the late Premier was that he should go home to float the loan—wanted to know who Mr. Kidston was now he was no longer Premier; why should they send him home? And so violent was the quarrel that the present Premier had to cancel that condition, and not only that, but he had to threaten, I understand, that if they did not accept him as Premier he would retire and advise His Excellency to send for the leader of the Labour Opposition. I do not know whether these accounts are true or not, but they, at any rate, are common rumour. They were, at the time, the general talk of the people of the State, and I think it is the duty, if these statements are not correct, of someone on behalf of the Government to get up and let the House and the country know something of the true state of affairs which led to the resignation of a man whom the country thought would continue in politics for some time longer. I do not want to say anything harsh about the late Premier. He is not here, and I think perhaps it is better left unsaid. In spite of the opposition I have given him, I have always had an undercurrent of liking for him and admiration of him. I have always said that he was a strange mixture of light and darkness. He had some very good qualities, and some which led to the disappointment of his friends. I will say no more than that. Now I have said that much, perhaps I had better get back to the question of the Governor's Speech. With regard to the Governor's Speech, I do not intend to deal with the number of Bills mentioned, but there are a number of general questions on which I desire to say a few words. First of all, I desire to express my pleasure at the proposed increase in the wages of the railway men. I think, considering the increased cost of living and the general prosperity of the State, it is a fair thing that those men should get the increase that is given to them, and I think we ought, in fairness, to compliment the Hon. the Secretary for Railways in giving them that increase. I agree, I think, with the leader of the Opposition in suggesting that there should be a validating or indemnatory Bill introduced this session for the purpose of validating the illegal financial transaction of last year, when a certain amount of money was put into a trust fund instead of into the public debt reduction fund. The Premier, in dealing with that matter, absolutely evaded the question at issue. He said that on inquiry from the Auditor-General or the Treasury Department he found there had been no accounts improperly paid. That is perfectly true, but that is not the charge made,

although I may say in that respect he said what was contrary to last year's Financial Statement, which said distinctly there was a number of accounts brought in before the usual time in order that they might be paid. However, that is not the charge. The charge that was proved up to the hilt last session was this: That there was a certain sum—something like £70,000—of last year's revenue paid into a trust fund, and not into the public debt reduction fund, as it should have been. It was paid in that way, and accounted for under the pretence that it was expenditure; and in support of that the Treasurer argued at considerable length that expenditure meant money that was devoted to a trust fund, as was done by the Commonwealth Parliament. I think it was clearly proved last session that that was a wrong interpretation, and the transaction was absolutely illegal, and therefore I say we should bring in a validating measure, particularly when some members of the present Cabinet were strongly opposed to the transaction last year. If nothing is done, it will form a precedent, and I think, for the sake of the future, we should clear up any doubt there may be as to the legality of the transaction. I was somewhat astonished at the Premier's explanation with regard to the offer of the Commonwealth Parliament to provide a loan for the State; and when I heard his explanation that the loan was merely for a short period, I changed my mind on that matter, and I think the Premier was perfectly justified in not accepting that offer for the limited number of years proposed.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: It was for four years.

The TREASURER: The terms were not good either.

Mr. HARDACRE: I think the terms were better than those obtained, because it would save all the flotation charges. At the same time I think everyone must admit that the loan floated was not a success. It may have been a success as compared with the previous loan, but the previous loan, as everyone knows, was one of the biggest loan failures we have had in Queensland.

Mr. FORSYTH: How do you make that out?

Mr. HARDACRE: It amounted to £95 per £100.

Mr. FORSYTH: It cost £3 14s. 1d. per cent.

Mr. HARDACRE: That may be, but I say it was one of our biggest loan failures.

The TREASURER: It was a great success.

Mr. HARDACRE: I do not think anybody can say it was a success, and it appears to me that, considering the very partial success of that loan, it does not augur very well for our success in obtaining the rest of the money to carry out our big railway policy that we have entered into, especially when you consider that we have a large amount of loans maturing in a few years from now. There is a good deal of sound wisdom in the suggestion of the hon. member for Fassifern, that some steps should be taken to meet the loans which will mature, and borrow money in Australia. It would be a good thing to take steps in advance, and not leave the thing to the last moment. We should open an office now for the purpose of selling maturing loan debentures to any one of the

*Mr. Hardacre.]*

investing public who might wish to take them up—something on the lines of our Savings Bank loans. We could get a great deal of money in a quiet way by selling debentures on such terms as might be considered fair, until the time comes to meet the loans.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: We would be paying double interest.

Mr. HARDACRE: We could be investing the money in the meantime, and getting interest for it. We might even offer to existing debenture-holders in London the exchange of new debentures for old debentures, on such fair terms as would be acceptable to them; it would be a good exchange for them and a good exchange for us. We all know that a long-dated debenture is much more valuable at the same terms than a short-dated debenture, just the same as a long pastoral lease is of more value than a short lease, because investors desire to have a long-dated investment if they can possibly get it. I am quite sure we could get a large number of these debentures taken up, and we should to that extent lessen the danger we shall probably incur when we have to float a big loan on the London market. The Governor's Speech opens with an expression of satisfaction at the unexampled prosperity of Queensland, but that has brought forth a good deal of comment, and I do not intend to labour the question. But whilst the prosperity is fairly general amongst the financial classes, the pastoral lessees, and others upon the land, it is by no means adequately shared in by all classes of the people. We know that the cost of living has increased enormously, and has to some extent absorbed any increase of wages, and it is really a question as to whether the bulk of the people have had any increase at all. In some cases there is no margin left, while in other cases there may be a small margin of advantage. In my opinion, there is nothing in the Government programme that will substantially improve the social condition of the people, and it is on those grounds that I oppose the Government programme. I have seen measures such as are proposed turned out session after session for the eighteen years I have been in Parliament, and I do not think there has been much good done. The Government policy is declared, as it has been declared again and again, to be one of material development by increasing population and settlement, but I do not think it is going to do anything substantial in increasing the real prosperity of the people of Queensland. It has been tried again and again in Australia, and if one looks back over the past they will be astonished. Seventy years ago, there was not a single person in South Australia, Queensland, or Victoria, and not a single ton of mineral of any kind except coal produced in Australia. To-day we have an enormous quantity of minerals mined every year. At that time there were only 50,000 acres under cultivation, and to-day we have something like 10,000,000 acres under cultivation. Sixty years ago there was not a single mile of railway in Australia, and to-day we have over 15,000 miles. Sixty years ago we had only 45 miles of telegraph line, but to-day there are innumerable miles, branching out through all parts of Australia. Sixty years ago there were only 5,000 vessels, of 500,000 tons burden; to-day we have something

[Mr. Hardacre.

like 20,000 ships of all kinds, of innumerable tonnage, and so on all through all branches of industry. But I question whether the people of Australia are improved at all, so far as their wages are concerned, to what they were at that time. From 1835 to 1888 was as good a time, as far as the workers were concerned, as to-day.

Hon. R. PHILP: That is the time in which so many came out to Queensland.

Mr. HARDACRE: I can prove that so far back as seventy years ago the conditions in Australia were just as good as they are to-day.

Hon. R. PHILP: Oh, no!

Mr. HARDACRE: On the authority of Coghlan—not in his Year Book, but another work—we are informed that in 1840 labourers in Sydney were paid 7s. to 8s. per day whilst mechanics got from 8s. to 12s. per day. Also I have a quotation from a report of the Immigration Commission in 1840 showing the state of the labour market there—

“Every department of industry is cramped, and no industry, public or private, can be prosecuted, except at an immense expense, owing to the exorbitant rates of wages and the inconceivable difficulty in procuring workers, servants, or mechanics upon any terms whatever.”

Hon. R. PHILP: I do not suppose there were twenty mechanics in the country.

Mr. HARDACRE: Oh! yes, there were. If we compare prices we shall find that the cost of living then was lower than it is to-day. I have here a list of the prices of that period—

“Bread, 2 lb. loaf, 2d. to 2½d.; beef, 1¼d. to 1½d. per lb.; mutton, 1¼d. to 2d. per lb.; butter (fresh), 1s. 9d. per lb.; bacon, 5d. per lb.; milk, 6d. per quart; vegetables in abundance; cabbages, 2d. each.”

The prices to-day are higher. Bread is 3½d. per 2 lb. loaf, beef from 5d. to 6d., mutton the same, butter 1s. 2d. a lb., milk the same price, and vegetables are even dearer. So if you take the general necessities of life at that time as far as food is concerned, and compare the wages of the time with those of to-day, you will find that, in spite of all the material development which has taken place, the conditions of the worker are practically no better than they were then.

Mr. GRAYSON: Butter and bacon were not so good then as they are now.

Mr. HARDACRE: That may be, but they were cheaper. I was reading an article in “Life” on a new book which was written. Discussing the question of progress, the writer says—

“I detest,” she quotes Herbert Spencer as saying, “that conception of social progress which presents as its aim increase of population, growth of wealth, spread of commerce. In this ideal of human existence there is contemplated quantity only, and not quality.”

I admit material development and increased production are good in themselves, but they do not go to the root of affairs; they do not affect those problems of our national life which I contend that any Government worthy of the name should aim to deal with and try to improve; they do not touch the social question. And after all, we must come to the inevitable con-

clusion that in this new country of ours, with all its resources, we are merely following in the steps of the older countries of the world. Banjo Paterson, in one his earlier poems, says—

THE NEW ORDER OF THINGS.

- "The olden days,  
The old bush life and all its ways,  
Are passing from us all unsung.
- "The freedom and the hopeful sense  
Of toil, that brought due recompense,  
Of room for all, has passed away,  
And lies forgotten with the dead.
- "Within our streets men cry for bread  
In cities built but yesterday.
- "About us stretches wealth of land,  
A boundless wealth of virgin soil,  
As yet unfruitful and untilled.  
Our willing workmen, strong and skilled,  
Within our cities idle stand,  
And cry aloud for leave to toil.
- "The stunted children come and go,  
In squalid lanes and alleys black;  
We follow but the beaten track  
Of other nations, and we grow  
In wealth for some, for others woe."

Even to-day, in this time of prosperity, if you go down to the other States where there is a bigger population, more development, more railways, and more of everything that we hope to obtain for ourselves, we shall find practically the conditions there, only not quite so bad, as obtain in the older countries of the world.

The TREASURER: There are many contributing factors.

Mr. HARDACRE: I read a statement a few days ago to the effect that in spite of all the great prosperity existing in the other States, they are actually going to appoint a commission in New South Wales to inquire into sweating. A few years ago Coghlan, in his Year Book, 1893-94, pointed out that in New South Wales the result of all the progress there had been to distribute the wealth in such a way that no less than 8 per cent. of the people of New South Wales owned half the wealth of the State, whilst half the population of New South Wales own no wealth, but depend for their livelihood upon the bare earnings of their [9 p.m.] labour. When we consider the startling figures given by the hon. member for Burke the other night with regard to the income tax in Queensland, we see that the people are not well off even in this State. The Government programme does not touch that big question, though it is within their province to deal with it. Just as it does not touch the social question, so also it fails to propose anything which is going to give us anything like permanent prosperity. It is true that we have to-day prosperity in a general sort of way in Queensland, but it is not due to anything the Government have done, except, perhaps, in the expenditure of money on public works. It is due to the good seasons which have prevailed, and to the high prices which all kinds of pastoral and other products have realised. It is one of those cycles of prosperity which come over and over again, and sooner or later—I hope it will be later—it will end in a period of depression, such as we have experienced in previous years. There is every indication that we are just going through a similar cycle of

prosperity to others that we have passed through in former times, and that it will end in a period of depression. If you go into the country you will find that fabulous sums have been paid for pastoral properties, that pastoral properties have been over-capitalised; you will also find in the towns that land is booming in price. It is common talk in the country that a reverse is bound to come. When I was up in the Central district I found that country which a few years ago would not be taken up even under an occupation license was now occupied—that a man had taken up 5,000 acres, disposed of it, and made £700 on his bargain after paying for all the improvements. I was told of another case out West, in which a man was asked what he would take for his grazing selection. He did not want to part with it, and he asked double the price he expected to get; the offer was accepted, and the purchaser went to Sydney and got £5,000 on his bargain. I was also told of another case in which a man bought a lease which had only three years to run for £25,000, and expected to get his money back with a profit in addition. These increased values in pastoral properties and the increased values of town lands all point to the fact that we are going along in the same old way that we have always gone, and that the prosperity, about which we are so jubilant, must end in a period of depression.

Mr. GRAYSON: That is not the fault of the Government.

Mr. HARDACRE: No; it is not the fault of the Government. But the Government are at fault in this respect: that they have nothing in their programme which attempts to guard against the depression that we know must come sooner or later, or which shows that they recognise that such a problem exists. Let me now say a few words with regard to immigration. Whilst we are introducing immigrants, we are also overlooking the very vital fact that the rate of increase in our population is gradually decreasing. There is a decreasing number of marriages and a decreasing number of births, and the general rate of increase in our population is most unsatisfactory. This is a matter to which Knibbs, at page 34, makes alarming reference. He says—

"The annual rate of increase in the Commonwealth population for the quinquennium 1901-6 was practically identical with the annual rate for Germany, the figures being, respectively, 1.49 per cent. and 1.47 per cent. In view of the sparsity of the population of Australia, and the recency of its settlement, this rate of increase, equal only to that of such a densely populated country as Germany, cannot be regarded as satisfactory. When contrasted with the growth of population in the United States, the comparison is even less favourable, since the annual rate of increase of that country for the period 1901-6 was 1.62 per cent. Further, if the increase in the population of the Commonwealth be compared with that of the United States under comparable conditions as to density of population, it will be seen that, whilst during the seventy years, 1790-1860, the population of the United States increased at a rate slightly more than 3 per cent. per annum, that of the Commonwealth during the ten years, 1900-1909, increased at a little more than half that rate."

It is a startling fact that since the commencement of civilisation in Australia the rate of increase in our population has been gradually diminishing. In the early days it was as high as 11 per cent., and to-day it has decreased to

Mr. Hardacre.]

something like 14 per cent. The rate of increase in Queensland is equally unsatisfactory. In the period 1881-1886 it was 8.42 per cent., in the period 1886-1891 it was 3.80 per cent., in the period 1891-1896 it was 2.49 per cent., in the period 1896-1901 it was 2.25 per cent., in the period 1901-1906 it was 1.15 per cent., and in the period 1906-1908 it was 1.60 per cent. On the whole there is a very considerable decrease. We have heard a great deal about race suicide lately. In this month's "Life" there is an article on the subject by Ex-President Roosevelt. It is rather long, but still it is worth quoting. Mr. Roosevelt says—

"One of the strangest and saddest things in the whole sad business is that the decline has been most marked in the very places where one would expect to see the abounding vigour of the race most strikingly displayed. In Australia and New Zealand there is no warrant whatever in economic conditions for a limitation of the birth rate, and the course of events in these great new countries demonstrates beyond possibility of refutation that the decline in the birth rate is not due to economic forces, and has no relation whatsoever to hard conditions of living. New Zealand is as large as Great Britain, and as fertile. Its population is between one-thirtieth and one-fortieth of that of Great Britain. It is composed of the sons and grandsons of the most enterprising and adventurous people in the old country, and the New Zealand people have realised to an extraordinary degree the institutional and industrial ambitions of democracy everywhere; yet the rate of natural increase in New Zealand is actually lower than in Great Britain, and has tended steadily to decrease. The Australians are sparsely scattered over the fringe of the great island continent. It is a continent which could support, without the slightest difficulty, tenfold the present population, and at the same time raise the general standard of well-being. Yet its sparse population increases so slowly that, even if the present rate were maintained, the population would not double itself in the next century; while, if the rate of decrease of the last decade continues, the population will have become stationary by the middle of the century."

That is a condition of things which demands more consideration on our part than the mere influx of a few thousand immigrants. I utterly deny Ex-President Roosevelt's statement that it is not due to economic conditions. I say it is due to economic conditions. It is an old saying among old country statisticians—a saying which is borne out by experience—that the marriage rate increases with the decrease in the price of corn, and decreases with the increase in the price of corn—in other words, that it decreases with the increase in the cost of living, and increases with the decrease in the cost of living. The figures I have quoted, and the condition of things existing here, show that we are just drifting into the same hard economic conditions of life as prevail in older countries, though not to the same extent yet. And I say there is nothing in the Government programme which proposes to deal with these matters, or which will in anywise alleviate or remedy them. The real remedy, in my judgment, is not in the Government policy, but in the policy put forth by the Labour party. The first part of the Labour policy which deals with that matter is the proposal to abolish the monopoly in land which exists in this country. We had a visit from the Scottish Agricultural Commissioners last year, and I think they put the case very well as far as Queensland is concerned. They visited the Kingaroy district,

[*Mr. Hardacre.*

and found that there were more applicants for land there than the land available would supply. The commissioners' remarks I shall not quote in full, but will just read the conclusion—

"Now, with reference to his difficulty, they had in this neighbourhood some excellent land, and about May next he understood that something like 76,000 acres was to be thrown open. It was admitted that there would be from six to fifty applications for each separate lot. It seemed to be quite certain that the whole area would very shortly be over-applied for. (Applause.) That meant that the people already in this country, and the people who were attracted to it from Victoria, New South Wales, and elsewhere, were on the lookout for this land, and were ready to take it up. That being so, it seemed that there were more people than could be supplied already. That was his difficulty. Say they had thrown land open, and twenty applied for it, and nineteen were disappointed—nineteen capable and worthy men, who would make good settlers—and they had to wait for their turn. Why, then, should Queensland ask to be sent immigrants when she could not supply her own people with land? (Hear, hear, and a voice: "It is speculation.") Mr. Morrison said he did not think it was speculation. Judging by the country side, they found people who were not speculators, but hard-handed working men, who were making the land a perfect garden of Eden. At any rate the commissioners did not propose to send out speculators at present. There seemed to be a large number of genuine settlers, farmers' sons and others, who could not be supplied with land. If that were so, when they were asked at home whether Queensland would be a good place for a man to go to, what could they say? If they could say that Queensland was a splendid country, and there was good farming land there, and they would do well there if they were the right kind of men, but there would be some difficulty about their getting Government land, they would reply, "That is a very strange land. They have something like 9,000,000 acres of land available for selection. How is it that we cannot get land?" He did not know why they could not. He could not explain it. He had been unable to see through it. But the present difficulty was, How could they recommend men to come and take up land in Queensland when Queensland could not supply the people who were already wanting it? Then, if they sent out immigrants and they could not get land, what would happen but that those people would go into some other employment, and go into the towns, which was exactly where Queensland did not want them. The rendering of land available seemed to be the first step in the whole business."

I have pointed out again and again that it is no use bringing immigrants from the old country if we have not got land to provide them with and other ways of absorbing them without detriment to the workers who are already here. We have had a good deal of discussion on the immigration question both on this side and on the other side of the House, and I have pointed out again and again that the whole clamouring of those who want immigrants brought out here is for the purpose of bringing them into competition with the labour in our own markets so as to lower wages. The argument has always been, "Let us have immigrants brought in here because we cannot obtain labour." If they wanted to obtain labour, they have a proper way of getting it, and that is to allow the law of demand and supply to operate in this case just as in any other case. If any particular article went up in price, what would members opposite say if we advocated that products of a similar nature should be brought in to meet the demand for it?

Or if we brought in a lot of doctors to compete with those already here, or if we brought in a lot of lawyers to compete with the lawyers here and to reduce fees, what would the lawyers say? And so we object when labourers are brought in here to come into competition with the labourers already here and cut down wages. In the first place that is what the immigrants do when they first come here—they lower wages. Later on they might create a larger demand for production, but in the first place they certainly come into competition with other labourers and bring down wages. We are not opposed to increasing the population. I am not opposed to immigration, but I think there is a better way than the Government propose, and that is to do away with the land monopoly that exists at the present time, not only in Queensland but in all the States of the Commonwealth. We are told sometimes that there is no land monopoly in Queensland. When the Land Monopoly Bill was sent up to another place some years ago they appointed a Select Committee to inquire into it. I have referred to this before, but on this occasion I am going to give the exact quotation. Mr. Scott, the Under Secretary for Lands, gave evidence before that Select Committee, and this question was asked of him—

“Has the country between the coast and the Main Range, in the Southern part of the State, been thoroughly explored for suitable land? Oh, yes. We generally regard it that all the land within 150 miles of Brisbane is disposed of, with the exception of the reserved areas.”

That is rather startling. There is not a single acre of land to be obtained within 150 miles of the principal city in Queensland. No wonder that we have our population crowded into the cities, and our women and children crowded into the large factories, when they are divorced from the soil in that way—when all the land within 150 miles from Brisbane has been locked up and alienated in such areas, and no wonder that we have no improvement in the condition of the masses of our people. Three years ago the *Courier* sent a special reporter to the Darling Downs, and he made this statement: That in the boundary of one shire alone there are estates in all of 500,000 acres. Some of these estates have since been taken up, but I will give them all as they existed a few years ago. They are Cecil Plains, 124,000 acres; Kurrowah Station, 53,000 acres; Condamine Plains, 33,000 acres.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That has gone.

Mr. HARDACRE: Yandilla Station, 50,000 acres.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That has gone.

Mr. HARDACRE: St. Ronans Station, 25,000 acres.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That has gone.

Mr. HARDACRE: Brookstead Station, 12,000 acres.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That has gone.

Mr. HARDACRE: Then the others were South Ruth Station, 13,000 acres; Westralian Station, 15,000 acres; Lemon Tree Station,

12,000 acres; Pine Creek Station, 16,000 acres; Leselican Station, 12,000 acres; St. Helens Station, 18,000 acres; and Pelton, 20,000 acres. Perhaps it is true that some of these have gone since that time. But only a day or two ago there was a letter sent to the *Brisbane Courier* which I think practically reasserted that state of affairs. In a letter to the *Courier* it was stated that in the Jondaryan Shire alone there were estates aggregating 250,000 acres within the council's boundaries than which none better for closer settlement could be found.

Mr. GRAYSON: That is quite true.

Mr. HARDACRE: The same thing occurs in other parts of Queensland. I think that this question of land monopoly is the biggest question before public life to-day. It affects every question that comes before Queensland at the present day. It affects the question of population. It affects the question of our increased cost of living. I consider that there ought to be a Select Committee, or Royal Commission, appointed to inquire into the question of the increased cost of living, but if we traced the real cause of the increased cost of living, it would be found to be due to three factors. It is due to the increased cost of labour, and it is the proper thing, too, that the workers should get some share of the increased prosperity. It is also attributable to some extent to the big tariff imposed by the Commonwealth Government, which increases the cost of importation and so increases the cost of production.

Mr. FORSYTH: Why do not they reduce it?

Mr. HARDACRE: I do not know. I know that in some cases it goes up as high as 35 per cent. of the actual total price, and in all departments of life it has materially contributed to the cost of living and has gone to swell the profits of the big factory-owners down South, and, as some of our sugar friends have told us, to swell the profits of the Colonial Sugar Refining Company. I heard a statement from an hon. member on this side that the tariff brought about an increased price of sugar to our own people, which went into the pockets of the Colonial Sugar Refining Company.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: That is a statement which cannot be verified.

Mr. HARDACRE: If that can be substantiated I should think that the people of the other States will soon rise and make short work of the tariff in that respect. But the real factor that has gone to increase the cost of living is the increased price of land. We know that the increased price of timber has gone to increase the cost of houses, and, naturally, the cost had to be passed on to the tenant. In the same way the increased price of land has gone to increase the price of all things. The vital question which concerns us more than anything else is the question of the increase in the price of our land. That is the raw material from which all wealth has to be produced. Our large cities exist and depend on it, and it is the biggest factor in our national life. Take our sugar question. Members to some extent did not go to the root of that question. I absolutely agree with them in every respect that the most of the profits go to the Colonial Sugar Refining Company. At the same time a bigger question is the increased price of

*Mr. Hardacre.]*

land. How can sugar-growing be made to pay when they had to pay £30, £40, and £50 an acre for land?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: If there is no profit in sugar-growing, why should they pay £30, £40, or £50 per acre for land?

Mr. HARDACRE: It does make a profit, but the profit goes to the owner of the land.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Your argument was that the profit went to the Colonial Sugar Refining Company.

Mr. HARDACRE: A big amount of it does, but it should not go there at all. It should go to the grower. The profits from our sugar-growing goes into the hands of the landowner and Colonial Sugar Refining Company, whereas it should go into the hands of the grower. We are not going to bring about the exportation of sugar by equalising the excise and bounty, [9.30 p.m.] but by doing something that will compel the land to come down in price, and so lessen the cost of production and leave bigger profits to those who grow it. This question of land monopoly has been put by our own party in one of its manifestoes in a very eloquent way. This is what it says—

“The Labour party wages war on monopolies, and the first and greatest monopoly to be attacked is that of the land. For it is here that the fundamental wrong against the people is committed. Once let the land upon which all are dependent pass out of their possession, and the opportunity of injustice is created and the seeds of evil sown for a bitter harvest.”

I say it is because we have parted with our lands that instead of any increase in wealth-production and the development we are making in different directions benefiting the working class, it is going to swell and increase the price of land and increase the cost of living, and the workers are little better off than they were before. There is only one proper remedy, and that is by taxing the value of the land. The value is created by the community, and it seems to me, apart altogether from the policy of the Labour party, it is a common-sense business proposition that the increase in value of the land created by the community by progress in all directions should be taken for public revenue instead of taxing the community in other ways and thereby burden the taxpayer and production.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Is it not created by the man who clears that land?

Mr. HARDACRE: Those are improvements. Let me give an example. I was in Sydney a few weeks ago, and I find the Government have constructed a tramway from the North Shore to Manly, and when I was in the tram I asked the conductor the price of land there, and I was told that miles and miles away from the North Shore they were asking £2 a foot frontage. I said it was a scandalous shame that, after the Government spending that money in building a tramway line, it should be making fortunes for certain people, and he said, “Yes, they were waiting there years and years for this tramway, and now they are reaping a rich reward.” I am told that the price of land in the Murwillumbah district has increased from £2 an acre to £50 an acre in a few years. That is for dairying land. In discussing the question

[Mr. Hardacre.

with an hon. member as to how we can pay good wages and export wheat in competition with the wheat from other countries, I said, “You cannot pay high wages and a high price for land.” The increased price comes out of the wages of the workers and out of the produce, and you cannot have the two together. The most important factor that leads to the improved condition of the worker in a new country is the cheap price and the abundance of good land, which leads to people taking up land and creating employment, and so raising the rates of wages, and increasing prosperity generally. I do not want to labour that question any further, but I say it is a very proper thing that we should take for public revenue some of the increased value which comes as a result of progress. A deputation waited on the Premier a few weeks ago from the merchants in Brisbane, asking for a remission of stamp duties, and I was entirely in sympathy with the objects of that deputation. I think of all the taxes that the Government imposes, of the bad methods of raising revenue that obtain today, the method of raising revenue by means of a stamp tax is the most irritable, the most trivial, and the most miserable of any that I know of. A man, before he can get an account receipted, has to go and find a penny stamp and so on. I say it is a miserable, trivial way of raising revenue, and the Government would be well advised if they would remit, at any rate, all the smaller stamp duties, and find revenue from the increase in land values as I propose. I want to pass on to another aspect of our policy. This party also desires to remedy existing evils by attacking other monopolies, and that brings me to the referendum proposals. The Premier in dealing with those proposals said it was made a party question. I think it was himself who made it a party question.

Mr. MURPHY: It was made a party question all over Australia.

Mr. HARDACRE: Yes; it was made a party question all over Australia, but it was first made a party question by all the forces of wealth and all the newspapers uniting in attacking the Commonwealth Labour party on the referendum proposals. I venture to say if those proposals had been made by the Deakin Government there would have been practically no opposition at all. This was followed up by the Government here making it a party question, and, naturally, we had to follow suit. Here is what the Premier said at Indooroopilly—

\* \* \* \* \*  
“It would be an enormous blunder if, through apathy and neglect, they did not register an emphatic “No” on 26th April.

“This movement, he said, was not being engineered by the Labour party, but by the socialists—a comparatively small body—who were driving Mr. Fisher to set up conditions which must lead to strife and disruption.”

If that was not making it a party question, I do not know what was, and I must say, in the leading newspapers at that time all the wild misrepresentations were made in regard to those proposals that could possibly be made. We were told we were going to hand over our railways and municipalities, and the Premier also said that the Commonwealth Government wanted to fix the freights and charges on our railways. I think anyone who read those



proposals must know they had nothing at all to do with our freights and charges. All that they proposed, so far as our railways were concerned, was, where there was an industrial dispute including employees on railways within the Commonwealth, the Federal Government should have power to determine the conditions and wages of the employees on those railways, just the same as in any other industry.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: They were to spend the money in carrying the railways on and we were to find it.

Mr. HARDACRE: Do not the merchants have to find the money and have to put up with the conditions which another party impose on them? Why should the railway employees be treated in any way different to the employees in other industries?

The TREASURER: The merchant fixes his own affairs.

Mr. HARDACRE: In so far as industrial conditions are concerned, we prescribe for him and determine for him by our Factories and Shops Act and by our wages boards, and in various other ways, and when the Commonwealth Parliament proposed in the referendum to have the power to determine the wages for private industries, why on earth should they not apply the same condition to the employees on our railways?

The TREASURER: Who is best able to decide the rates to be paid—the Commonwealth Government or the State Government? We know the conditions.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The Queensland Government is responsible for the interest on the money borrowed for public works.

Mr. HARDACRE: It is only in the case of a dispute on the railways that they want the power to make the conditions uniform throughout all Australia, and it seems to me to be a very fair and proper thing. The Premier has told us there is a request for a State conference to be held to consider the question of handing over to the Commonwealth Government certain powers—enlarging the powers of the Commonwealth Government to deal with certain matters—and what he proposed to do, so far as I can gather from his intimation on the matter is that they should give to the Commonwealth Parliament just what Mr. Deakin proposed should be given—that is, they should be given power to fix the condition of wages where wages boards in different States gave different awards in the same industries. So far that is all very well. It is a very proper thing if an industry in New South Wales—say the boot-makers, as was pointed out in the case before the Arbitration Court—paid 9s. a day and in Victoria they were only paying 8s. a day, that, instead of ruining the boot trade in New South Wales, the Commonwealth should have power to establish some tribunal where the rates of wages should be equalised in both States, and Mr. Deakin, in his manifesto in 1898, proposed to establish an interstate commission for dealing with those matters. That is exactly what the Commonwealth Parliament propose to do.

Mr. FORSYTH: They wanted to control the railways.

Mr. HARDACRE: And in order to carry that out they must of necessity establish a tribunal to do it, which was practically an interstate commission. So far as it goes, it is a very good thing indeed, but it is an admission on the part of the Premier that, so far as that was concerned, the Labour party's demand was right.

The TREASURER: Oh, no!

Mr. HARDACRE: It does not go far enough, and what on earth is the use of proposing a State Premiers' Conference when the Federal Parliament would not accept any offer they made, because it has already been determined by the people, so far as the Federal Parliament is concerned, not to give them that power.

Mr. MURPHY: No. They only determined not to give them all the power they asked for.

Mr. HARDACRE: That is so. The Federal Parliament say the power offered is insufficient, and they would have to send the matter to the people again. As we know already, the last State Premiers' Conference actually made the offer to the Commonwealth Parliament and they refused it. What the last State Premiers' Conference did was to make an offer to the Federal Parliament, which the Premier now says the coming State Premiers' Conference will make. What is the good of another conference to make an offer such as has already been made and the Commonwealth Parliament has refused? It is simply a waste of time.

Mr. CORSER: Because they expected to get something more.

Mr. HARDACRE: They will have to get something more sooner or later. If it was not got last year it will have to be fought out until it is obtained, because it is an absolute necessity that the National Government in Australia should have larger powers than they have at present.

Mr. TROUT: The people do not say so.

Mr. HARDACRE: Of course, they don't. They say many things which are wrong, and they say many things later on, when they get more knowledge on the matter, that they did not say previously. At one time they said they would continue the employment of black labour in Queensland, but the time came when we got them to say that they would not employ black labour. It was alleged that the Commonwealth referendum proposals, if they had been carried, would have entrenched upon the rights of the State; but I say they would not do anything of the kind, as they were absolutely necessary to carry on some of the things which have been proved by appeals to the Commonwealth Arbitration Court could not be done by the State Parliament. Take the question of dealing with monopolies, for example. It is said that the State Parliament has full power to deal with monopolies within its own border. That is quite true, but if any particular State does not deal with a monopoly, why should the rest of the people of Australia suffer the evils of the monopoly in the other States? Take the sugar monopoly. The Colonial Sugar Refining Company is a monopoly, making exorbitant profits out of the increased price of sugar; if the Queensland Government fails to deal with the monopoly, why should the people

*Mr. Hardacre.]*

of Western Australia and Victoria, or the other States pay high prices and suffer the evil of that monopoly? Why, in the same way, should Queensland suffer the evil of the tobacco monopoly because the Victorian Government may neglect to do its duty? Before I conclude, I want to deal with one particular question. I do not want to make any capital out of the "Yongala" case now, but it was a matter which was discussed during the Federal campaign, and the present Minister for Lands made an argument, which is the whole case for one of the powers asked for in the Commonwealth referendum. Dealing with the loss of the "Yongala," he said—

"Mr. Hughes had used the "Yongala" disaster for political purposes, but had the Labour Government really wanted compensation for seamen, it could last session have passed an Act within forty-eight hours. Continuing, Mr. Macartney said the State Parliament of Queensland, in the exercise of its rights, had passed a Workers' Compensation Act which would apply to the "Yongala" case, provided the vessel had been lost within the three miles limit."

That is the whole question. Here is the "Yongala" disaster, causing bereavement and distress amongst the relatives of those who were lost, but there was no power to get compensation, either under our Queensland Act or under the Commonwealth Act, because no one can tell where the "Yongala" was lost. Then there was another case—the "Kaliaba" case—which was mentioned during the election campaign. It was pointed out by Mr. Hughes that in the "Kaliaba" case, the sailors could not get compensation because, while the accident had occurred within New South Wales waters, it was a foreign vessel, over which the New South Wales Act could not prevail, so neither under the Commonwealth Seamen's Compensation Act nor the New South Wales Act could compensation be given in that case. I do not intend to deal with the programme of the Government at any greater length, except to reiterate that so far as the Government programme is concerned, there they do not in any way touch the problem of our social conditions, and they do not propose to do anything that will lead to the permanent and enduring prosperity of Queensland, and for that reason I have exercised my right of criticism in regard to them.

Mr. FORSYTH (*Moreton*): 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.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER: I beg to move that the House do now adjourn. The business to-morrow afternoon will be, first, the motion standing in the name of the hon. member for Woothakata, and in the evening the resumption of the debate on the Address in Reply.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at ten minutes to 10 o'clock.

[*Mr. Hardacre.*

THURSDAY, 27 JULY, 1911.

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

#### QUESTIONS.

MEN SUPPLIED TO BINGERA AND FAIRYMEAD PLANTATIONS.

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

"1. How many men have been despatched through the agency of the Government Labour Bureau at Brisbane and Bundaberg during the months of June and July to the following plantations:—(a) Bingera; (b) Fairymead?

"2. How many have been despatched direct through the medium of the Intelligence Bureau, Sydney?"

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. W. H. Barnes, *Bulimba*) replied—

"1. Brisbane (a) June, 13; July, 34—total, 47; (b) June, 301; July, 154—total, 455. Bundaberg (a) June, 7; July, 1—total, 8; (b) June, 16; July, nil—total, 16.

"2. Have no information."

GOODS FOR SETTLERS ALONG DALBY-TARA RAILWAY.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

"1. Owing to the unavoidable delay in opening the Dalby-Tara line for traffic, will he endeavour to lessen the inconvenience placed in the way of settlers in having goods sent along that line?

"2. Will he also issue instructions to the resident engineer that all storekeepers doing business along that line be given equal opportunities of securing goods without preference being given to any one individual?"

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

"1. I am not aware of any inconvenience being placed in the way of settlers. Their goods are taken forward in full truck loads by ballast train, and the resident engineer is doing his best to avoid delay, but a time-table cannot be adopted, as the free movement of the ballast train must not be interfered with, otherwise the completion of the line would be further delayed.

"2. No preference is given to any storekeeper or other individual."

#### HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

##### INITIATION.

On the motion of the HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. G. Appel, *Albert*), it was formally resolved—

"That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Health Act of 1900."

#### STATE CHILDREN BILL.

##### INITIATION.

On the motion of the SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. K. M. Grant, *Rockhampton*), it was formally resolved—

"That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to consolidate and amend the law relating to State children."

## AMENDMENT OF TRADE UNION LAW.

## RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

On the Order of the Day being read for the resumption of the debate on Mr. Theodore's motion—

"That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should at the earliest possible opportunity introduce legislation for the purpose of amending the law relating to trade unions so that the unjust disabilities which now operate against those bodies may be removed—"

which stood adjourned at 7 o'clock p.m. on Thursday, the 20th July—

Mr. RYAN (*Barcoo*) said: When this matter was adjourned on the last day it was before the House I was speaking in support of the motion. I think that, in view of the change which has taken place in the construction of the Ministry, it is well that we should confine ourselves to the contention that a Trade Disputes Bill should be passed by this House. When the Premier was speaking on the question, I asked him if he was prepared to pass a law the same as that which is in force in England, and he said he was not. I was dealing, when I last spoke, with what was said by the present Attorney-General when he introduced a Trade Disputes Bill in 1906. I wish to again refer to it to show that the Bill introduced by the Government, of which the present Chief Secretary was a member, was the same as the law is in England to-day, and I think it very desirable that we should know, and that the people of Queensland should know, whether the Government are prepared to carry out the programme that he then was a party to, or, in other words, are they prepared to carry out what is now known as the Rockhampton programme.

The PREMIER: The English law has passed beyond that stage now.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. RYAN: The English law has passed beyond that stage now, or is likely to pass beyond it. But I asked him was he prepared to make the law in Queensland the same as the law was made in England in 1906.

The PREMIER: That was not your question.

Mr. RYAN: Well, I ask it now. Will the hon. gentleman reply now?

The PREMIER: You did not ask that before.

Mr. RYAN: It is no use evading the question in that way. I ask the Chief Secretary now, is he prepared to make the law here the same as it was made in England in 1906. Will the hon. gentleman say "Yes" or "No" to that?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: He is not a witness now, you know. (Laughter.)

Mr. RYAN: There is no answer from the hon. gentleman. There is an evasion.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That was not the question you asked before.

Mr. RYAN: I can quite understand the Secretary for Public Instruction is very uneasy at the position raised by this motion, and I can also understand why the Chief Secretary is very uneasy.

The PREMIER: Not in the least. I indicated last week what disabilities I was prepared to remove.

Mr. RYAN: The Chief Secretary is prepared to remove the disabilities he referred

to last week, but these are not the disabilities which were proposed to be removed by the Government of which he was a member in the measure which they introduced and passed in this House in 1906.

The PREMIER: Since then the wages boards have come in, and that largely obviates the necessity for a Trade Disputes Act. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. RYAN: Oh, yes; we have heard all these things. I desire to quote from the speech delivered on that occasion by the present Attorney-General. I think he is to be congratulated on his speech and the thorough grasp he had on the question on that occasion. This is what the Attorney-General said with regard to the Bill before the House in 1906. It will be found in *Hansard* for 1906, page 1270.

Mr. HAMILTON: Mr. Blair was Attorney-General at that time.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, but this is the speech that was made by the present Attorney-General (Mr. O'Sullivan), who was then Secretary for Public Works—

"The Bill passed its second reading without any division in the House of Commons, and when it got into the Committee stage some divisions were taken on the provisions of the Bill similar to the Bill now before the House, with the result that it was carried by overwhelming majorities—by 300 to 30, and majorities like that.

"Mr. JACKSON: Was that the Government Bill you are speaking of?

"The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The Government Bill was altered. What took place in the House of Commons was this: The Government brought in a Bill. One of the clauses of the Bill was not satisfactory to some members—that is the clause on the question of giving protection to trade union funds. The scheme of the Government Bill was to appoint a strike committee, and the union was not to be held liable for any action unless it was authorised or ratified by the strike committee. But some members of the House of Commons took up this position: They were in favour of granting immunity to the trade unions—that either the funds were entitled to immunity or they were not. If they were entitled to immunity, they should get direct immunity; if they were not entitled, there was no reason why they should get even indirect immunity. The objection to the Government scheme was this: There was an obligation on the part of trades unions to repudiate the acts of trade unionists within a reasonable time after coming to the knowledge of the trades union. Now, that really negated the principle of immunity, all the time, and, judging by the legal experience of trades unions, the Government thought it better, and it certainly seemed more logical, to bring in a Bill like this to decide whether trades unions are entitled to direct immunity or not. There seems to me to be no middle course. If they are entitled to immunity, the Act should say so in plain terms; if they are not entitled to immunity, then they should not get an immunity even in indirect terms.

"Mr. MACARTNEY: Does the English Act give them immunity?

"The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Yes; it passed practically on the same lines as this."

Those are the words that I particularly draw attention to, that the English Act was passed on practically the same lines as this—meaning the Bill then before this House. That was the Bill that was included in the Rockhampton programme, and it is the Bill which the Chief Secretary told me on Thursday last he was not now prepared to support.

The PREMIER: You are misquoting me.

*Mr. Ryan.]*

Mr. RYAN: It is a serious thing to say that I am misquoting. That is practically accusing me of misrepresentation, and if that is so I am quite prepared to withdraw from my position if the Chief Secretary will say now if he is prepared to introduce legislation on the lines of the English Act of 1906. There is no reply to that. There can be no reply, because since then several Ministers—two at least—have been introduced into the Cabinet who in 1906 took a stand directly against the proposal of the then Secretary for Public Works. I refer to the Secretary for Agriculture, Mr. Tolmie, and the Secretary for Public Lands, Mr. Macartney. I would like to quote what the Secretary for Agriculture said on that occasion, interspersed with interjections from the late Premier, Mr. Kidston, and the present Secretary for Public Instruction, Mr. Grant. Dealing with the Bill in 1906, Mr. Tolmie, the present Secretary for Agriculture, made use of these words on page 1359 of *Hansard*—

“Mr. TOLMIE: Dealing with the Bill itself, we find that it contains three principles—first, that there shall be an exemption in certain cases where men commit what is an intolerable nuisance to others—that is, in the case of picketing; second, that there shall be exemptions in the case of conspiracy, and, third, that the funds of the unions are to be protected from paying any damages that may have been incurred by them. As far as the first is concerned, it is not a matter of great moment to anybody other than the persons subjected to the nuisance. We are told that the law of picketing still prevails. Under the extension it will be made more intolerable. The question is whether it is desirable that we should make the lives of some unfortunates intolerable because they do not care to comply with the demands of the unions. They are in a minority, and probably the rule applies that a minority must submit to the will of the majority, although it seems a very hard rule to adopt in such cases as that.

“The PREMIER: Which is better—that the minority should suffer or the majority?”

“Mr. TOLMIE: I do not think either is very good; but I am not answering conundrums, even from the Premier. I do not think it impossible to devise a system by which neither might take place.

“The PREMIER: I believe this Bill will be the best means to bring about that end.

“Mr. TOLMIE: One would think, from the number of times this Bill has been before the House of Commons, they would be justified in passing it. It was before the House of Commons in 1902, in 1903, in 1904, in 1905, and it is now again before them in 1906.

“Mr. GRANT: That shows the necessity for it. Every good thing has to be brought before the public often.”

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and laughter.

Mr. RYAN: I trust that the hon. member for Rockhampton, the present Secretary for Public Instruction, will not object to it being brought before the House once again, if only to show his inconsistency—that is, if he is not prepared to vote for the motion because of the change of front on the part of the Government.

Mr. HAMILTON: They do not trouble about it now.

Mr. RYAN: It may not trouble the Government or the leader, but this is a matter which concerns, not only the members of this House, but the people of Queensland. The people of Queensland have been told, and are still being told, by the hon. members on

[*Mr. Ryan.*

the front Treasury bench, and by members sitting behind the Government, that the programme of the present Government is the same as the programme of the late Ministry—the same as the programme that was promulgated at Rockhampton. I will proceed to show, incidentally, that it is not the same programme, and there is a great necessity for this House to affirm the motion which has been moved by the hon. member for Woothakata. It seems to be contended by the Government, and by the Premier in particular—no doubt in deference to the additions to the Cabinet—that there shall be no immunity to trade unions except in the case of provident funds, although the law of England has gone further, and although his predecessor in office gave forth to the people of Queensland, and was returned to this House upon it with a majority behind him, that the law should be made the same as in England, not only in regard to provident funds, but in a number of other things. The Premier seems to argue that the only legitimate object for which union funds can be accumulated is to carry on in case of strikes.

The PREMIER: And for benevolent purposes—superannuation and unemployment.

Mr. RYAN: For benevolent purposes. I like the word “benevolent.”

The PREMIER: The expenditure of 1909 amounted to £16,256, of which £2,000 was spent for benevolent purposes and £14,000 for political purposes.

Mr. RYAN: I should like to know from the Premier, whether union funds being spent to keep men on strike is a legitimate object?

The PREMIER: Much more so than in inciting men to strike.

Mr. RYAN: I am not asking him “much more so”; I am asking him, is it a legitimate object?

Mr. D. HUNTER: Not while there are wages boards.

Mr. RYAN: He said last Thursday, and he says now, there is no necessity for it.

The PREMIER: Oh, no; there again you misrepresent me.

Mr. RYAN: I should like to know how you are misrepresented.

The PREMIER: *Hansard* will reveal what I said and what you state.

Mr. RYAN: I am quite prepared to stand upon what *Hansard* says, because I have every confidence that the *Hansard* staff report what actually takes place in this House, and I am quite satisfied to leave it to the people of Queensland, and they can judge as to whether the Premier is continuing in the path which he wishes to lead them to believe he is continuing in, or whether he has gone back on his promise to the people, because he has introduced into his Cabinet some hon. members who do not believe in the principles he then believed in, and because he is supported by a party that is not actuated by the same political ideas as the party that then sat behind him. In other words, he has proved to the people of Queensland that he is prepared to hold on to office—perhaps I am transgressing, but I cannot help being led away by the fact that the hon. gentleman seems to be shuffling, if that word may be properly used in Parliament.

Mr. LENNON: It is very appropriate.

The PREMIER: It is not true.

Mr. RYAN: If the use of strike funds is legitimate for keeping a strike going, surely it is also legitimate for unions to spend their funds to constitutionally bring about what they desire—to send men to Parliament to advocate what is in their interests, and thereby bring about results that heretofore were brought about by strikes!

Mr. HAMILTON: In order to prevent strikes.

Mr. RYAN: It seems to me that the Premier is inclined to resort to the old primitive methods—the only way to settle industrial disputes is to resort to strikes. We say “No;” the proper way to settle industrial disputes is in a constitutional manner; by returning representatives to Parliament who have a thorough grasp of the justice of the case, and not be a particular advocate of one side or the other, who regard the justice of the case and provide tribunals which are competent to decide on these matters, and which will decide in such a way that industrial disputes will be settled. All the hon. member for Woothakata asks is that the immunity which is being granted in England by the Act of 1906 shall be extended to trade union funds, notwithstanding that some of those funds are devoted to political purposes.

Mr. D. HUNTER: I would not vote for it on that condition, but I would have supported it without.

Mr. RYAN: I do not think it is a matter of much concern to the hon. member for Woothakata, or to members on this side, how the hon. member for Woothakata votes on the question—(loud Opposition laughter)—the hon. member for Woolloongabba I mean to say—because however his vote is cast, I feel it will only be cast with the object of gaining political support outside, although he is not really at heart in favour of the gist of the motion moved by the hon. member for Woothakata. I am very desirous that this matter should come to a vote, and I will content myself with again emphasising the fact that the present Government have receded from the position that was taken up by the late Premier.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: No.

Mr. MULLAN: Yes.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: You are not asking for that Bill—you want something else.

Mr. RYAN: I am asking for that Bill, and I say I am quite satisfied with that instalment, and the Premier has said distinctly he is not in favour of that. The hon. member for Rockhampton will have an opportunity of speaking and saying whether or not he is in favour of the Rockhampton programme, or, in other words, whether he is in favour of going so far as to bring in a Trade Disputes Bill similar to that which was brought in in England. I sympathise with him sincerely, because I know that he is a member of a Cabinet that he does not rule—that is ruled by hon. members who were not associated with him at that time and who were not supporting him at that time, and of course, naturally enough, he has to bow to the will of the majority, but still he gives way to the will of the majority at his own risk, and that

risk, of course, has to be decided by his electors. I do not think I need add anything further. I shall support the motion.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HAMILTON: Let us hear the Secretary for Public Instruction.

The PREMIER: I rise to move an amendment—can I move an amendment, Sir?

Mr. MULLAN: That is not in order.

Mr. MURPHY: You cannot move an amendment now; you have already spoken. You must abide by the rules.

Mr. MULLAN: While the hon. member is settling the matter, I shall say a few words on the motion. I am astonished at the inconsistency that is displayed by the Premier in connection with the motion moved by the hon. member for Woothakata. It is surprising to think that an hon. member who was prepared to support a Trade Disputes Bill in 1906, when it was introduced by a Cabinet of which he was a member, is not prepared to support this motion to-day. Of course, one of the arguments he gave for taking his present stand is that now we have wages boards the necessity for this Bill is obviated. Now, as a matter of fact we had a Wages Board Act in force in 1908, and a Trade Disputes Bill was included in the Government's programme. In the first and second sessions of 1909 a Wages Board Act was in existence, and yet a Trade Disputes Bill was included in the programme which the hon. member promised to support. He shows again his extraordinary inconsistency in connection with this matter. He said the other day,

[4 p.m.] *sistency in connection with this matter. He said the other day,*

*in speaking on this motion—*

*“but I doubt very much if the trade unionists generally are desirous of being converted into a political machine—”*

*and he said—*

*“I object very much to unions using their funds for the promotion of socialistic unionism.”*

The PREMIER: Hear, hear!

Mr. MULLAN: The hon. gentleman is rather late in the field; he shows himself to be a Rip Van Winkle when he takes up the position in 1911 that trade unionism is not going hand in hand with political and socialistic unionism. Why, as far back as 1894, in England—the home of trade unionism—a trades unions congress sat at Norwich, and the following resolution was moved—

*“In the opinion of this conference, it is essential to the maintenance of British industry to nationalise the land, mines, minerals, and royalty rents.”*

And Keir Hardie, a prominent member of the English Labour party, moved what was then regarded as the famous amendment, to the effect that we should substitute for the words “mines, minerals, and royalty rents” the words “and the whole means of production, distribution, and exchange.” The motion was supported by John Burns, and in supporting it he said trades unionism was the indispensable preliminary and precursor of the modern development of socialism.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Was the amendment carried?

*Mr. Mullan.]*

Mr. MULLAN: The amendment was carried, embodying the principle of socialism, by 219 to 61 votes, and from then it became recognised that unionism supported the principle of socialism. More than anything else, the point I wish to make is that unionism in England recognised that industrial and political action should be taken together.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MULLAN: Then again, what is the position in Queensland? Why, at the first labour convention held in Queensland, in 1882, they formulated a programme based upon the platform of the Australian Labour Federation. The old Australian Labour Federation comprised the unions of Queensland, and they had the most socialistic platform that has yet been recognised in Queensland. The first political labour platform of Queensland was based upon that, showing that the hon. gentleman is altogether out of touch with what the unions of Queensland require. The Australian Workers' Union, which is the very strongest union in Queensland, has been the very backbone of political unionism in Queensland, and if the hon. gentleman says that the unionists of Queensland do not require this sort of thing, we will look at the doings of the last trades union congress, held, in 1910, in Brisbane, at which there were thirty-nine Queensland trade unions represented. We find the following resolution was carried unanimously—

“That this congress affirms the principle of industrial unions taking political action, approves of the constitution and platform framed by the recent Labour Convention, and urges upon the members of all Queensland unions to do their utmost to secure the enactment into statute law of each plank embodied in the Labour platform.”

I think I have submitted abundant evidence to prove that the unions of Queensland, at all events, are to-day in favour of political and industrial action going hand in hand, and before the Premier again gets up in this House to tell us that the unions do not require to have socialism incorporated in their principles, I think he should study the doings of and try to understand what really is the motive power which is driving the unions of Queensland to-day.

The PREMIER: I quite understand that.

Mr. MULLAN: Apparently, the hon. gentleman was unaware of it when he made his statement last Thursday afternoon.

The PREMIER: Oh no!

Mr. MULLAN: The most astounding statement made by the hon. gentleman was that in which he said he was prepared to protect the strike funds of unions. It is an extraordinary thing to see the Premier get up and tell the House that he is prepared to do something to promote strikes. This side wants to prevent strikes.

The PREMIER: You have not proved it.

Mr. MULLAN: The hon. gentleman flung a taunt across the floor that we wanted to promote strikes, but he got up and told the House that he was prepared to protect strike funds. We, on the other hand, while we would have latitude to protect strike funds, go further, and do what the hon. gentleman says he will not do—strange as it may appear—we will also protect politi-

[*Mr. Mullan.*]

cal funds, and enable unions to have their troubles settled politically instead of by the tortuous method of strikes. We deprecate strikes; we look upon strikes as the last resort, although I will be sorry when the day comes when men will be debarred of the final right of strike, because, when all is said and done, men must have a final right of insisting on their demands.

The PREMIER: Like the previous speaker, you are misquoting—I said I would protect the benevolent funds or provident fund; I do not remember the exact words.

Mr. MULLAN: On pages 163 and 164 the hon. gentleman spoke as follows:—

“I am willing, if industrial laws to-day are not effective, to have them amended so that they shall be effective, or I am perfectly willing to amend trade union law to provide that the contributions which the various persons shall give per week or per month shall be allocated to a benefit fund, strike fund, or superannuation fund.”

That is plain enough.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear! What more do you want than that?

Mr. MULLAN: If the hon. gentleman is prepared to protect a strike fund, is it not a monstrous thing to say that he is not prepared to support a political fund, by which we might settle disputes of trade unions—

The PREMIER: No, create them.

Mr. MULLAN: Through this House, instead of through the medium of a strike. Evidently, from all we have seen of the statement of the hon. gentleman, it is he who is eager to create strikes rather than this side of the House.

Mr. D. HUNTER: You have not proved your statement yet.

Mr. MULLAN: If the hon. gentleman will submit to the method we suggest of enabling us to settle our disputes—and of protecting our unions during disputes—then all will be well. I am really astonished at the hon. gentleman, but, as I was about to state when I was interrupted a little while ago, in 1890, when the great maritime strike was raging, and later on when the shearers' strike created such trouble in Queensland, we were told that unionists, that labour men, should try and settle their disputes in a constitutional way.

The PREMIER: What are the points of dispute—rates of wages and conditions?

Mr. MULLAN: We are prepared to settle our disputes in a constitutional way; but the hon. gentleman would prevent unions from using their funds to put men into Parliament to settle disputes in a constitutional way. This is supposed to be a Liberal Government; yet the hon. gentleman had to quote in support of his contention one of the most Conservative members of the House of Commons, F. E. Smith.

The PREMIER: One of the ablest men there.

Mr. MULLAN: I am not disputing his ability; I am referring to his politics. The hon. gentleman was hard pressed when he had to call to his support one who is recognised as one of the leading Conservative members.

The PREMIER: I also called in Keir Hardie.

Mr. MULLAN: I also brought in Keir Hardie to support my position. The Premier also said that one of the reasons why he would not accede to the request of the unions was

that the minority could levy on the majority, as the majority would not vote. In any sphere of life the same thing applies. Take any company with which the hon. gentleman is connected: the minority of the shareholders control the company, because the majority will not take the trouble to vote. And is it a fair thing to deprive unions of protection for their funds because he fears that the minority of members will impose a levy on the majority?

The PREMIER: I am afraid of coercive power being used.

Mr. MULLAN: The hon. gentleman is a good judge of coercive power.

The PREMIER: I gave plenty of evidence of it in my speech last week.

Mr. MULLAN: In these days of modern progress he must recognise the far-reaching and beneficial influence of unionism.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear!

Mr. MULLAN: The Commonwealth Statistician (Mr. Knibbs) in matters of this kind merely looks from the cold materialistic point of view, and he says in his recent publication that the objects of trade unionism are to extend the reasonable comforts of a civilised community to those engaged in every branch of industry.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear!

Mr. MULLAN: The hon. gentleman can "hear, hear" that; but when we want to obtain the means by which that can be accomplished he wants to prevent it.

The PREMIER: The hon. member's object is socialism.

Mr. MULLAN: Mr. Knibbs goes further and says that "their efforts have resulted in improved conditions, particularly shorter hours, and a healthier mode of life." Surely the hon. gentleman does not disagree with that?

The PREMIER: I entirely agree with it.

Mr. MULLAN: Then the hon. gentleman is entirely inconsistent in doing something to prevent the possibility of bringing it about. Prior to 1871 in England trade unions were illegal combinations.

The PREMIER: That is ancient history.

Mr. MULLAN: It is ancient history, but the hon. gentleman went further back than that.

The PREMIER: You are trying to talk it out; we want to come to a vote.

Mr. MULLAN: In 1871 an Act was passed in England, giving what the hon. gentleman described in his "ancient history" last week as a charter to trade unions. In 1886 we got a similar charter here, and we rested in fancied security till the Taff Vale decision of 1901, which showed that we were subject to the conspiracy laws, and that our funds were liable to confiscation, and that unions were liable for the unauthorised acts of their agents. Fancy the conspiracy laws of troublous times, when men were conspiring for the dethronement of a monarch, or the downfall of a Government—fancy the people of Queensland having those laws applied to them! A very apt illustration of the position of trade unions might be given by making a comparison between banks and trade unions as regards the protection of their funds. If a servant or agent of a bank were to take a plug of dynamite and blow up a private office, he would, of course, be

arrested and liable to conviction, and probably a long sentence; but it would end there; neither the bank nor its funds nor its officers would be liable. But if a unionist during a strike goes to a private office—the Colonial Sugar Refining Company's office, for instance—and blows it up with a plug of dynamite, he is liable to imprisonment for a long term. But it does not stop there. The whole union is liable; the whole of the funds are liable for the damages, and the officers are liable to conviction for conspiracy under the Act. Does not this plainly show that the laws of Queensland do not place unions on the same footing as companies? Why should unions be amenable to a law that is not equally applicable to banks and other companies?

Mr. D. HUNTER: You do not state the case.

Mr. MULLAN: It shows the deep-rooted antagonism that prevails against unions, and against anything we do to promote the amelioration of the condition of humanity.

The PREMIER: You know that is not true.

Mr. MULLAN: I may, perhaps, use the hon. gentleman as an example of a person who would trample under foot the aspirations of the people. The position is this: After the Taff Vale decision it became necessary for the unions to get further protection for their funds.

The PREMIER: Is that all you ask?

Mr. MULLAN: I will tell you what I ask. I ask the hon. gentleman is he prepared to give the Trade Disputes Bill, as promised in the programme of several Cabinets of which he was a member?

The PREMIER: I will deal with that at the proper time.

Mr. MULLAN: The hon. gentleman has not the courage to answer the question.

The PREMIER: I have already spoken, and I cannot deal with it now.

Mr. MANN: I will move an amendment to give you a chance.

Mr. MULLAN: The Trade Disputes Bill of 1906 was introduced by the Imperial Parliament to protect trade union funds; it was intended to meet the defects found owing to the Taff Vale decision. It covered two points. It was intended to legalise picketing—that is, to give unionists an opportunity in strike time of going to men who were misled probably—men seeking to take the places of their mates—and put their aspect of the case before these men. Is it not better to enable unionists to go and submit their views peacefully to the other men—men who are now described as blacklegs, and scabs, and so forth—than, as at present, have those men brought silently and secretly, surrounded by police in such a way as to incite strikers to breaches of the peace? That was really the intention of the English Trade Disputes Act—to legalise peaceful picketing, and amend the law of conspiracy in relation to the acts of individual unionists.

The PREMIER: Was it peaceful picketing at Childers the other day?

Mr. MULLAN: As the senior member for Ipswich reminds me, the English Act was passed by a Conservative House of Lords, and yet we have a so-called Liberal Government sitting on the other side of the House who refuse to grant even this modicum of relief to trades unionists of Queensland.

The PREMIER: What modicum?

*Mr. Mullan.]*

Mr. MULLAN: The Trade Disputes Bill, as promised by the hon. gentleman over and over again.

The PREMIER: That is not what the hon. member for Woothakata asks for.

Mr. MULLAN: What is the hon. gentleman prepared to give the hon. member for Woothakata?

The PREMIER: I said last week what I was prepared to give him.

Mr. MULLAN: The only thing that I could see the hon. gentleman was prepared to give last week was that he wanted to prohibit unionists from accumulating funds for fear they might return Labour members to this House. But he was quite prepared to give unionists the opportunity of establishing strike funds in the hope, perhaps, that he might incite them to strike. I could see no other object in his speech than that.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: He likes strikes.

Mr. MULLAN: It is not long since a prominent member of the Government accused others on this side and myself of inciting men to strike. Yet here we had the hon. gentleman telling us last Thursday that he was in favour of doing the one thing which above everything else is likely to help men to strike, because men must have the sinews of war if they strike. They must have money behind them, and the hon. gentleman was prepared to give them power to get money for that purpose. Our party recognise that trade unions are beneficial to the community as a whole. We believe in the principle of collective bargaining. We think that the average individual to-day would have a pretty hard tussle—that he would have a hopeless chance of asserting his right to a living wage—if he had to go on the principle of individual bargaining as against collective bargaining.

The PREMIER: Then what is the use of all the industrial legislation?

Mr. D. HUNTER: That is a poser.

Mr. MULLAN: I did not catch the Premier's interjection.

The PREMIER: Then what is the use of all the industrial legislation if what you say is correct?

Mr. MULLAN: What I have said is in no way inconsistent with any industrial legislation. What I have said has shown rather the necessity of giving us more industrial legislation.

The PREMIER: On what lines?

Mr. MULLAN: To protect unions against trusts, combines, and monopolies; as we have them to-day, it would be hopeless to have individual bargaining, and we are bound to have collective bargaining.

The PREMIER: Per medium of the Arbitration Court and wages boards—yes.

Mr. MULLAN: It is because we recognise this that we are the more eager to try and protect union funds and union members, as far as possible. I do not want to monopolise the whole of the time, as there are several other members interested in this subject, and I want to give them an opportunity of saying a few words too. I realise that the Government want to do nothing that would help forward political or socialistic unionism; but unionism will proceed on the even tenor of its way regardless of the friendship or the hostility of the hon. gentleman. Unionism has done

[Mr. Mullan.

more for the people of Queensland than ever the hon. gentleman's Government or any other Government of the same kind has done or is likely to do.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Socialism has not.

Mr. MULLAN: To unionism is due more than to anything else the grand progress that we have made industrially and politically in Queensland.

Mr. CORSER: Not under socialism, though.

Mr. MULLAN: Yes. The socialism of Queensland was practically conceived by the unionists of Queensland. It was the unionists of Queensland who formed the Australian Labour Federation, and drafted its socialistic platform. I do not intend to detain the House any longer, except to say that I am surprised at the attitude the Premier has taken up, and I hope that even at this late hour he will see fit to recede from his position, and possibly the way in which he will recede will be to get one of his colleagues to get up and try to create a sort of escape door per medium of an amendment.

The PREMIER: Certainly we will move an amendment.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. K. M. Grant, *Rochampton*), who was received with laughter and cheers from Opposition members, said: I am not occupying the position the hon. member for Charters Towers desires this side should take up—that I and a number of other members on this side, myself in particular, who voted for the Trade Disputes Bill that was introduced in 1906, shall be put into a nasty corner by this motion. That is the most foolish idea possible. It is a most ridiculous idea, because we are still prepared to vote for the Bill that was introduced in 1906.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: Why don't you introduce it?

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: But that is not the Bill the other side are asking us to bring in. Boiled down, what they are asking at the present time is that every trade unionist in Queensland should be a member of the Labour party.

LABOUR MEMBERS: No.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Every unionist must be a member of the Labour party.

LABOUR MEMBERS: No.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: In the Australian Workers' Association rules there is a proviso that every member must sign, and that is that he is in favour of the Labour platform.

Mr. RYAN: Yes, but this protects employers as well.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: He must be in favour of the Labour objective. And what does that mean? That any man whose political opinions are opposed to those of the Labour party must either starve or become a hypocrite. That is exactly the position. This has been tried before. As the hon. member for Charters Towers said, it was tried by Mr. Lane, and the Australian Labour Federation, many years ago. Even the socialists of that time found that it became unworkable by its own weight. If this motion is carried,



it means that two unions will control the whole of the workers in the State—the Australian Workers' Association and the Australian Workers' Union; and those two unions will be controlled by two or three men in Brisbane. They will give their instructions, and the unions will simply have to do what they are told. The hon. member for Charters Towers also referred to a certain conference. I remember that conference being held about twenty-five years ago. They passed, as the hon. member rightly said, one of the most socialistic platforms that was ever devised, and the end of that platform was: "And this is to be put into force forthwith." That was twenty-five years ago. It has not been the Labour party that has put palliatives, as the hon. member for Bundaberg says, into operation. It has been the Liberal Government of Queensland.

Mr. MAY: Forced by the Labour party.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I have heard that cry before. As my late leader said in Rockhampton when he was contesting the election two years ago, in reply to the charge that the Labour party made him do these things—"I will show you next session. I will put my programme through, and the Labour party won't have the credit of dotting an 'i' or crossing a 't' in the matter."

Mr. MURPHY: How many of the first Labour party declared themselves socialists?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I know many Labour members pretend to be socialists, but I would like to know how many genuine socialists there are in the party. I know my hon. friend, the hon. member for Barcoo, is not even a Labour man. He may pretend to be one, but he is not really as much a Labour man as I am. (Laughter.) The hon. member for Charters Towers says a Trade Disputes Act was carried in England. But

[4.30 p.m.] what were the conditions in England when that Act was passed? The trade unions desired to be represented by some of their own men, and the only way in which they could get representatives in Parliament to voice their views was by paying those members. There were no wages boards in England. But in Queensland there is payment of members to meet the views of the workers who desire to be represented in Parliament by their own men, and we have wages boards to deal with industrial troubles when they arise. The Trade Disputes Bill introduced by the Minister for Works at that time, Mr. O'Sullivan, did not meet the views of the Labour party, though they are now pretending that they desire such a Bill. What did the *Worker* of the 19th October, 1906, say about that Bill? It advised the Labour party to throw out the Bill, and members of the Labour party were afraid to vote for it, though they have now the temerity to say that members on this side are opposed to a Trade Disputes Bill. The Labour party of that day were instructed by the *Worker*, and the *Worker* said, "We represent the opinion of the trade unions of Queensland, and we advise the Labour party to have nothing to do with the Bill."

Mr. LENNON: The Labour party take no instructions from anyone outside its own ranks

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I know whom the hon. member takes instructions from.

Mr. LENNON: No, you don't; I challenge you to name anyone from whom I take instructions.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: The Labour party were instructed to vote against that Bill, and now we have them saying that members on this side are refusing to support such a measure. I do not suppose there is any man sitting on this side of the House who was in the House at that time who will not vote for the Bill as introduced in 1906. The Premier clearly stated that he wanted to give the fullest liberty with regard to trade union funds and to protect those funds. The hon. gentleman went to considerable trouble to make his meaning clear, and he did make it clear, and that was that for all legitimate purposes trade union funds would be protected, but not for political purposes. If all the workers in Queensland were socialists and were believers in the Labour party, something might be said in favour of asking for the protection of funds used for political purposes. But members opposite are asking the House to put into the hands of organised unions a weapon that will enable them to compel men to be out of work unless they become hypocrites and sign the Labour platform. We are quite willing to give every legitimate protection to trade union funds, but we are not willing to give trade unions a weapon by which they may compel thousands to starve or become members of the Labour party. That is exactly the position.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: That is the conservative argument always.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: If the unions desire to become members of the Labour party, and to become socialists—and I do not think it will be contended even by members opposite that all the workers of Queensland are socialists—the Labour party would be very much stronger than it is at the present time. The hon. member for Charters Towers accused members on this side of fomenting strikes and industrial troubles, but he knows that is not the case.

Mr. MULLAN: Creating the means by which they can be fomented.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: No; that is not what the hon. member said, and that is not the impression which he desired to convey to the House. The impression he desired to convey was that we created or fomented strikes and industrial troubles. No Government—whether a Labour Government or a Liberal Government—desires to have strikes and industrial troubles in the State whose affairs they have to administer. Has the 1906 Act done away with industrial troubles in England? Is it not a fact that one of the biggest strikes that has ever occurred in England is raging in the seaport towns of the United Kingdom at the present time? If the Trade Disputes Act has not done away with strikes in the old country, how can it do away with strikes in Queensland? The hon. member for Barcoo said it would tend to do away with strikes,

Hon. K. M. Grant.]

but again I ask, have there been fewer strikes in the old country since the Trade Disputes Act was passed there?

The PREMIER: No.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: We are not a bit different from the people in other countries, and the Labour party here are not different from the Labour party in other countries. The Labour party want to get into power here as they want to be in power elsewhere. How do they prevent strikes in New South Wales? How did Mr. Griffith, the Minister for Works in New South Wales, deal with strikers in that State? Did he say "We will give you a conference, and will discuss the matters in dispute in a friendly spirit, we say your demand is a reasonable one, men doing the work you are doing should have better wages and better conditions?" Did he do anything of that kind? No. He did what we should have been blamed if we attempted to do—he engaged a lot of "scab" labour in Sydney, arranged for a special train to take those men to the work, and when the men who were on strike went to their work next morning they found they were not wanted, as the free labourers introduced by the Minister for Works had taken their places. That was done under a Labour Ministry; and that is probably what the Labour party would do if they got into power in Queensland. They would find then that their theoretical opinions and hard practical conditions cannot always be reconciled. The hon. member for Charters Towers gave an instance of what might happen if trade union funds were not protected as he desires, and said that if a bank were blown up by a unionist the funds of the union would be confiscated. That is not so. But if a trade union passed a resolution instructing someone to blow up that bank, it would be a fair thing to seize the union funds. I know that the hon. member for Woothakata thought that in moving this motion he was adopting a clever piece of political strategy. But he did not take into account the fact that the hon. member for Woolongabba and other hon. members who have spoken have advocated and voted for a Trade Disputes Bill.

Mr. MAY: It was not to benefit us, but to benefit the workers that the motion was brought forward.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: It was not to benefit the workers. The Premier may have been wrong when he said the motion was introduced to benefit socialism. It has been introduced more to benefit the members of the Labour party at the next election by providing a means of coercion which can be used against men who do not believe in the Labour platform. It appears to me that that is exactly the position, and now, to give an opportunity to members who believe in a Trade Disputes Bill as introduced in 1906 and who voted for that measure, and would, I presume, vote for it again, I have much pleasure in moving an amendment.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Ah, ah!

Mr. WINSTANLEY: That is not strategy, is it?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I have here a proviso to add to the end of it, just to make it clear, as the Premier says, so that he who runs

[Hon. K. M. Grant.

may read, and so that anyone can see who are going to benefit by it, the workers of Queensland or the Labour party. For that is what it amounts to. I move that this proviso be inserted after the word "removed"—

"But this shall not apply to unions which contain in their rules a contribution for political purposes."

(Loud Opposition laughter.)

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That means that members on both sides of the House can now clearly understand what they are doing. On our side we are willing to give every protection to unions. We are prepared to protect their benefit fund and their unemployment fund or any other fund that they desire to be protected, but we refuse to give a weapon to a political party to coerce men into joining their union.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: For that is exactly what it amounts to.

Mr. LENNON: Will you exempt the funds of the People's Progressive League?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: No political funds will be protected at all. I have much pleasure in moving the amendment I just read.

Mr. MULLAN: You will not protect many unions with that amendment.

Question put.

Mr. MANN (*Cairns*): I was rather sorry that the Chief Secretary was not allowed to move his amendment. I do not know if it was the same in substance as that just moved by the Secretary for Public Instruction. I was going to meet the case myself and allow the Chief Secretary to have a second speech by moving an amendment to omit the word "trade" and insert in its place the word "industrial" and make it apply to all industrial unions and not merely to trade unions. I advocated that that should be done during the last election. The motion for a Trade Disputes Bill is not comprehensive enough, and if it is a good thing for trade unions it should be a good thing for all industrial unions. It is only a fair thing to include all unions of unskilled workers just the same as trade unions. So far as I can judge, the amendment means that the Government are prepared to support any Bill that will not contain a proposition that the political funds will be protected. I really cannot see myself why political funds should not be protected if they protect strike funds. If the unions through its officials commit any harm and do any damage, then the union should be compelled to pay for it.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MANN: That is the opinion I have always held. I do not believe in the present disability in connection with unions, because it may then throw the whole responsibility of any acts of a unionist on to the officials, although the acts may be committed without the consent of the officials. That is, if the president of that union or the secretary happens to have property in the shape of a cottage or allotment, and any member of a union during troublous times goes and commits a wrongful act the officials may be held

responsible. I do not believe in unions suffering disabilities. On the other hand, I do not believe for one moment that anyone who desires to join a union that is making for better conditions in the trade or calling in which he is engaged should be compelled to pay into the political funds of that union if he does not agree with it.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MANN: The whole thing should be optional. If a man believes in supporting a certain party because he believes that that party are going to assist him to get better conditions, then he has a perfect right to pay into their political fund; but if, on the other hand—and we find a good many cases of it amongst working people—they think that the other party is better for them, then he should not be compelled to pay into the political fund of the party he does not believe in.

The PREMIER: That is the crux of the whole question.

Mr. MANN: It is the crux of the whole question. If all the workers in Brisbane were supporters of the Labour party and the policy of the Labour party, then, instead of holding only two seats in the metropolis, they would practically hold every seat in the Brisbane area, with the exception of one or two seats in the suburbs. If all the workers supported the Labour party in their political programme, they would sweep the whole of the metropolis, and the strength of the Government, instead of being in the cities, would be in the country districts amongst the farmers. On this side you will find two or three members returned by country districts, because the farmers in that district believe that the programme of the Opposition is the programme best suited for the welfare of the small settler; but you will find on the Government side of the House numerous members representing workers in the metropolis, because the workers believe that the Government programme is the best to help them.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MANN: I may say that I was in favour of the Bill introduced in 1906. I went to the country in 1908 supporting it, and again in 1909 I put before my electors my views on the matter, and urged that, instead of having it merely for trade unions, it should apply also to industrial unions, and take in all workers. I am prepared to give the workers every protection that it is possible to give in the matter of their funds, so that if anything is done by any member of a particular union without instructions from his officials, then the officials shall not be penalised for any action which they have not sanctioned. That is only fair. I was listening to the senior member for Charters Towers, and he said that in the last resort strikes should be resorted to.

Mr. MULLAN: No; I said I should be sorry to see strikes, but we should never take away from men the final right to strike.

Mr. MANN: That also implies that you should not take away from the employer the final right to lock out. That is what it amounts to. You must take that away to have industrial peace. If you tell the men they must not strike, you must also tell the employer that he must not lock out. It is a foolish thing to say after we have passed legislation, and perhaps have a costly arbi-

tration court, that the employers should be able to say, "That decision is not for us. We will lock the men out."

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: The employers have other ways of getting over it.

Mr. MANN: And so have the employees. The unionists are not as helpless as they were in the old days. They have organisations, they have funds, and they are just as skilful in industrial warfare as the employers. I honestly believe that, and say so on the floor of this House. I claim that if you are going to leave the men, as a last resort, the power to strike, you must leave the employer the power to lock out, and then all your industrial legislation will be useless, because if you settle a question in the Arbitration Court and either side refuse to accept the verdict, what is the use of having a tribunal to settle disputes? Would you have it in a court of justice? Say the member for Charters Towers and myself had a dispute about a piece of property, and I appealed to the court and the verdict was against me, would you allow me to use brute force and say to the member for Charters Towers, "I have been beaten in the court, but I am going to beat you by physical violence?" We cannot allow that for one moment. If we are going to pass legislation to prevent strikes, it must be equally binding on both sides, and if we are going to prevent lock-outs we must also stop strikes.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Question, question!

Question—That the words proposed to be added (*Mr. Grant's amendment*) be so added—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 32.

Mr. Appel	Mr. Hodge
" Barnes, G. P.	" Hunter, D.
" Barnes, W. H.	" Keogh
" Booker	" Mackintosh
" Brennan	" Mann
" Bridges	" Morgan
" Corser	" Paget
" Crawford	" Petrie
" Cribb	" Philp
" Denham	" Somerset
" Forrest	" Swayne
" Forsyth	" Trout
" Fox	" Vowles
" Grant	" Walker
" Grayson	" White
" Gunn	" Wienholt

Tellers: Mr. D. Hunter and Mr. Vowles.

NOES, 22.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Maughan
" Barber	" May
" Breslin	" Mulcahy
" Ferricks	" Mullan
" Foley	" Murphy
" Hamilton	" Nevitt
" Hardacre	" O'Sullivan
" Hunter, J. M.	" Payne
" Land	" Ryan
" Lennon	" Theodore
" McLachlan	" Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Theodore and Mr. Breslin.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Macartney and Mr. Allan.

Noes—Mr. Blair and Mr. Lesina.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Original question, as amended, stated.

Mr. McLACHLAN (*Fortitude Valley*): I was rather surprised to notice that the first Ministerial deliverance in this House

*Mr. McLachlan.*]

of the Secretary for Public Instruction should have been one in opposition to a very fair measure of industrial reform. The Minister, during the whole course of his speech, endeavoured to point out that the reason why he, and other members on the Government side, did not propose to support the motion was because it went further than the trades disputes measure which had been introduced in this House on a previous occasion, and which he, and others, were prepared to support. It seems to me a very strange attitude for the hon. gentleman to take up—to argue that he was still prepared to support that measure, and to find, although he is a member of the Cabinet, he did not have included in the programme of the Government a Trade Disputes Bill. A Trade Disputes Bill was in the policy which Mr. Kidston submitted to the people of Queensland in his Rockhampton speech, and I think it was about that

[5 p.m.] time that he used the words quoted by the Secretary for Public Instruction, that he would not permit the Labour party or any party to cross a "t" or dot an "i," and that it was his intention to pass into law his own programme.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: And he did it. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. McLACHLAN: A portion of that programme was the Trade Disputes Bill. Mr. Kidston has removed himself, or been removed, from this Chamber, but we have still the Secretary for Public Instruction, who was conspicuous during that election when the Rockhampton programme was before the people of Queensland in the way he supported the Premier of the day.

Mr. MAUGHAN: And he said it was all going to be carried out.

Mr. McLACHLAN: And included in the programme on which he was returned as a supporter was a Trade Disputes Bill.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That is not the Bill you want.

The PREMIER: It is not the purport of this resolution.

Mr. McLACHLAN: The Secretary for Public Instruction says that it was not the Bill that we want. I do not know that there was any Bill mentioned in the programme of Mr. Kidston other than the term, "a Trade Disputes Bill."

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: There was a Bill introduced into the House.

Mr. McLACHLAN: I am perfectly aware that there was a Bill introduced into the House some time ago, and that that Bill did not become law. Certain exception was taken to it by members on this side, and by people in other parts of Queensland, and the evidence we have had in the past is that when objection is taken to a measure by members on this side and by an agitation throughout Queensland, that on another occasion when the measure is again introduced there has been some provisions included which were advocated on this side, and it is reasonable to suppose that the measure which the late Premier intended to introduce as part of his Rockhampton programme would be in an amended form, and the Secretary for Public Instruction was not prepared to support a measure of that kind. To-day we find him moving an amendment to a motion brought forward to authorise the introduction of legislation which would protect

[Mr. McLachlan.

trade unions and trade union funds, and it was for no other purpose than to place himself and the other occupants of the Government benches in a position to justify their opposition to the motion of the hon. member for Woothakata, and still be enabled to explain to their constituents that they were anxious and willing to support a Trade Disputes Bill, that this amendment was moved.

The PREMIER: What a kindly motive.

Mr. McLACHLAN: We saw the Premier rise with feverish haste, immediately the hon. member for Charters Towers concluded his speech, to move an amendment, forgetting all about the Standing Orders for two or three moments. A man so well versed in the Standing Orders, knowing full well that he had already spoken on the main question, had he considered a moment, he must have known he would have been out of order in moving an amendment, but so anxious was he to make himself right with the people, to show that he was still in favour of some sort of Trade Disputes Bill, that he was anxious to get an amendment moved, hoping to right himself and please men on this side of the House.

The PREMIER: We got it moved and carried by a fifty per cent. majority.

Mr. McLACHLAN: The hon. member has not even considered the amendment yet. I am perfectly satisfied on this point: that when the Secretary for Public Works, the Secretary for Public Instruction, and the other gentlemen who grace the front Treasury benches, and supported by so many members behind them—when they go into this question and realise the full purport of the amendment, when they submit themselves to the public of Queensland, and the public interpret, as they will interpret, what was really meant by the amendment, I am pretty confident in prophesying that the hon. gentlemen will regret their action (Government laughter).

Mr. WHITE: They are quite prepared to take the responsibility. Are you stonewalling?

Mr. McLACHLAN: I am not stonewalling. A good deal has been said during the course of the debate on the motion, and an effort has been put forth by those who have interested themselves in this question on the Government side of the House to endeavour to convince or show the people of Queensland that we on this side of the House, in our advocacy of a Trade Disputes Bill, are anxious to place trade unions and trade unionists in a different position, so far as the law is concerned, than any other individuals in Queensland. That is not so. What we desire to do by the introduction of a Trade Disputes Bill, and other legislation which will be consequent on the motion, is to place trade unions and unionists in the same position as any other individual in Queensland. What is the position to-day? We have had two examples in Brisbane in recent years of how the funds of unions can be used in legal disputes to contest cases in our law courts—where the whole of the funds of a union have been used on account of the action of individuals. It has been laid down—and some of the legal gentlemen in the House will be able to correct me if I am not right—that the conspiracy law, so far as the particular cases that I am referring to are concerned—that is the Heggie case, known as the shipwrights' case, and that

of the Queensland Typographical Association—the state of the law is such that where an action is taken by an individual it may be taken without any legal action being taken against the person so concerned; but if two or three more persons are concerned in that action it immediately becomes a conspiracy, and they are liable to an action under the conspiracy law. In connection with trade unions, so far as the law stands at the present time, in the Taff Vale decision and the Osborne judgment, it has been ruled by, I think, the Chief Justice that the law as laid down at home must apply to every other place where trade unions are in existence, and the position that we find ourselves in to-day is that, in so far as the funds of a trade union are concerned, they are never safe. Irresponsible people may take certain action, without any authority at all from a union, which will land the union into serious legal trouble, and by reason of such irresponsible action the whole of the funds of the union—benefit funds, provident funds, funds such as the Premier would safeguard with legislation, strike funds, are all to be confiscated, or to be used to defend an action which may be brought about by the conduct of some irresponsible person. What was looked upon as the law in Australia and in England before the Taff Vale decision? We were satisfied that the law was such that the funds of unions were protected; and all we are asking by this measure is that by legal enactment unions will be placed in the position which everybody thought they were in prior to the Taff Vale decision. That is all that is asked for.

The PREMIER: It is not by any means all that is asked for.

Mr. McLACHLAN: All we are asking is that the law in Queensland shall be made such that we in Queensland—the trade unionists in Queensland—would be placed in the position which the whole of the people of Queensland thought they were in prior to the Taff Vale decision. Is the Premier prepared to do that?

The PREMIER: I indicated exactly my position last Thursday.

Mr. McLACHLAN: If the hon. gentleman is prepared to do that, he is prepared to carry the motion moved by the hon. member for Woothakata.

The PREMIER: No—it is a very different thing.

Mr. McLACHLAN: No, it is not.

The PREMIER: We must not argue across the chamber.

Mr. McLACHLAN: I am going to argue, anyway. I have got the floor, and I am going to go on arguing. (Laughter.) Prior to the Taff Vale decision it was thought in Queensland and other parts of Australia that trade union funds were protected, and that the actions of irresponsible individuals could not be fixed on a trade union as a whole; and if the Premier is prepared to introduce legislation which will make the law in Queensland exactly what I have said I will be satisfied, and I think every other person will be satisfied also. When we consider the money expended in connection with the two cases I have referred to, we find that in the shipwrights' case they lost £1,000 through the action of an irresponsible person, and in the dispute with the Typographical Society the

cost to the society was something like £700 or £800. I am sorry the Secretary for Lands is not present, because he has a very lively recollection of that case.

The PREMIER: I hope he will be in sufficiently good health to be here next Thursday; he is not well to-day.

Mr. McLACHLAN: I am sorry to hear that the hon. gentleman is not well, and I join the Premier in hoping that he will be in his place next Thursday thoroughly restored to health. (Hear, hear!) So far as the Typographical Society is concerned, they had a mortality fund set apart wholly to provide mortality benefits for the relatives of deceased members; and we thought our benefit fund would be protected, even though our general fund might be attached, but that also had to be swept into the pool and used to pay the costs of defending an action brought about by an irresponsible person with no authority at all. We are asking that such a state of things shall be allowed to exist no longer.

The PREMIER: Will you confine your request to that? That is not what the hon. member's motion contains.

Mr. McLACHLAN: If the hon. gentleman is prepared to concede the point I am making he must concede the whole, because if you can attach the funds in connection with their use for one purpose, you can attach them all in connection with a legal case. With regard to the resolution carried at home after a conference sat and recommended certain legislation to protect union funds, it was recognised in the House of Commons and passed there, and passed through the conservative House of Lords; and surely a Government in Queensland that calls itself a Liberal Government would hardly allow itself to be styled more conservative than the House of Lords! This is what was included in the measure—

“An action against a trade union, whether of workmen or masters, or against any members thereof, or on behalf of themselves and all other members of the trade union, for the recovery of damages for any tortious acts alleged to have been committed by or on behalf of the trade union, shall not be entertained by any court, provided that nothing in this section shall affect the liability of the trustees of such union to be sued in the events provided for by the Trade Union Act of 1871.”

This was advocated some time ago in Queensland, but the Premier, though he supported a Government prepared to introduce a Trade Disputes Bill, and the other members sitting with him, who supported a Government that included in their programme a Trade Disputes Bill—we find them opposing that measure. When the Premier was speaking last week he was very desirous of pointing out that one of the principal objections, if not the principal objection, he had to the motion was that it would have the effect of compelling men in unions to subscribe to the Central Political Executive and also to the *Worker*.

The PREMIER: You recognise that the motion goes beyond what you were formerly arguing.

Mr. McLACHLAN: I am just trying to controvert the argument of the hon. gentleman. The reason he adduced for that objection was that he was opposed to people being coerced into a certain line of action. I might for a moment refer to something that took place during the recent referendum as far as coercion is concerned. Leaflets were sent far

Mr. McLachlan.]

and wide from a political association levying people up to a certain point to provide funds for the campaign.

The PREMIER: Was it not optional?

Mr. McLACHLAN: I have a circular here saying "You are levied to the extent of £10." Some of these were sent to supporters of the Labour party in mistake.

The PREMIER: Is there any reason why they should not be sent? They are not all socialists.

Mr. McLACHLAN: The hon. member for Townsville, Mr. Foley, received one.

The PREMIER: They knew he was not a socialist.

Mr. McLACHLAN: Now fancy the hon. member for Townsville getting a circular from the People's Progressive League, or someone connected with the People's Progressive League, calling upon him to subscribe £10, or £15, or £20, as the case may be, to defeat the party with which the hon. member is associated.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Was that not magnanimous?

Mr. McLACHLAN: Is that not a system of coercion?

The PREMIER: Not at all. Was he coerced? Did he yield?

Mr. McLACHLAN: The hon. gentleman can conjugate the verb "to coerce" to suit himself. It is a different matter when the same argument is applied with reference to the Central Political Executive and the *Worker* newspaper. It would be wrong if the members of unions were asked in the same way to contribute to the Central Political Executive or to the *Worker* newspaper.

The PREMIER: It is a condition of membership in a union.

Mr. McLACHLAN: It is not. Before the funds of a union can be allocated in any way, a motion must be submitted to the union, and it must be carried by a majority of the members of the union.

Mr. CORSER: A majority of those present.

Mr. McLACHLAN: The majority of the electors of Maryborough did not return the hon. member to this House. If a majority of the electors of Maryborough had the power to shift the hon. member, he would not be in this House to-day, and probably a majority of those who put him here will shift him at the next election. The Premier argued that a minority in that instance should have the right to control the whole union. Now, before any union funds can be used for any purpose a motion in that behalf must be carried—in most instances by ballot—by a majority of the persons in the union. Surely, if a majority of the members of a union decide that a certain thing shall be done with their money they have a perfect right to do so!

Mr. D. HUNTER: Not for political purposes.

The PREMIER: Where is your conscience clause that you talked so much about in another connection?

Mr. McLACHLAN: I know the Premier argues that majorities should only have weight when they suit the hon. gentleman's views. Queensland is not the only place where the funds of unions are used for political purposes. I think the hon. member for Woolloongabba, when speaking last Thursday, made some reference to the society of which he is a member. I find, on looking up the

[*Mr. McLachlan.*

report of the eleventh annual conference of the Labour party held at home, that there is a list of the different unions in England that are subscribing to the parliamentary fund, and in that list I find the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Yes, but we do not subscribe to that fund.

Mr. McLACHLAN: The society at home is a political society.

Mr. D. HUNTER: We do not subscribe to that.

Mr. McLACHLAN: I do not know whether the society here is affiliated with the society at home or not.

Mr. D. HUNTER: We do not pay to that fund.

Mr. McLACHLAN: But I notice that in the list the society, with a membership of 45,000, is put down as subscribing £375 during the year 1910 to the parliamentary fund.

The PREMIER: Quite so, but they have no payment of members by the State. That is a different matter.

Mr. McLACHLAN: The argument of the Premier is that it is right for a trade union to have a fund for political purposes provided that fund is going to be used to pay members of Parliament. There is no payment of members there.

The PREMIER: It does not obtain here because the State provides here what the unions provide at home.

Mr. McLACHLAN: Does the hon. gentleman argue that he is prepared to allow the funds of unions to be used for the political purpose of paying the salaries of members of Parliament where there are no salaries provided by the State?

The PREMIER: There is no need. The State provides them.

Mr. McLACHLAN: I want to know whether the Premier is prepared to argue in that way.

The PREMIER: No, I am not.

Mr. McLACHLAN: The hon. gentleman is endeavouring to introduce another side issue. He tried to make the electors believe that he was in favour of a fund being subscribed for a certain purpose—

The PREMIER: No, no!

Mr. McLACHLAN: But whenever he is brought down to bedrock and is asked to bring his conclusions to something definite, he says, "No, no, I am not prepared to do that." What I am arguing is that, if it is right to provide that the funds of a union may be used for a political purpose, when that purpose is the payment of the salaries of members of Parliament—

The PREMIER: That was decided to be illegal in England.

Mr. D. HUNTER: That is a special fund.

Mr. McLACHLAN: The Premier is arguing that it is right.

The PREMIER: No, no.

Mr. McLACHLAN: Well, if the hon. gentleman's argument means anything at all, it means that. I have quoted a case to show where the funds of unions are used in England for a political purpose.

Mr. D. HUNTER: A separate fund.

Mr. McLACHLAN: A fund that is subscribed by unions through their membership—a fund which is called a “Parliamentary Fund.”

The PREMIER: And which has been found to be illegal.

Mr. McLACHLAN: It is used for the purpose of providing salaries for representatives in Parliament. In reply to that the Premier says, “But there is no payment of members there.” Now, what is the logical deduction to be drawn from the hon. gentleman’s interjection?

Mr. D. HUNTER: But we are more advanced in Australia than they are in England.

Mr. McLACHLAN: I will come to the hon. member afterwards. The logical deduction to be drawn from the Premier’s argument is that, because there is no payment of members in England, it is right to use the funds of a trade union in that direction.

The PREMIER: It has no bearing in this State—that is the deduction.

Mr. McLACHLAN: It is the principle that I am discussing. The hon. gentleman might say that because they have passed a certain law in another State, where the conditions are not absolutely similar to the conditions here, we should not pass that law here. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to admit that, if the funds of a union can be rightly used in a certain political direction in one country, then there is nothing wrong in using them for political purposes in another country? I think that if the hon. gentleman expressed his real opinion, it would be that it would be right and proper for the different unions in Brisbane to allocate a portion of their funds for the purpose of keeping the present Government in power—

The PREMIER: It would show their good sense.

Mr. McLACHLAN: But if the money is going to be used to put his party out of power, then it is not a right and proper thing. That is about the hon. gentleman’s argument.

Mr. D. HUNTER: It is a compulsory fund.

Mr. McLACHLAN: I could show that out of the ninety-three unions which contribute to the parliamentary fund in England, some of them have a membership ranging from 70,000 or 80,000 down to less than 100, but in every case they subscribe to the Parliamentary Fund, recognising that it is a correct thing to do with the funds. And why do they subscribe to that fund? And why have they Labour members in the House of Commons? They have not got such a franchise as we have in Queensland or they would have a bigger representation. The workers of Queensland and the workers of the Commonwealth of Australia have recognised that if they expect to get on the statute-book legislation that will have for its effect the improvement, in an amicable way, of their conditions, and that will make for the well-being of the people of Queensland and of Australia, they can only expect to get such legislation passed by returning to Parliament men who are seized of what is needed by the workers to bring about such an improvement.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Why don’t the Amalgamated Society do it in Australia?

Mr. McLACHLAN: Probably because they have not got the liberal spirit or the enlightened leaders.

Mr. D. HUNTER: They would not do it when they were asked. They did not want the Labour party.

Mr. McLACHLAN: I do not want to take up too much time over this business, as I believe a good many other members want to speak; but I feel confident that this motion has done good in this House. It has shown exactly where the Premier and those who sit behind him stand [5.30 p.m.] in regard to this matter. The Premier, and those who voted

with him, thought that by moving the amendment which has been carried they had got themselves out of the wood, but I think they will find that they have just got themselves into the wood. The Trade Disputes Bill, which would be introduced if this motion were carried and the Government acted upon it, would have for its object the protection of union funds. The principal object of a Trade Disputes Bill is to protect union funds, particularly benefit funds, and that object ought to commend itself to the Premier.

The PREMIER: He advocated it last week.

Mr. McLACHLAN: Mortality funds raised from the contributions of members of trade unions are established for the specific purpose of providing something for widows and orphans after men are called to their reward, and those funds are sometimes swept away under the law as it exists at present. It is not proposed that a Trade Disputes Bill should place unions above the law, but simply to place trade unions on the same footing as that occupied by other institutions. That is all that is asked for by this motion, and it seems to me that it is a very fair thing to ask for. The principle has been recognised by previous Governments. A Trade Disputes Bill has been included in their programme, and such a measure was introduced by the Kidston Government. I am satisfied that the discussion which has taken place on this motion will show the workers of Queensland that if they expect to get the remedial industrial legislation that they have been asking for for years, they must remove from the sphere of government the gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury benches, and return—as I am confident they will do at the next election—to power a party who will introduce and pass such legislation.

Mr. PAYNE (*Mitchell*): If the Premier was in earnest in the remarks he made on this question the other evening, he would accept this motion.

The PREMIER: I voted for the amendment.

Mr. PAYNE: I did not intend to say a word on the subject, but the matter has been treated in such a nonsensical way that I feel compelled to express my opinion with regard to it. The Premier made out that the motion moved by the hon. member for Woothakata specifically says that all unions who devote their funds to political purposes shall come under the operation of the proposed Bill. I do not understand the motion in that way, and I regard the amendment which has been passed as only the height of hypocrisy. If the Premier was in earnest in the matter, he would accept the motion, and when he brought in a Trade Disputes Bill he would exclude from its provisions

*Mr. Payne.]*

those unions which use their funds for political purposes. I am surprised at the attitude which has been taken by the hon. member for Woolloongabba on this question, because I understand that he belongs to a very large and strong industrial organisation, which does not use its funds for political purposes. Is it not an extraordinary thing to see a member of such a union voting against legislation being brought in to protect its funds? The Premier may talk as he likes, and say that there are certain trade unions in Queensland which use their funds for political purposes. But it is a well-known fact that there are a large number of trade unions in Queensland which do not use any part of their funds for political purposes. The Premier has a majority behind him, and if his only objection to the motion is that he wishes to exclude from the provisions of a Trade Disputes Bill unions which use their funds for political purposes, he could, if he was in earnest in the matter, introduce a Bill which would exclude those unions from its provisions. There are members on that side who belong to strong industrial organisations, and yet they voted against the introduction of the proposed measure. As I have already said, the hon. member for Woolloongabba belongs to a strong industrial organisation, which he says is spread all over Queensland and all over the civilised world, and which does not use its funds for political purposes. Whatever difference of opinion there may be among members in this House, honest people will say that the amendment was simply moved to side-track the question.

The PREMIER: I am sorry for you.

Mr. PAYNE: If I am speaking foolishly my remarks will react upon myself, and I shall have to put up with the consequences, but I am of opinion that the amendment moved by the Secretary for Public Instruction was only a move to side-track the question, because if the Premier is really willing to introduce such a measure as he says he is prepared to introduce, he should do so, and it would protect a lot of industrial organisations in Queensland which do not use their funds for political purposes. But the Premier says he will not introduce such a Bill.

Mr. D. HUNTER: The amendment says he will.

Mr. PAYNE: The amendment says nothing of the sort. If the matter had been looked at in an honest way the Premier need not have troubled to get one of his colleagues to move an amendment. He could have accepted the motion, and then have done exactly what is proposed by the amendment. Anyhow, I hope he will introduce legislation even on the lines he has indicated, in order to show that he is honest in the matter. What is the use of members in this Chamber saying, "We will do certain things," and when it comes to the point trying to get all round the matter? If the hon. gentleman does not believe in the motion, if he does not believe in legislation of the kind proposed, then he should say so, and say clearly, "I am not going to introduce legislation." It would be better to do that than to adopt a course which simply side-tracks the question.

The PREMIER: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member has spoken.

The PREMIER: I have not spoken on the amendment. (Opposition laughter.)

[Mr. Payne.

The SPEAKER: I would point out to the hon. member that that amendment having been carried, we are now back on the original motion, plus the amendment. Hon. members who have spoken to the original motion or the amendment cannot speak to the question now before the House.

Mr. WINSTANLEY (*Charters Towers*): The motion moved by the hon. member for Woothakata has caused a little flutter on the front bench. It seems that the debate as it has proceeded has got broader even if it has not got deeper. With regard to what the hon. member for Cairns says about the employers and employees, we know very well that no legislation imaginable can be passed to compel men to work if they do not wish to work, and no legislation can be passed to compel employers to keep their works open if they do not wish to. I know many cases where employers close their shops and say that they have no orders, and yet their neighbours are carrying out those orders for them. This has been done over and over again. Every means should be adopted to stop this that can be adopted.

Mr. MANN: If you give it to the employees, you should also give it to the employers.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: The employers take it themselves.

Mr. MANN: You can penalise them.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: You cannot penalise them, because they can get out of it by saying that they have got no orders, and then close down their works, whilst someone near them can carry out their orders for them, and they have done it over and over again. Taking it in its broadest sense, there are some things done that we do not approve of. There is the right of revolution which might be resorted to. If a party is only strong enough, and brings about a revolution and that revolution is victorious, then everybody accepts it and puts up with the consequences. While the awards that are given may be good in some instances, you cannot make it apply to the employers always. The employer has ten ways of getting out of it, while the employee has only one way. The present motion, as amended, does not cover all that we want. We say that it should also include the repeal of the Osborne judgment. Whilst we say that the Trade Disputes Bill should be brought in as it is brought in in the old country—

The PREMIER: You are not asking for that in the resolution.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: I am only responsible for myself and what I am saying. In the old country now they have a Trade Disputes Bill as part of the law, and they are asking for the repeal of the Osborne judgment and asking for it with a good deal of vim and vigour. I say that one is needed just as much as the other. The question arises in my mind how it happens that there has to be so much argument to get these laws placed on the statute-book. It is because that in the past the laws have always been made in the interests of those who passed them. The people who were in power made the laws to suit themselves, and not only were the laws favourable to themselves, but they were oppressive to the working man. When the industrial workers themselves become as class-conscious as the capitalists and landowners are, there will



be different legislation passed to that which is being passed at the present time. A few years ago it was only necessary for three or four men to meet together and talk over their own conditions, when under the conspiracy laws they could be brought before the magistrate—and in many cases the magistrates were employers of labour—and they were transported out of the country in which they lived. No one would venture to say that this was right at the time it took place, but the law was there, and to-day we have laws in existence which are not much better than the laws which existed at that time. The trades union is not merely for the purpose of improving the conditions and lessening the hours of labour. That is only a primary part of them. Trade unionists at their very commencement took a wider view of life than mere wages and conditions of work, and they have done a great deal more for workers than shortening their hours, increasing their wages, and bettering their conditions. Trades unions have been an educational force, and have been the means of bringing men to the front, and in different ways have conferred a benefit not only on themselves, but on the communities in which they lived. In the past it has been found that trade unionists, by merely being trade unionists and confining themselves to their own particular trades, would never attain the objects which they had in view. It was only about thirty years ago that trades unionists thought that if they could only get every tradesman into the unions, the industrial millenium would be brought about, but experience has taught them differently since then. They have now been forced to the conclusion that they have to take action not only so far as politics are concerned, but so far as the Press is concerned. They found they were compelled to apply politics to trade unions, and they found that they had also to make use of the Press to put forward their views. The Labour movement the wide world over is the result of the trade unions. They have not only directly, but indirectly, been teaching men industrialism, economics, and other things that have helped to bring about the present condition of affairs. There is no doubt that the feeling in favour of trade unions taking part in politics has grown, and while there may be some at the present time who are so backward that they refuse to take political action, they are becoming a diminishing quantity. There is no trade union in existence to-day that does not, directly or indirectly, take action in connection with politics. If they do not, they are not trade unionists at all, but only benefit societies which exist for dealing with contingencies that arise in their own particular trade. Unionism has become much wider and much more extensive, and people understand it much better. The aims and objects of trade unions are becoming better known, and in this respect they are doing an exceptionally good thing for themselves. It might be argued, what would be the result if the law was applied to other things as it is applied to-day to trade unions? What would happen if it were applied to a friendly society? Suppose that a member of a friendly society did something which brought him within the grip of the law and the society he belonged to were made responsible. What would be the result? It

would not be tolerated for five minutes. At present trade unions in England have to contribute to the payment of their members in Parliament, but even when payment of members is brought about it will not stop at that. Not only have they to provide the salaries of members, but they have to meet all the expenses of an election when it takes place, including the fees of the returning officer and every official, right down to the lowest, who are engaged in it. In many instances this runs to a pretty large sum, and it is essential that the trade unions will have to do something in this direction. A good deal has been said about jury-made law and judge-made law, and a lot could be said about existing conditions, and perhaps there has been some bias and some prejudice. Certainly there is not the same here as there is in some countries. It is practically impossible in some countries for a worker to get a verdict. One of the things at the present time which makes the wages boards unsatisfactory is that it very often depends on the whim of one man, and while some of them may be impartial and honest, it strikes me they are very few indeed. It has been stated by the Premier that in the past, when the men were in the right, they won, and when they were in the wrong, they lost. As a matter of fact in nine cases out of ten where the men have been right, they have lost, for the simple reason that the question has not been decided on equity and justice, but on the length of the purse, and invariably the employers have the biggest purse and the workmen have been starved into submission.

The PREMIER: Well, out of £16,000 raised last year by the trade unions £14,000 were spent on politics.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: And well spent. As a matter of fact, that shows clearly that the unions recognised the necessity of helping one another in times of difficulty and in times of stress, and that is the right kind of feeling to have amongst the workers. Notwithstanding that fact, they have over and over again been starved into submission, although they have had justice and equity on their side. I know of one instance when the public were denounced for feeding the men on strike, and it was stated, "If you leave them alone, and not help them, they will have to give in." The same thing applies here, and consequently unions all over the world have helped each other, as they have a perfect right to do, and it seems to me this is one of the best features and most encouraging features in connection, not merely with trade unions, but with unionism as we understand it at the present time. I think if the Premier showed one thing more than another when speaking on the question, it was that he did not thoroughly grasp the question he was dealing with, when he mixed the Central Political Executive with the debate that is taking place.

The PREMIER: It is the very genesis of the whole question.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: It is nothing of the kind; and when the Premier makes a remark of that kind, it shows he does not know what he is talking about. As a matter of fact, the Central Political Executive has nothing whatever to do with any industrial or political organisation, except when power is given to it, and the hon. member used the old gag which we have heard over and over

*Mr. Winstanley.]*

again from the very inception of the Central Political Executive, while there is not a vestige of truth in it.

The PREMIER: The hon. member for Fortitude Valley says there is.

Mr. BARBER: No!

Mr. WINSTANLEY: We have had some very curious opinions expressed with regard to majority rule. It is certainly surprising to me that the majority should not rule. The majority has a perfect right to rule. It rules in this House, and it rules outside, and why should it not rule in trade unions or political unions? If a majority of any union say the funds should be used for a certain purpose, then they are perfectly justified in using their funds for that certain purpose.

The PREMIER: "Might is right."

Mr. WINSTANLEY: In nine cases out of ten, when exception is taken to the funds being used for a certain purpose, it is not taken by legitimate unionists, but is taken by men who get into those unions for the purpose of breaking them up. The arguments that have been used in favour, not merely of this Bill, which protects union funds, but in favour of something more, which has practically been asked for at the present time—a reversal of the Osborne judgment—are perfectly legitimate. The only argument that has been used against the motion is that it would foster the spread of socialism. That is a perfectly legitimate object. The point about it is this: Whether the Premier believes it or not, or whether he likes it or not, socialism is a growing force, and it is proceeding in certain directions. That is, that the State should interfere more and more in the industries of the community, and it will continue in that direction until the State practically controls the whole lot.

Mr. FOLEY: The Home Secretary is a socialist.

The HOME SECRETARY: A State socialist.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: This motion leads in the right direction, and whether it is granted now or not, it will certainly be granted in the future.

Mr. WHITE: Stonewalling.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: And the workers will send their representatives here and have legislation placed on the statute-book which will be in their interests, and consequently, in the very near future, the Premier, like others who have preceded him, will be relegated somewhere else, and others will take his place, who will place those enactments on the statute-book that will be for the good, not of a class, not of a few, but for the good of the whole.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. WHITE (*Musgrave*): I regret that this afternoon should have been wasted. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. FOLEY: Wasted?

Mr. WHITE: Yes; wasted on socialism—a theoretical discussion—an academic discussion on socialism. It is the same old Thursday afternoon business. Everyone has his little complaint, and gets his little fireworks off. With regard to socialism, I can assure you I have seen a good deal during my short experience of political life, and I have heard

[*Mr. Winstanley.*]

a good deal of what this socialism is. Is there any member of this House who believes in State socialism?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Yes, yes!

Mr. WHITE: Two only. What is a socialist?

One who has yearnings  
For equal division  
Of unequal earnings,  
Idler or bungler, or both, he is willing  
To put down a penny and pocket your  
shilling.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and Opposition laughter.

Mr. WHITE: Who are the idlers? Who are the bunglers? Who are the socialists who are willing to put down their penny and pocket your shilling. (Laughter.) There are a good many on that side of the House who are quite willing to do this. (Government laughter.) A very sensible, and I think a good idea, was brought forward by the front Treasury bench, and the Premier showed he was quite willing to remove the disabilities that have been talked about so much all this afternoon, and I am quite certain he is quite willing to remove those disabilities, but the Opposition have shown by their action, in preventing the motion from being put, that they do not want to remove those disabilities.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear!

Mr. WHITE: They do not want those disabilities removed, because immediately those disabilities are removed they would lose one of the best arguments on that side of the House against the people over here. (Opposition laughter.)

At 7 o'clock the House, in accordance with Sessional Order, proceeded with Government business.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY.

##### RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. FORSYTH (*Moreton*): I have to congratulate you, Sir, on having attained the position of Speaker, which is the highest position that this House can give to any member in it, and I feel sure that while you are in the Chair you will conduct the business with honour to the House and credit to yourself. (Hear, hear!) I have also to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply—the hon. member for Dalby and the hon. member for Enoggera—on the most excellent speeches which they made when we opened Parliament. They are men of common sense, and with a practical knowledge of business, and I think they will both be a distinct acquisition to the House. (Hear, hear!) I have also to refer to the death of the late Speaker, the late Hon. J. T. Bell, and I am sure that everyone on both sides will regret his decease. I have also to refer to another event, which I do not think has been referred to, and that is the death of the late Mr. Thallon, the late Commissioner for Railways. He was a man whom this State could ill afford to lose, and one who, I am sure, gave up his life to carry on the duties devolving on him as Commissioner for Railways. (Hear, hear!) He was a man who was devoted to the State, and I venture to say that there was no one in the service for so many years who had such a wonderful grasp of detail and administrative power as Mr. Thallon had. With regard to his successor, Mr. Evans, I feel sure that the House—in fact, I think, the

country—has expressed itself in favour of appointing a man from our own service instead of going outside. Mr. Evans was a lieutenant under Mr. Thallon, and I feel sure that he also will be a competent and capable administrator. (Hear, hear!) The Governor, in his Speech, starts by discussing the question of the great loyalty that has been manifested throughout the British Empire in connection with the crowning of the King and Queen. He states—

“It was highly gratifying to note the admirable spirit with which 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 to their Majesties which on that great occasion took place in every portion of the Empire.”

Now, it is somewhat sad to think that after all this rejoicing in connection with the coronation of the King, something should be said by the Prime Minister of Australia, which I think is no credit to himself, and certainly is no credit to Australia.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FORSYTH: This is what Mr. Fisher is reported to have said in the cables appearing in the papers lately—

Mr. MULLAN (sitting at the table): What if it turns out that he did not say it?

The SPEAKER: Order! I have not this session called attention to the fact that interjections are generally disorderly. I did so last session, and I now wish to again point out that interjections coming from the table—which is reserved for members and officers of the House who have to do some work there, and do not wish to be disturbed—are more than ordinarily disorderly. I ask hon. members on both sides of the House, when they are sitting at the table, to refrain from interjections.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FORSYTH: Mr. Fisher is alleged to have said, in an interview with the editor of the *Review of Reviews*—

“Don't talk of Empire. We are not an Empire. No end of mischief has arisen from the use of that word. We are a very loose association of five nations, each independent, each willing for a time—”

For a time, bear in mind—

“to remain a fraternal co-operative union of Great Britain and each other; but only on condition that if at any time or from any cause we decide to terminate that connection, no one can say us nay. We are independent, self-governing communities, untrammelled by laws, treaties, and Constitutions. We are free to take our own course, in our own interests, without anyone preventing us. There is no necessity to say we will or will not take part in England's wars. We recognise our territory is subject to attack by England's enemy. If threatened, we should have to decide whether we should defend ourselves, or if we thought the war unjust and England's enemy right, we should haul down the Union Jack, hoist our own flag, and start on our own.”

Mr. WHITE: Disgraceful.

Mr. FORSYTH—

“We don't expect an attack or contemplate independence, because, except as the riddance of the risk of being attacked by England's foes, we gain nothing if we are as independent as any other sovereign State, and might lose much.”

That is a statement which was made by Mr. Fisher in London just a few days before he left, and one of the most remarkable things

in connection with that statement is this: That when Mr. Hughes, the Attorney-General of the Commonwealth Government, was asked to give his opinion with regard to the statements made by Mr. Fisher, he said—

“The facts are, of course, such that any departure from the recognition of the common destiny and responsibility of various members which form the Empire as we know it would be not merely destructive of the idea but fatal if not to the existence at least to the independence of some of them. I expressed opinions very much like this in regard to observations in the South African Nationalist Press last week suggesting an attitude of neutrality by one of the parts of the Empire when the other portions were involved in international warfare. I said then, and I think now, that such an attitude is incompatible with any form of alliance.”

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FORSYTH: That is a statement which I thoroughly approve of, and one which I think the bulk of the people of Australia thoroughly approve of. Mr. Botha, the Prime Minister of South Africa, is a man whom we might think, taking his past experience into consideration, might not be so loyal as Mr. Fisher, and yet he distinctly states that the suggestion raised by Mr. Fisher is so ridiculous that it is unnecessary to discuss it.

Mr. MURPHY: A similar suggestion was made in the *Volksstem* by Botha.

Mr. FORSYTH: Sir John Quick is reported as follows:—

“Sir John Quick, of Melbourne, at Plymouth, yesterday said that Mr. Fisher might speak for himself and for a small clique of socialists, but his statement was a perversion and a gross misrepresentation of the views of the great mass of the Australian people and the Australian democracy. It was false and useless to say that “the British are not an Empire, but merely a loose association of five nations, each independent of each other.” Such utterances were unworthy of a Prime Minister who has just attended the coronation.

“Sir John's explanation of the incident was that the socialistic party were threatening to depose Mr. Fisher from the leadership of the Australian Labour party, and anti-British and anti-Imperial speech was a sort of rallying counterblast for extremists and revolutionists.”

Mr. LENNON: Do you regard that as an impartial criticism?

Mr. FORSYTH: I regard this as being the opinion of the majority of the people of Australia, whether the latter remark of Sir John Quick is correct or not. We are a people who really come from Great Britain—we have either been brought or are descended from people who came out here; and we are loyal to Great Britain to the core.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FORSYTH: And we have just cause to be so.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FORSYTH: I cannot understand a statement like that coming from Mr. Fisher after receiving most magnificent hospitality at the hands of the people of Great Britain. Here is a gentleman who has been giving out Imperial sentiments ever since he went home, and, in spite of that, he winds up with giving utterance to sentiments absolutely opposed to the sentiments held by the people of Australia.

Mr. LENNON: You would have been wise to wait and hear his explanation.

*Mr. Forsyth.*

Mr. FORSYTH: A cable appeared in to-day's Press stating that the report sent out on Monday is absolutely correct.

Mr. MURPHY: You must not forget that Mr. Fisher showed his loyalty by starting to build a fleet in Australia.

Mr. WHITE: Waste of money.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Money well spent.

Mr. FORSYTH: The people of Australia should be proud of the old country.

Mr. LENNON: Who said they were not? You are beating the air.

Mr. FORSYTH: I am talking solid facts, which I challenge anyone to contradict.

Mr. FOLEY: It is an "Aunt Sally."

Mr. FORSYTH: We are proud of the old country, and well we may be. She has a magnificent history; her traditions are well known all over the world; her aims are high, and her ambitions noble. Will anyone deny that? I will go further, and say that Australia should be glad to be an integral part of the Empire.

Mr. LENNON: Have you a mortgage on the loyalty of this House?

Mr. FORSYTH: We have had the protection of Great Britain's fleet ever since we have settled Australia; and when we consider the enormous commerce between Australia and other countries, we realise the value of that protection.

Mr. MAUGHAN: What are you trying to prove—that the Labour party are disloyal?

Mr. FORSYTH: No.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Yes; and you cannot do it.

Mr. FORSYTH: I am referring to statements made by Mr. Fisher. The inference from the hon. member's remark is that the Labour party is loyal.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Always have been.

Mr. FORSYTH: I am glad to hear it; I hope it is so. How is Australia to defend itself against a nation like Germany or Japan?

Mr. LENNON: Talk like yours won't defend it.

Mr. FORSYTH: We owe a great deal to the protection we have received from the British fleet; and if there is one thing more than another that has proved the loyalty of Australians it is their action in the Boer war in sending contingent after contingent to South Africa to help the old country.

Mr. THEODORE: Disgraceful.

Mr. FORSYTH: It is astonishing that a gentleman in a high position who had just received honour from the King—he is now the Right Hon. Andrew Fisher, a privy councillor—should make such statements.

The PREMIER: Shame!

Mr. FORSYTH: Another thing: It is not likely to do Australia any good in connection with our financial requirements. We have all along been dependent on Great Britain for the money needed for the development of the different parts of Australia; and the utterance of such sentiments is not likely to assist us in connection with any money we may require before very long, but may do a great deal of harm. I believe the people of Australia are

[*Mr. Forsyth.*]

loyal to the core, and I hope we shall never be independent of Great Britain, because goodness only knows how we would get on then.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Does loyalty depend on the successful flotation of loans?

Mr. FORSYTH: It depends on something more than that.

Mr. MAUGHAN: I should think it would.

Mr. FORSYTH: At any rate, I believe the large majority of the people of Australia are loyal to the core; and I cannot compliment the Prime Minister of Australia on the sentiments he uttered before leaving Great Britain.

Mr. MAY: What was the population of the United States of America before they cut the painter?

Mr. FORSYTH: It is not a matter of population. They had cause for their action in America on account of the taxes put upon them. It is different here, because we are practically independent and the Home Government do not interfere with us. Under the circumstances, I consider that the words expressed by Mr. Fisher were really a disgrace to Australia and to himself. I believe that if we had the absolutely private opinion of Mr. Fisher he would be loyal too. There may have been some cause for all this; but whatever the cause may have been he had no right to utter the words.

Mr. MURPHY: They accused Asquith of being a traitor the other day.

Mr. FORSYTH: I do not intend to go through the whole gamut of the various Bills mentioned in the Governor's Speech, but I will try to lay a few plain facts before the House; and I hope the Government will not think my remarks are made in any spirit of carping criticism. The remarks I intend to make in connection with finance will come from the bottom of my heart. I do not wish to stand here as a candid friend of the Government, but I want to lay a few facts before them, so that they may know my opinions in connection with finance. We have to congratulate the country upon good seasons. We certainly have been very prosperous for some years back, and I am sure everyone of us hopes that that prosperity may continue for many years to come. If we only get good seasons and a fair rainfall, and fair prices for our primary products, I do not think any Government—not even a Labour Government—can keep Queensland from developing as she should do. But while that is so, if ever there was a time in the history of Queensland when the Government of the day should be cautious, it is now. Anyone who looks through the figures that we have had year after year will notice the wonderful development that has taken place so far as our railway revenue is concerned, and that has helped materially in bringing forth good credit balances year in year out for the last six or seven years. If hon. members will only go back for the last five years, and compare the revenue then with the revenue last financial year, they will see the wonderful progress that has been made. In 1904-5 our total revenue was only a little over £3,500,000. For the financial year which closed on 30th June last, the revenue was not less than £5,320,000, or an increase in the period mentioned of no less a sum than £1,725,000. That is real genuine progress, and a great deal of that addi-

tional revenue came from railways. The expenditure for the year 1904-5 was very much the same as our revenue, as there was a small surplus of about £13,000 only. The increase in expenditure up to 30th June last as compared with the expenditure for the year 1904-5 was £1,793,000. Our railway revenue in 1904-5 was £1,409,000, and last year it was £2,700,000. In other words, it nearly doubled. It is particularly gratifying to know that the country is progressing at such a rate—that wealth is being produced from the soil so as to increase our railway freights to such an extent. Now last year was an exceptionally good year. Our revenue was the biggest on record, but our expenditure was also the biggest on record. We had an increase in land revenue of £50,000; taxation last year increased to the extent of £82,000, caused principally by the receipts from income tax having increased by something like £40,000 or £50,000, whilst there was also a heavy increase in stamp duties. Then the railway revenue showed a large increase over the receipts for the previous year of no less a sum than £388,000. Our miscellaneous receipts increased by some £64,000—or a total increase for the year of no less than £585,000. Good business that! It only shows the wonderful progress Queensland is making at the present time. While we had these increases of £585,000, we received £383,000 less from the Commonwealth than during the previous year, and there was also a small decrease of £1,400 in the receipts from the Mines Department. That was the only State department that showed a decrease. But despite those decreases, the Government were still to the good some £200,000.

Mr. MAY: The Mines Department is starved.

Mr. FORSYTH: The figures are very satisfactory so far as they go; but, on the other hand, we have to bear in mind that, while the estimated expenditure for last year was a little over £5,000,000, the actual expenditure was nearly £300,000 more. In other words, we spent £276,000 more than was estimated. That is a feature that has been taking place for a good many years back. The Premier mentioned in connection with charging the year ended 30th June with expenditure and liabilities belonging to the current year, that that was not the case. I have made inquiries into the matter, and I believe that what the hon. gentleman stated is perfectly correct. We have been doing something with the big increases we have had during the last two years that we were not in the habit of doing before. Money that was really chargeable to the year ended 30th June, 1911, but which had not been paid by that date, would under ordinary conditions have been paid during the present year, and would have been charged to this year's account, although the liability was really incurred during the last financial year. By wires and by information received from various parts of Queensland, the Government had endeavoured to find out what these liabilities were, and they have debited them—as they justly were entitled to do—to last year's account. The same thing, I understand, was done last year. But there is one thing in connection with this year's transactions—

Mr. LENNON: Do you approve of the £70,000 business last year?

Mr. FORSYTH: We will come to that matter.

Mr. LENNON: But do you approve of it?

Mr. FORSYTH: Yes, I do approve of it. In 1909-10 we had a big surplus of £270,000 or £280,000, and that surplus was reduced. As Mr. Kidston stated at the time, although they had increased the expenditure during that year by £279,000 more than the estimated expenditure, strictly speaking only about £30,000 of that was really expenditure over the Estimates, because he told us that he had debited to revenue extraordinary and non-recurring items totalling £249,000. In that sum there were such items as £50,000, which was part of a deficiency on a loan which had been standing to the debit of loan account, and had been transferred to revenue account. Then there was an item for public buildings which in former years had been charged to loan and which was last year credited to loan account and debited to revenue account, and so on. Hon. members who are interested in mining will remember also that there was an item of some £45,000 or £50,000 lying to debit on account of deep sinking for many years, and Mr. Kidston thought it would be wise, as the money was never likely to be paid, to write it off, and the only way to write it off was by debiting it to revenue. I do not blame him very much for doing these things, because it is far better in any year when you can afford to wipe off such items, to do so, just as any business man, if he has a good year, likes to have something up his sleeve for the following year, because he does not know how it may turn out. Now this year we have not got that. There is no surplus charged anywhere with the exception of a few thousands of pounds, and that is just the reason why I think the Government should be particularly careful in connection with expenditure. We cannot control our revenue. If we have good seasons and the money comes in, it is all right. But we have absolute control over our expenditure, and that is where I think caution should be shown.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Do you say they are extravagant, because I do not?

Mr. FORSYTH: If we had not had a very much larger revenue last year than was anticipated, only one thing could have happened, and that would have been we should have had a deficit; and I am sure we are all agreed that that is a state of affairs we do not want if it can possibly be avoided. With regard to land revenue, I am sure we are all gratified at seeing that the income from our lands is [7.30 p.m.] increasing by leaps and bounds.

During the last three years our land revenue increased by about £160,000. As I said last year, I say now, the time is not far distant when the revenue from our public lands will be £1,000,000. I believe it will not be very long before it reaches that amount. There are some members who wish to abolish certain taxes. It is said that farmers want to get exemption from the income tax and other irritating imposts. I should like to ask the gentleman who suggests that, what he would substitute for the income tax? The income tax, in my estimation, is the fairest tax we can impose, because under that tax a man only pays according to his income. (Hear, hear!) If we were to take off the £348,000 derived

*Mr. Forsyth.]*

from the income tax, exclusive of other taxes—small irritating taxes—I should like to ask hon. members where they are going to get that amount? Members opposite will, of course, tell us that we should put on a land tax. I do not think we want a land tax. We have got one already—a tax imposed by the Federal Government.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: We should have that for the State.

Mr. FORSYTH: I shall speak of that tax later on. Of course, we know that the policy of the Labour party is to have a State land tax as well, and yet they pose as friends of the farmers. There are hundreds, probably thousands, of farmers in Queensland who hold land, the unimproved value of which is a great deal more than the £300 exemption proposed by the Labour party. Therefore, instead of helping the farmer, the Labour party would simply add to the taxation they have to bear now, and drive more money out of the country. The hon. member for Ipswich, when speaking the other night, stated that members on this side of the House posed as the friends of the farmers. The hon. member never said a truer word. The members on this side of the House are the true friends of the farmers, and the farmers know it. I think that almost every farming constituency represented in this House has returned a member who sits on this side.

Mr. MAUGHAN: You will have to watch the farmers, as they are organising now.

Mr. FORSYTH: They are organising for the purpose of knocking the Labour party on the head far more than they have ever done hitherto, and I think the hon. member will find that out for himself before he is much older. One reason why I made the remarks I did just now is that the matters referred to may have some effect on our floating loans in the old country.

Mr. LENNON: Nothing of the sort.

Mr. FORSYTH: I do not know. Those who control the money market are very sensitive in matters of this kind. We have had assistance to the extent of £250,000,000, which we borrowed from the old country. What would Australia have done, what would Queensland have done, but for that assistance from the old country in the shape of loan money? Where else could we have got the money? Nowhere else; and I say we should be pleased and thankful to think that the old country has stood by us, and found the money that we required for the development of Queensland. In considering this question of finance, we should not forget that some of our loans will shortly be falling due, and I say again that there never was a time in the history of Queensland when the Government have needed to be more careful in connection with the public finances than they need to be at the present time. We have got enormous liabilities ahead of us. We have to meet during the next eighteen months a sum of £2,596,000, and we have got to meet during the next three years nearly £12,000,000 more. In other words, during the next three years whatever Government may be in power have got to arrange for the renewal of over £14,000,000 sterling. And I say we need to be as careful as we can in connection with our finances. I strongly advise the Government to look ahead, and think what they are going to do within the next eighteen months. I am not

[Mr. Forsyth.

at all at one with the hon. member for Leichhardt, who spoke last night on this matter. His idea of the manner in which we should deal with this matter is a good one, if it was practicable, but unfortunately it is not practicable. The whole of the moneys falling due during the next three or four years are 4 per cent. debentures, and I do not think he would get people who have still to wait three or four years for their money to accept 3½ per cent. when they know they can get 4 per cent. for four years. They are all 4 per cent. debentures.

Mr. MAUGHAN: I think you are wrong there; they are not all 4 per cent.

Mr. FORSYTH: Every solitary one of them is a 4 per cent. loan. I have the particulars here, and I can assure hon. members that every one of those loans is a 4 per cent. loan. I hope and trust that we shall be able to arrange our finances in such a way as shall enable us when those loans fall due to save at least ¼ per cent. By saving ¼ per cent. on those loans we shall reduce our interest bill by about £35,000 per annum. We are not paying more than 3½ per cent., and I hope that the Government will be able to arrange a renewal of the loans at a lower rate of interest.

Mr. MAUGHAN: We will send you home to fix it up.

Mr. FORSYTH: I do not want to go home to fix it up. There are men in London who are ten times abler than myself or any other member in this House to arrange that matter. But I say the Government should start arranging the matter now. They should start now making arrangements for the retirement of those loans which will fall due at an early date. It is no use waiting. All these things have to be arranged, and I think the Government should approach the people who have taken up our inscribed stock, and see what they are prepared to do in the matter. They have all the names of the persons concerned, or the Bank of England knows the names of every one of them, and we should not wait until the loans are actually becoming due, but should approach those people as soon as possible, and see what they are likely to be prepared to do when the loans fall due. By doing that we might get an indication of what they are willing to do, and take action accordingly.

Hon. R. PHILP: We could not do it now.

Mr. FORSYTH: We might not be able to do it now with regard to all the loans, but we might do it with regard to the loans falling due during the next eighteen months. This is the most important measure the Government could discuss at the present time, and I trust that it will receive their most serious attention. Leaving that matter, I pass on to the subject of population. We have had a great deal of discussion lately about our population. I think it was the acting leader of the Opposition who stated that he hoped the Government would not bring out immigrants wholesale as they are doing in Canada, where men are walking about idle. I would point out that, with all the increase in our population from immigration and from natural increase, the population of this State has only increased by slightly over 2 per cent. per annum. I would ask the hon. member if he thinks 2 per cent. per annum is too large an increase in our population?

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: No; he does not say that.

Mr. FORSYTH: The hon. member knows that our natural increase is not too great, and yet he is against the Government spending money on immigration. I say we shall never populate this State as we ought unless we assist people to come here and help us to develop our resources, and share our liabilities. That is the position. Now, we have in Australia at the present time a very small increase in the population. Last year, not in Queensland but in the whole of Australia, the total increase in the population was, so far as immigration was concerned, only a paltry 20,000. Surely the hon. gentleman does not say that that is too much of an increase for Australia! Surely that is not letting people come in here in a wholesale fashion! So long as we can absorb these people and find them work we should bring them in all the time. (Hear, hear!) This country will never be properly populated unless we assist it ourselves by bringing people out here to help increase it. The information given by the Premier shows that at the present time there is a scarcity of labour in almost every trade. Carpenters and all other trades are crying out that they cannot get men to do the work that they have to do. The farmers are crying out for labour and they cannot get it, and just as quickly as these people come in here so quickly are they absorbed. I was speaking to Mr. Brennan, the Immigration Agent, the other day, and I asked him about the immigrants with the view of using the information in this debate. I asked him how they were being absorbed, and he said there were very few immigrants left, as they were all absorbed. He added that it was marvellous how they were all absorbed as quickly as they came. So long as they are absorbed it is all right. We do not want people to run about the streets and be idle, but we want to give them work. If we want to develop this country as it should be developed, then we must continue to bring out people of the right sort, and if we continue to do that then it will be of great benefit to Queensland.

Mr. MULLAN: Develop the country and let Brisbane develop itself.

Mr. FORSYTH: The Labour party say that they are not against immigration, but as a matter of fact in their hearts and souls they are dead against it. They have said more than once—they have said it in this debate—I believe it was the hon. member for Leichhardt who said it—that we were merely bringing a lot of these people out here for the purpose of reducing wages. Wages are not being reduced at all. In fact, wages are going up. A number of men were brought out, and they were sent out West to work on railway construction work for 9s. per day, and they went on strike for 10s. a day. I am not saying whether they should get 9s. or 10s. a day for the work they were doing, but the fact remains that they were getting 9s. per day, which amounts to £2 14s. a week.

Mr. ALLEN: What about wet days?

Mr. FORSYTH: I understand that they were getting £2 14s. a week for six days a week, and that their cost of living came to 13s. or 14s. a week.

Mr. ALLEN: 17s.

Mr. FORSYTH: Well, we will say 17s. a week. With a margin of a few shillings to spend that left them £1 15s. a week, which they could save after paying for their board

and lodging. Can anyone tell me that these men were able to work in the old country, pay their board, and save £1 15s. a week? Will anyone say that?

Mr. LENNON: No one would be so foolish as to say it.

Mr. FORSYTH: No; but they are foolish enough to go out there and create dissatisfaction amongst the men there.

Mr. ALLEN: Who did that?

Mr. FORSYTH: It was done in connection with the men who went to work at Wallal.

Mr. ALLEN: It was the men themselves who did it.

Mr. FORSYTH: You may tell that to someone else. It is no use telling it to me, as I do not believe it.

Mr. MURPHY: Spence wired to them to go and look for work, so he was not mixed up in it. (Laughter.)

Mr. FORSYTH: There are hundreds and thousands of factory hands wanted in Australia to-day. There are many wanted in Brisbane and other places.

Mr. LENNON: The clothing trade has not made a determination yet in connection with the wages board.

Mr. ALLEN: They have been three years at it.

Mr. FORSYTH: The wages board is there at any rate, and they are hopeful of getting good wages. I do not believe in a man paying his hands poor wages at all. I will give you the figures showing the cost of the raw material and the value of the production from the factories in Australia. The total output of the factories in the Commonwealth in 1909 was valued at £107,000,000 and the raw material was valued at £65,000,000. These are great figures. We want more production and more wealth to go to the people here, and we want more people to help them to get it. The total number of people employed in factories in Australia amounts to 266,000, and of this number 29,000 are employed in Queensland. The amount of wages paid in the factories of Australia amounted in 1909 to £21,000,000, and the amount paid in Queensland totalled between £2,000,000 and £3,000,000. I am taking these figures from "Knibbs." It shows the wonderful business that is being done in Australia, and even in Queensland, but we want to increase it still more if we possibly can. We have had a good deal of discussion in connection with the misrepresentations that were made in connection with the referenda poll. We had a good discussion last night about it. I remarked then, and I remark again now, that there is not the same jubilation existing in this Chamber amongst hon. members opposite over the result of the referenda poll on the 26th of April as there was amongst that party—and justly so—at the result of the poll on the 13th of April, 1910. There is no doubt about that. It shows what are the feelings of the people in connection with these matters. The Labour party want to get everything. They want to get absolute control of the whole of Australia. They want to get control of the whole of the trade and commerce, labour, and employment in Australia. If they got control of all these things, which hon. members opposite were very anxious that they should get, I ask them what would be left for the States? If they got complete control of labour and commerce there

Mr. Forsyth.]

would be nothing left, or practically nothing. They asked for too much, and they got what they richly deserved.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: What will you give them now?

Mr. FORSYTH: So far as I am concerned, I would give them mighty little.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: But your leader is going to give them something.

Mr. FORSYTH: I do not know anything about my leader, but, so far as I am concerned, I would give them mighty little. There are lots of things that they have power to take over, such as State debts, which they have not yet taken over. They have not taken over the lighting of the coast either. The leader of the Opposition, in referring to the wreck of the "Yongala," said distinctly that he blamed the Queensland Government for not putting up sufficient lights on the coast.

Mr. LENNON: I said that whatever responsibility there was for not lighting the coast rested with the Queensland Government, as they were responsible for the lighting, and not the Federal Government.

Mr. FORSYTH: So far as anyone can judge, I do not think the want of lights had anything to do with the wreck of that vessel. At the same time, the hon. gentleman blamed the Queensland Government for not putting up more lights.

Mr. LENNON: I was putting the blame on the proper shoulders.

Mr. FORSYTH: Suppose, for the sake of argument, that the Queensland Government did put up the lights on the coast, and then the Federal Government took them over, would they refund the money that the Queensland Government spent on the lights?

Mr. MAUGHAN: You would not expect that they would?

Mr. FORSYTH: Why not? I know that they would not like to refund it. At any rate they have the power to take over the lights and they should do it.

Mr. LENNON: They have power to take over the State debts.

Mr. FORSYTH: Yes. I will deal with that later on. I am glad that they are taking some action now, and that an expert is coming up from the South, and he is going over the Queensland coast to find out exactly how the lights stand. That, I am sure, we will all be glad to hear. The leader of the Opposition also stated that the floating of the last loan of £2,000,000 was an absolute failure, and there was great exultation over there in connection with the small percentage of that loan that was taken up by the public. How could you possibly expect the public to take up the loan when these loans are practically under the control of the underwriters? Everyone knows they are under the control of the underwriters, and is it not infinitely better to pay them a small commission than to put the loan on the market and simply let the public say we will take it up or not, and perhaps have it an absolute failure? I think it is infinitely better, for the small commission we give them, to have the loan guaranteed.

Mr. HARDAGRE: It is put on the market all the same, and they guarantee the balance.

Mr. FORSYTH: Yes, and when they guarantee the balance they guarantee to take

[Mr. Forsyth.

the whole lot. I think it is far better for us to take no risk in the matter. According to the hon. member that loan was a great failure. I do not know of any loan floated in Australia that has been floated cheaper. I think our last loan cost us, depreciation and all expenses taken in, about £3 14s. 1d. per cent. Why, the Federal Government want 3½ per cent.

Mr. LENNON: It is better to pay 3½ per cent. in Australia than go to the London market.

Mr. CORSER: Not for four years.

Mr. FORSYTH: In connection with the matter of loan money, I think it is a wise thing; if we can get money in Australia, then by all means let us have it so long as we get it on the same conditions and at no higher rate than in the old country. I say if the Queensland Government could get millions of money in Australia to cover these renewals at the rate of 3½ per cent., they would be perfectly justified in taking it.

Mr. LENNON: There is more money in Australia now than at any previous time in our history.

Mr. FORSYTH: I grant that. The banks are choke full of money, and at the same time that is one reason why this may be a good time to get some money out of Australia because of the fact that there is a large sum awaiting investment. The Federal Government, as we all know, take a large amount of revenue out of the people of Australia. Each State also takes a very large amount of revenue, and it might surprise hon. members on both sides of the House to know the total amount of revenue taken out of the pockets of the people of Australia last year was something like £56,000,000, and that does not include money spent out of loans.

Mr. LENNON: It is only a little over £4 a head after all.

Mr. FORSYTH: A great deal of that money is for services rendered, such as railways, but it is a huge sum of money to take out of the pockets of the people. There is also another thing I should like to mention, and that is in connection with old-age pensions. Everyone believes in that, but I do not think it is a good advertisement for Australia when we find that one-ninth of the total gross revenue of the Commonwealth went in old-age pensions. One-ninth! £2,085,000 were spent last year in old-age pensions, and there will be a considerable amount more this year. Eleven per cent. of the total gross revenue of the Commonwealth Government went in old-age pensions. I do not look upon that as any specially good advertisement for Australia. I am inclined to think it should not be so large. I do not blame the Commonwealth. I have been into the office here again and again, and I believe the officers here are good men, and they get all the information they can, so that the country is not bled by people getting money under false pretences; but I think we want more rigid inspection, and they should be more rigid with regard to getting information in connection with this matter.

Mr. MURPHY: I think they are too strict.

Mr. MAUGHAN: They are pretty strict now.

Mr. FORSYTH: I am very glad to hear it.

Mr. MAUGHAN: My word, they are.



Mr. FORSYTH: Queensland, as I said before, is prosperous, and we have been able to spend a great deal of money in developing this country, more especially in respect of railways. Queensland last year introduced a scheme of railways which was the greatest and boldest ever brought forward in Australia. In Queensland we have a huge territory, and if that territory is ever to be developed as it should be developed, it can only be developed in one way, and that is by having railway communication. The Government understood that, and they were prepared to bring in a Loan Bill of £10,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out that great scheme. It is most satisfactory to think that, although we have only one-third of the population of some States, we are ahead of every other State so far as mileage of railways is concerned. We are ahead of New South Wales and ahead of Victoria. All that is very satisfactory. At the same time I again put a word of caution in. Last year the Queensland Government spent from revenue £5,314,000 and trust funds £858,000, and from loan account £1,995,000, or a total of £8,168,000. They are the largest employers of labour, and are spending a huge sum of money. Our expenditure increased last year, as against the year before, by £1,100,000. We spent over £7,000,000 the year before, and last year we spent £8,100,000 odd. That is very large, more especially as one does not know when we may have bad times, and if we had a check to the development of Queensland, nothing, to my mind, could save us from a deficit.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Hon. R. PHILP: There is a deficit in New South Wales now.

Mr. FORSYTH: Yes. They received a large sum less from the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. MAUGHAN: We have had big deficits in good seasons.

Mr. FORSYTH: We have had big deficits and we have had big surpluses. I sincerely hope that the Government will be cautious so as to avoid having deficits. Now, there is a vexed question which has been raised in the papers lately in connection with transferred properties. The Federal Government have had the use of those properties for the last ten years, and we find they have never paid a single shilling interest on the cost of those properties. They are responsible to the various States of Australia for the total value of those properties, which amounts to £9,622,000, Queensland's proportion being £1,521,000. Queensland has lost during the last ten years, from the fact of not receiving any interest on the cost of those properties, upon the basis of 3 per cent., which they are prepared to pay now, half a million of money which the Federal Government should have paid to this State. Although they had not paid it, according to Mr. Fraser—I have got his speech here—they recognise that that money is a liability upon the Commonwealth of Australia.

Mr. LENNON: Why did not the Deakin Government pay it?

Mr. FORSYTH: There is one thing I will tell the hon. member about the Deakin Government. I am very glad he has made that point, as it is a rather interesting one. There has been no Government in Australia,

State or Commonwealth, that ever had such a surplus as the Labour Government now has.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: More glory to them.

Mr. FORSYTH: It is to their discredit, because they had no right to take out of the pockets of the people of Australia £1,870,000 that they did not want. If they were honest and straightforward in this matter they should pay at least 10 per cent. of that money as part payment on this large sum that they owe in connection with the transferred properties. It would be of great benefit to [8 p.m.] the States at the present time.

It would be of great benefit to Queensland, because Queensland would get from that about £150,000, which, in these times, when we want so much money, would be of great service to us.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Where does that money come from?

Mr. FORSYTH: From the surplus kept lying down in Melbourne.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Out of the pockets of the people.

Mr. FORSYTH: It has come out of the pockets of the people, that is my objection to it. Good financing, as I understand it, does not mean that a man can exactly finance so as to make his expenditure balance his revenue. They have taken out of the pockets of the people of Australia about £1,870,000, after paying off that little liability of about £250,000 lying to the debit of the Northern Territory.

Mr. FOLEY: The land tax did it.

Mr. FORSYTH: That land tax brought in a good deal of money. Mr. Fisher was not very far out in the land tax; his estimate was £1,000,000, and it has brought in a total of about £1,413,000. But where Mr. Fisher was absolutely out was in his Customs, and he was out £1,250,000, while other departments made up over and above his estimate of revenue nearly £2,000,000.

Mr. LENNON: The unexpected prosperity of Australia did that.

Mr. FORSYTH: It was an unexampled dragging out of the pockets of the people money he had no right to.

Mr. LENNON: Nothing of the sort—Customs duty.

Mr. FORSYTH: The hon. member for Leichhardt referred to the fact of the higher tariff. If Mr. Fisher is getting more money than he wants, why does he not reduce the tariff? It would be the means of making cheaper food, and boots and clothing would be very much less.

Mr. LENNON: You would like them to take the duty off sugar.

Mr. FORSYTH: I think it would have been a very nice thing if the Commonwealth Government had really handed over to the States, say £900,000, or 10 per cent., of that total debt on transferred properties they owe; because they owe it—they do not deny it, and they propose to pay to the States 3 per cent. per annum. They are going to arrange a sinking fund, and that sinking fund is to come out of the pockets of the various States. Mr. Fisher is only going to give 3 per cent. upon the value of the transferred properties, but if we want to borrow money from them we have to pay

*Mr. Forsyth.]*

3½ per cent. They do not deny that they owe that money, and they take it upon themselves to increase that sinking fund from ½ per cent. to a higher rate; they also say they may later on want to pay it off in cash, thus recognising their responsibility. But to go and take ½ per cent. and put it into a sinking fund, which should be part of the interest that they should pay the States, is not in my estimation good finance. It may be good enough for the Federal Government, but it is certainly not good enough for the States. Everybody recognises that 3½ per cent. would be a fair rate, and if they want a sinking fund for the purpose of wiping off that debt let them make a sinking fund from the whole of the revenue, apart from giving us 3 per cent., and that will be a fair thing. However, that is one thing. That will recoup the Queensland Government to some extent, even if they do not get more than 3 per cent., because next year the Federal Government will hand over to Queensland something like £90,000 for interest for two years, upon the basis of interest at 3 per cent. on the value of the transferred properties. The deputy leader of the Opposition was mentioning the amount of money in Australia. It is most remarkable how the money is lying in the banks of Australia at the present time—such a huge sum at current account, without any interest at all. We have at the present time bearing interest, over £77,000,000 of money, and we have £61,000,000 lying at current account, for which the owners do not get a single shilling interest, and besides that we have £60,000,000 in the savings banks. There is no doubt there is £200,000,000 available for investment. Seeing that money is so plentiful the Queensland Government ought to be able to get and retain a considerable portion of that, so as to square up liabilities. Even in Queensland we have no less than £10,800,000 at fixed deposit, and £8,612,000 at current account; or nearly £20,000,000 lying at fixed deposit or current account in Queensland. That will give some slight idea as to whether the country is prosperous.

Mr. MAUGHAN: It does not look as if capital is flying away.

Mr. FORSYTH: One or two members raised a question in regard to the Savings Bank, and compared the rate of 3 per cent. interest paid here as against that of other States.

Mr. LENNON: The hon. member for Carpentaria.

Mr. FORSYTH: It looks upon the face of it a fair thing that if other States are paying 3½ per cent. Queensland should pay more. The reason is this: it is because Queensland cannot pay it.

Mr. LENNON: That is a bad advertisement for Queensland.

Mr. FORSYTH: It is not a bad advertisement; it is a very good advertisement for Queensland. The total net profit on the Savings Bank last year was £6,900 odd. I would like to ask my friends opposite who believe we should give 3½ per cent., and an extra ½ per cent. on £6,000,000, representing £30,000 a year, how we could square accounts if we gave the extra ½ per cent.?

Mr. MURPHY: Float a loan. (Laughter.)

[Mr. Forsyth.

Mr. FORSYTH: The reason why we cannot pay more than 3 per cent is this: That the Savings Bank in Queensland is a savings bank pure and simple; while the Savings Banks of New South Wales and Victoria are banks which lend money on mortgage, and naturally, of course, pay a much higher rate. If we look at the Insurance and Banking Record for May, we shall see that the Victorian Government at the present time are raising by debentures about half a million of money, to be advanced on town and country properties, and they are floating that at 3½ per cent., at a discount, and the people who take up these debentures on the basis of 3½ per cent., less discount, will really get £3 17s. per cent., or more than 3¾ per cent. They can afford to do it, for the simple reason that they are lending that money and working against banks and mortgage companies.

Mr. LENNON: Is there anything wrong in that?

Mr. FORSYTH: I am not saying there is anything wrong about it, but we cannot do that under our Savings Bank Act. Our Act states that two-thirds of the total money lying at the credit of the Savings Bank must be put into Government securities, and that the other third must be kept for current accounts, to pay out money when the people want it, and any moneys over and above that, if desired and the Government think they can do without, must be put in Government securities, for which they cannot get more than 4 per cent. Let me tell my friends who think it is a wise thing to increase rates, that one of the bulwarks which assists this State in connection with finance has been the money they have had to get from the Savings Bank.

Mr. LENNON: You can double it or treble it by the simplest method imaginable—by increasing the limit from £200 to £1,000. I suggested that two years ago.

Mr. FORSYTH: That may be a good thing. At any rate, that is the reason why we cannot give more than 3 per cent. on Savings Bank money. I only wish, before sitting down, to make a remark about taxation. Some of our friends opposite talk about nationalising the hospitals. No doubt that might be a good thing; but the Government are now giving £2 instead of £1 10s. endowment, and that should help very much.

Mr. LENNON: They might as well go the whole hog.

Mr. FORSYTH: If we were to nationalise the hospitals, it would require a lot of money. We are spending £93,000. For the increased wages, especially on the railways, another £70,000 is required. The interest on the £2,000,000 loan and other things referred to will amount to an extra £250,000, and the question is: Where would all the money come from? While the things are very good, we must bear in mind that the money has to come out of the pockets of the people. We have to add this year to expenditure ½ per cent. sinking fund in connection with the loan of £2,000,000, which will amount to £10,000; increase to railway men, £93,000; increase to hospitals, £30,000; loan account in connection with the £2,000,000 loan, £70,000; and with the 10 per cent. increase in asylum wages and automatic increases the total will probably show an increase of £250,000. Where is the money to

come from? Of course, the estimates of revenue may be exceeded, but we want to be careful. If a sinking fund of  $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. is to be charged on all loans or renewals, in that case we would have to find at least £125,000 a year after the renewals and obtaining the loan money wanted to complete the railway scheme—say, £25,000,000 in all. All these things require careful consideration. Some people object to the land administration in some respects. I understand that in the case of a man who has a grazing farm, and purchased a leasehold, the department refused to transfer the leasehold on the ground that the man is the holder of a grazing farm. Whatever may be thought of the Act passed last year, I do not think that was intended. The section in the Act relating to this matter is section 53, the latter part of which reads thus—

“ Provided that any person having an interest in a pastoral holding shall, to the extent of that interest as ascertained in acreage, be disqualified from applying for or holding a grazing selection; but this proviso shall not affect the right or title of any person who at the commencement of this Act is the duly qualified selector of a grazing selection, and also has an interest in a pastoral holding.”

I do not know exactly what the Government mean by that, but the hon. member for Leichhardt and others are inclined to think it was never intended that when the holder of a grazing farm wants to buy a leasehold from somebody else, the Government should refuse to transfer the land simply because he has a grazing farm.

Mr. HARDACRE: I do not think it was foreseen in that way; at the same time it raises a very difficult position.

Mr. FORSYTH: I do not think it was the intention of the Legislature when the Act was passed, and I hope the Government will have it altered, so that transfers may be given in such cases. I was under the impression that the Government were not throwing open land as much as possible for the benefit of people who want land; but I have inquired from Mr. Graham, and I find that there will be 76,000 acres available next month on Taabinga and Tarroong; 10,000 acres will be open to selection on the Murgon Railway within two months; there is any amount of land available in the Burnett district; the Dawson River Valley is being opened up, and there will be a great deal of land available there in the next twelve months. So I honestly believe the Government are doing their sincere best to open up land for settlement. We cannot always get land in the exact locality we want it, and we can only get Crown land where it is available. I wish now to refer to a matter of importance to my own electorate, as well as to other parts of the State. There are many people engaged in growing bananas, citrus fruits, and pineapples; and they complain of the quantity coming from Fiji, and cutting them out. After the hurricane some years ago the quantity was restricted, but large quantities are coming in again, and 40,000 bunches of bananas are going to Sydney and Melbourne every fortnight, and the people here have to compete with fruit grown under black-labour conditions. Therefore, they want some protection from the central Government. They have protection to the extent of 1s. a cental, which represents about 6d. a bunch; but they want protection to the

extent of 2s. a cental, or 1s. a bunch. There are 300 white growers of bananas in the State; and if they are protected against the Fiji bananas, the Federal Government will be doing a good thing. In 1909 the export of bananas was valued at £76,000, citrus fruits £14,000, and pineapples £34,000, making £125,000 in all. It is a growing business, and I think our friends on the opposite side should get in touch with their friends in the Commonwealth Parliament, and endeavour to get some assistance for these people. The Federal Government are giving protection to white growers of sugar in the shape of a bounty; and if they believe in a “White Australia,” they ought to extend assistance to the white growers of bananas.

Mr. LENNON: I agree with you.

Mr. FORSYTH: It is their policy, and they should carry it out and take the responsibility.

Mr. MORGAN: Should we not try to improve the quality of our bananas?

Mr. FORSYTH: That would be another matter. I have no objection to that, but something should be done to help these people. I have seen some of the growers, and they tell me that lately their returns from the South leave them no profits at all, and I certainly think they are deserving of some consideration. I only hope that the country will prosper. I trust we shall have plenty more rain and a great many more good seasons, and then I feel certain that Queensland will progress and will be able to continue her policy—which I think most people believe in—in connection with the building of railways, immigration, and land settlement. If we had bad times, we may have a check to that policy, and we want to avoid that. I am sure I express the sentiments of every hon. member when I say that I trust Queensland this year will prosper.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. THEODORE (*Woothakata*): There is one important question which is just now exercising the public mind, and not very much attention has so far been devoted to it by members supporting the Government. That is the question of the relation that the sugar industry bears to the State of Queensland. The sugar industry at the present time is labouring under certain difficulties. It is in the throes of industrial turmoil, and I think there is a distinct danger that, unless something is done, the industry may be ruined. It is in danger of being entirely wiped out. Yet the Queensland Government do not seem to realise the danger, and are not attempting to discover any means by which that danger may be removed. Since the trouble between the employers and the employees in the industry commenced a couple of months ago, there has been a good deal of comment regarding it in the papers of Australia. I am going to quote the opinion of a leading newspaper in Sydney—the *Daily Telegraph*. In a leading article in the issue of 4th July upon the sugar trouble and the relation the industry bears to this State, they say—

“ The manufacturers declare that they are not doing well enough to be able to give the growers any more, and the growers repeat that complaint. Yet we know that in the chief case the manufacture and distribution of sugar is a highly profitable business, and that the people of Australia subsidise it more or less through

*Mr. Theodore.* ]

taxation. Therefore, at one end of the industry enormous profits are being made, while at the other there is all-round complaint culminating in the appeal of the workers for £1 10s. a week and "keep." As Mr. Tudor indicated, something must be wrong where an industry of such proportions as this cannot pay that wage to married men."

Further on they remark—

"The suggestion that the remaining fourth of the excise now retained by the Government should be returned to the growers—in other words, that by establishing a balance between excise and bounty, both should be extinguished—involves a still further call upon the public; for, although the price of sugar might not be affected, the Commonwealth would lose about £140,000 of revenue, which would have to be obtained in some other way. How long is this to go on? The industry has had years in which to establish itself and test the commercial practicability of white-labour conditions under, as has been shown, very generous assistance. At the present time Australia might be getting its sugar at a substantially reduced cost had it not been considered good policy to protect the local industry. When, however, the growers only ask for more, there is not much encouragement to persist with that policy."

I claim that those remarks, coming as they do from a leading journal in the largest State, express the opinions of a large section of the people of Australia regarding the industry. I am not one of those who uphold the contention of that article. I think that the Queensland sugar industry is well worth protecting and well worth assisting and well worth continuing. But not long since, when Mr. Tudor, Commonwealth Minister for Trade and Customs, made a very advantageous offer to the cane-growers to equalise the bounty and excise, that offer was refused. The offer certainly carried with it a condition—that condition being that the employers should comply with the demands then being made by the Amalgamated Workers' Association. Now the refusal of the employers to accept that offer practically meant a refusal to accept more than £160,000 per annum.

Mr. LENNON: It amounted to 2s. 3d. per ton of cane.

Hon. R. PHILP: I am sure the growers would not refuse to accept an offer to equalise the bounty and the excise.

Mr. THEODORE: Well, they did refuse it, and it is a wonder that they do not now indicate their willingness to accept it. On 29th June the offer was distinctly made when Mr. Tudor met a deputation of growers and millers at Bundaberg. This is a report of what took place—

"Mr. Tudor asked what the additional cost in wages would be if the Amalgamated Workers' Association demands were granted?

"The Hon. Angus Gibson: 47 per cent.

"Mr. Tudor asked if the manufacturers would be prepared to grant the men's demands if £1 excise kept by the Federal Government were returned to the industry?

"Mr. Young: I do not think if hours are limited to eight that the crops can be taken off, but I believe they would give more wages.

"Mr. Tudor: If manufacturers will give the assurance I refer to I will do my best to have legislation brought in to equalise the excise and bounty."

In a subsequent interview, published in the *Brisbane Courier* of 8th July, Mr. Tudor is reported to have said—

[Mr. Theodore.

"At a meeting of 500 growers and manufacturers, Mr. Tudor said he had asked whether anyone would say publicly that the present wage rate was a living rate, and nobody had answered."

Subsequently he reiterated that he had offered to the representatives of some 500 growers and millers to equalise the bounty and excise on the condition that they would comply with the men's demands, and he was told that they would not agree to the offer. I think they made a mistake in that, because the extra payments would easily have been covered by the additional amount received in the shape of bounty. I think the Queensland Government should have made some move. They are directly interested. They have four mills, and they should have indicated that they favoured the equalisation of the bounty and excise. I do not think they can advance any argument against such a proposal. The Hon. Angus Gibson, who apparently represented the millers at the deputation which met Mr. Tudor, said—

"He had entered into an agreement with his growers that if £1 was returned it would go to the growers exclusively."

That is fair enough. So it should go to the growers. If the people of Australia are prepared to assist the industry to the extent of another £1 per ton of sugar produced, I think that any such benefit should go to the growers, because they, no doubt, are having a harder battle than the millers and refiners, and more severely feel the claims for higher wages and more restrictions on employment; and, if they cannot at present make a success of the business, any further assistance which may be contemplated should go to them. An offer has been made, and they have turned it down, and I cannot see any reason why they should take up that attitude.

Hon. R. PHILP: One meeting in Bundaberg does not represent all the growers of Queensland.

Mr. THEODORE: No; but the offer was published in all the papers, and if the growers in other parts of the State were disposed to accept it, it is very strange they have not done so, because, if they realise what it actually means—that it means 2s. 3d. per ton on all cane grown—and the men's demands probably do not represent more than 1s. per ton—they should be very pleased at the offer. If they are simply refusing to accept it on the understanding that they will get the equalisation of the bounty and excise later on without any conditions at all, that is only a manifestation of greed on their part. I do not know whether that is the move, but, whether or not, I think the Government should have done something. They should have indicated their willingness to accept the offer, so that they would be able to give the farmers who grow cane for their mills some further consideration. The farmers growing cane for the four Government mills have been clamouring continuously for an increase in the price of cane, and this would have been a way in which they could have got that increase. The farmers in the Proserpine district—I do not know whether it [8.30 p.m.] is so in the other districts served by Government mills, but the farmers in the Proserpine district were perfectly willing to meet the men's demands in

the matter of increased rates, and they asked the Government to pay them an increased price for their cane. All that could have been done if Mr. Tudor's offer had been accepted—

Hon. R. PHILP: Mr. Tudor did not make his offer to the Government.

Mr. THEODORE: The Queensland Government were not, I admit, primarily concerned in the matter, but they were indirectly concerned, and as far as I can gather the offer was a general one made to the canegrowers of Queensland. The Government should, in my opinion, have used their influence with the growers to induce them to accept the offer. Had they done so, it is probable that they would have ended the dispute, which has now assumed such serious dimensions. As a matter of fact the Government have not gone as far as they might in the direction of terminating the trouble or preventing it spreading. Personally, I am of opinion that they have done the very opposite. I cannot understand their action in sending increased numbers of police to the strike districts, and in assisting the large sugar proprietors and the Colonial Sugar Refining Company to get men to take the places of those on strike, unless they had some understanding with the employers to defeat the objects of the strikers. It may not be so, but it seems very much like it, because I do not think the Commissioner of Police would have taken it upon himself to send large bodies of police to the sugar districts before any disturbance had arisen and before any breach of the peace had been committed. The Commissioner would not have done that, except with the sanction of the Government.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. THEODORE: I do not know that I am transgressing any Standing Order.

The SPEAKER: If the hon. member wishes to know in what way he is transgressing the Standing Orders, I would remind him that he is referring to a subject that has already been discussed this session under the heading of "A definite matter of urgent public importance." As the hon. member is a young member I give him that information.

Mr. THEODORE: I desire to discuss a matter which has developed since we had that debate, that is the sending of additional police to the sugar districts.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member cannot discuss any phase of a question which has already been debated this session under the heading of "A definite matter of urgent public importance."

Mr. THEODORE: Then I merely wish to suggest to the Government that they should alter their policy in this connection, because it seems that the trouble, according to reports which are appearing in the papers, is likely to become very much more serious. I think the Government should realise the possibilities of the position, and adopt all possible conciliatory means to bring the dispute to a termination in a way which will satisfy both parties. Last night the senior member for Townsville made some reference to the mining industry. That is a subject which has not been very much touched upon in the course of this debate. I agree with the hon. member that something more should

be done than has been done to relieve the depression, and to encourage the further development of the mining industry. The problem is not one which it is very easy to solve, but I think that the invitation to give suggestions which will tend to relieve the depression in the industry can be easily complied with. I believe that the building of railways to mining fields and mineral areas is one method by which the industry can be assisted. The Government should take every possible opportunity to build railways to mining centres. They might do something by building a line to the Mount Mulligan coal area. That would be only a short length of line, about 33 miles, and it would open up a coal area which would serve a large mining district, and would tap a coal deposit in which the coal has been proved by tests to be of very good quality. I understand that the Chillagoe Company are interested in this matter, and that they will probably ask permission to construct the railway. I do not think the Government should give them that permission. I think the Government should build the line, and if necessary take over a portion, or the whole, of the Chillagoe Railway. By doing that they will assist the mining industry in that district; the company have imposed freights and fares which are 50 per cent. above the rates charged on Government railways, and which are a burden to the industry in that part of the State. The Government might also assist the mining industry by erecting batteries, smelting plants, and treatment plants. This has been suggested I do not know how many times by members on this side of the House, but so far the Government have done nothing. I could mention several places in my own district where the Government might erect or purchase batteries, and run them without suffering any loss. For instance, they might erect a battery at Herberton, Dry River, Stannary Hills, and at Wolfram. They might also establish assaying offices where miners could get their ores tested. They could further help the development by assisting miners to secure markets for their ores and minerals. At present they are restricted to local buyers, and in many places one buyer has a monopoly in the district, with the result that miners suffer. Again, the Government could assist the mining industry by placing a larger amount on the Estimates for prospecting and deep sinking. Last year the wretched sum of £2,000 was put down on the Estimates for prospecting, and £8,000 for deep sinking. I have forwarded a number of applications from miners for assistance from the prospecting vote, and in every instance they have not received the assistance they asked for. I contend that the Government should assist men to prospect, not only in new mineral country, but on old fields. But the whole policy of the Government in connection with this matter seems to demonstrate that they have no sympathy with this industry. A certain amount of depression was caused in the mining industry in the North by the recent block on the Cairns Railway. I hope the Government will seriously consider the question of introducing during the course of this session the plans and section of a railway which will prevent the possibility of the recurrence of such a state of things. There have been several routes proposed

*Mr. Theodore.]*

for a railway to tap the hinterland in that part of the State. One is from Port Douglas to Mount Molloy, another from Cooktown to Mungana, and another an extension of the Tolga-Johnstone Railway to tap the coast somewhere near Cardwell or Mourilyan. Personally I favour the Port Douglas to Mount Molloy route, as I think a railway by that route can be constructed more cheaply than a line by any of the other routes, and that it would be much more satisfactory, as it would go more direct to the coast and would have a reasonably good port at the terminus. I hope that the Government will have a thorough investigation made of the different routes and decide in favour of one, and as soon as possible start on the construction of such a railway. There is a population of 15,000 people engaged in all industries in the hinterland of Cairns depending in a most precarious manner upon a railway in which the confidence of the people is entirely shaken—that is the Cairns Railway. I might mention while on this subject that during the period when the Cairns line was blocked there was a good deal of hardship experienced. Mr. Pagan, the present Deputy Commissioner for Railways, but at the time Chief Engineer, visited the district. On his return to Brisbane he gave an interview to one of the newspaper reporters, and in the course of that interview he is reported to have said that the only cause for hardship that he could find in the back country was occasioned by the stoppage of the beer supplies. I think that those remarks on the part of Mr. Pagan were wholly uncalled for and undeserved. The people residing in that back country are just as industrious, hardworking, and temperate as people residing in any other part of Queensland, and aspersions should not have been cast upon them by a public officer. I have not seen a repudiation of the statements mentioned, although there was a good deal of adverse comment in the Northern papers and amongst the Northern people. I do not know if anything can be done now, but I hope that no public servant will be allowed to cast undeserved reflections on any community which is suffering from hardships such as the people in the hinterland of Cairns were suffering from during the block on the Cairns line. Another matter that I wish to touch upon is the extension of the Atherton to Evelyn Railway to Cedar Creek. It is only a small extension of something like 5 miles, and it will serve a large number of people. It is a railway that should have been built long ago, as it is quite two or three years since the settlers asked for the extension to be carried through to Cedar Creek. The 5 miles of road from the present terminus is a very rough one, and it makes it impossible to haul timber to a market. The settlers are hanging on to their land waiting for the railway, and putting up with a good deal of inconvenience in consequence. They are paying a price for their land which is high in accordance with the value of the timber upon it, and yet it is impossible for them to realise a value for the timber. If they clear their land they will have to burn the timber, because it is not profitable to cart it to the railway. There are over 100 settlers in that locality, and I hope that a Bill authorising the construction of that railway extension will be amongst the first Bills presented to us this

[*Mr. Theodore.*

session. I have another matter to refer to in connection with railways and railway administration, and I am glad to see the Secretary for Railways coming into the Chamber. It is in connection with the wages paid to the men on construction works. The men engaged in the maintenance and repairs of the Cairns line were getting 9s. per day, which was an advance of 6d. per day above the ordinary rate paid on that line.

**THE SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS:** That is the classification rate.

**Mr. THEODORE:** Although the men got 6d. per day above the classification rate they considered that it was not sufficient, because they had bad conditions to contend with, great inconvenience, and long distances to travel to work. They had to work through an abnormally wet season, and the conditions were far from pleasant. There was also considerably more danger than on the ordinary construction works. I admit that eventually special consideration was shown to the men, in that they were paid 10s. a day for one month; but as they were engaged on the work for four months they should have received 10s. a day for the whole period. Apart from that, there is also the trouble that took place in connection with the building of the Great Western Railway. During the by-elections for the Enoggera and Rockhampton electorates the Secretary for Public Instruction, Mr. Grant, made the statement that a certain schedule of rates was to apply to railway construction works. He said that on the Great Western Railway north of Windorah the rate was to be 10s. a day, and south of Windorah 9s. 6d. per day, for pick and shovel men. It was owing to an objection to accept the rate offered that the men went on strike at Wallal. They were recently arrived immigrants, and instead of getting 9s. 6d., as stated by Mr. Grant, they were offered 9s. a day.

**THE SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS:** They were offered the wages they knew they were to get in that district. They knew the rate of wages before they left the old country.

**Mr. THEODORE:** It is very strange that they should disagree with the rate of wages offering as soon as they arrive here. They came out here on a misunderstanding; but whether it was a deliberate attempt on the part of the Government to deceive or not I cannot say. The statement was made, and apparently officially, by the Secretary for Public Instruction that the rates were to be 9s. 6d. per day south of Windorah and 10s. per day north of that town.

**THE SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS:** Eight shillings, 9s., and 10s. per day were the rates of pay quoted to these men.

**Mr. THEODORE:** That does not agree with the statement of the hon. member for Rockhampton. I hope that the Minister will make another declaration to the Press if the other statement was misleading, as the men went to Wallal expecting to get 9s. 6d., and I know that the others seeking employment north of Windorah will expect to get 10s. a day. And I think it is only right that they should get it for working in the Western country. Surely 10s. a day is a small enough minimum wage for working in the West!

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: We are absolutely paying the rates agreed upon.

Mr. ALLEN: Didn't you agree to tucker them for 14s. a week?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: No.

Mr. THEODORE: I hope the Minister will send someone out in connection with these railway works who can improve the conditions and provide some entertainment for the men.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I sent out Mr. Stokes, who is one of the finest men in the department for that particular work.

Mr. MAUGHAN: A very good appointment.

Mr. THEODORE: I am very pleased to hear of the appointment of that gentleman, as he is sympathetic to the interests of workers generally, particularly those on construction works, and I think he will be a good officer in that capacity.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I have taken a special interest in that phase of the question.

Mr. THEODORE: I might suggest to the Minister that another way in which he could benefit the men engaged on construction works is to help them to establish co-operative boarding-houses. There is no doubt that the highest rates are charged by the storekeepers, and they penalise the honest men on the construction works for the risks they run with the dishonest men. That element would be wholly eliminated with boarding-houses, and I hope the men will be assisted to establish co-operative boarding-houses. Let a number of men in each camp, to the extent of fifty or seventy, or whatever number may be most convenient, group themselves together and engage cooks, and let the department assist them by giving them tarpaulins and also by shifting their utensils when the camps are being shifted.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I offered to assist them with a co-operative store on the Clermont-Mount Elliott Railway and they declined.

Mr. THEODORE: I think it would be a very good thing if the system were encouraged, as it would give them an opportunity of getting the full benefit of the wages paid for that class of work. At present the storekeepers charge a higher amount than the ordinary rate for their goods, because they run a certain risk with slopers. No doubt they are running a certain risk on account of slopers.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Not "Alley Slopers" but navy slopers.

Mr. THEODORE: The department also levy a tax on the collection of accounts which I think is too high. Five per cent. is too high, and if it was reduced to 2½ per cent. it would be better, and no doubt the storekeeper would pass the benefit of that reduction on, because the worker is entitled to get that benefit. I hope the Minister will consider the matter and carry out that suggestion. In conclusion, I have to express satisfaction at the decision of the department to establish a hospital for insane at Herberton. Not that I think we want a hospital for insane up there more than in any other part of Queensland, but I think in any extension in the accommodation for the insane the North should be considered.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: It is because of the climate.

Mr. THEODORE: I think it should be located at Herberton because of the climate, but I think it should be located in the North not only because of the climate but because there are a number of patients from the North who at present have to be sent to Goodna or Toowoomba, and consequently they cannot be visited very regularly, and some not at all, by relatives or friends, and it would be very much better for the relatives and friends of those so afflicted if an asylum were located in North Queensland. I think the location for such a place should be at Herberton. The climate is all that could be desired, and it is within easy access by means of railway, and so on, from all the principal centres of the North. Therefore, I think it is a very good selection. I think the department which controls the matter should also consider the advisableness of establishing a sanatorium at Herberton. I think there is no better climate in Queensland than the Herberton climate for such an institution, and I think the Secretary for Public Instruction should consider the wisdom of establishing a technical high school at Herberton somewhat similar to that which, I understand, they have at Warwick. There is an agitation in North Queensland for the establishment of secondary schools, and I think one should be established at Herberton, which place can easily be reached from Mareeba, Chillagoe, and other populous centres, and the climate is such as to make it a suitable place for such an institution. I hope consideration will be given to that suggestion.

Mr. ALLEN (*Bulloo*): Before this Address in Reply goes to the vote I desire to pass a few observations on the questions referred to. First of all, I must express my disappointment at the very poor programme that has been put before us. I think it would be very hard indeed to get together such a weak collection of Bills, and one has only to look up former programmes to see quite a number of old friends, and that shows there is not a great deal of business in them. During the recess we have had some changes in the personnel of the Government, and apparently some very great change in the policy, or alleged policy. The first thing that strikes one is that the only two remaining measures that were contained in the Rockhampton programme which are not yet on the statute-book, have been cast aside by the present party. I refer to the Trade Disputes Bill and to State Insurance, and I would like to ask the question, Why? If that is the same homogeneous democratic party that swept the polls on the Rockhampton programme nearly two years ago, why is not the remaining part of the programme carried into effect this year? It seems to me that the chief object of the present party is to keep in power, and in order to keep in power they propose to do very little, so as to offend nobody, and at the same time promise everything. Everything that is asked for, the present Ministry will promise. It does not matter what it is or how impossible it is to carry it out.

At four minutes to 9 o'clock p.m.,

Mr. MULLAN called attention to the state of the House.

Quorum formed.

Mr. ALLEN: Another thing that struck me since the opening of the present session is that a number of members sitting behind the Government have got up and congratulated

*Mr. B. F. S. Allen.]*

the Government on their splendid programme and twitted the Opposition with being very weak critics, and then they start to "bog in." One wonders what their object is. They may have two objects. They may see the writing on the wall and think the sooner they make preparation to get in out of the cold the better. Or, on the other hand, some of them may be learning, by past experience, that loyalty does not pay—that if they want a portfolio, or if they want to get on in the party, they have to act the role of candid friend. All the chief candid friends of last session are to-day on the Treasury bench, and the hon. members who were most active in their loyalty, who were continually lauding the Government for their good actions, and who maintained the Government could not do anything wrong, have been left out in the cold, and now we see some of them are beginning to play the part of candid friends. As I said before, it appears to be the main policy of the Government to promise anything to keep office. Any member sitting behind the Government, or any critic in their front, has simply to mention something that ought to be done, and they promise to do it.

Mr. BOOKER: You don't believe that, do you?

Mr. ALLEN: I am going to make my point directly. The trouble is they make a promise and have no intention of carrying it out.

Mr. BOOKER: We never break a promise on this side.

Mr. ALLEN: During the by-elections we had a scale of wages for workmen on the railways promulgated by the Government in order to get votes. I contend that the Government are not paying that scale of wages. Why? Then again, at the Dalby by-election that electorate was invaded by a whole host of labourites and Government supporters, and the pace was made that warm that the Premier promised railways and canals—(laughter)—and remission of taxation too. He may not himself have promised to remit taxation, but one of his supporters in this House stated, at a public meeting in Dalby, in answer to a certain pamphlet that was being distributed by Mr. McNeil's committee, which pointed out certain pettifogging taxes that the Labour party intended to remit, that the Government were going to take those taxes off this session. I want to know why we have not been informed of the intention of the Government to repeal these taxes.

Mr. MAUGHAN: It is a farmers' party.

Mr. ALLEN: It is up to the farmers' party to do something, or their supporters will be disappointed with them.

The TREASURER: They were a keen disappointment to you.

Mr. ALLEN: Of course the Treasurer is right, they have been a keen disappointment to me. Two years ago at the last general election, the paper in my electorate came out with scare headings—"A new departure in land settlement—what the Minister for Lands is going to do." The Minister for Lands of that date is the present Premier. They were going to put down bores on dry country and then open same for selection.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I wish they could. (Laughter.)

Mr. ALLEN: I would like to point out the manner in which these alleged friends of the

settlers treated this matter. Nothing at all has been done in regard to that proposal. Of course, the Premier was desirous to secure the Western seats, and this was the bait. In connection with land settlement, I am greatly disappointed with the administration of the Lands Department, so far as the Western lands are concerned. There is no doubt that the most attractive form of settlement in Queensland is grazing farms. It is the most lucrative, and there is a keen demand all over the State, but the trouble is that the Government are not resuming all the land that they could. Another very objectionable thing is that they are not properly manning the country offices. In some of the country districts the officers of the Lands Department are working night and day to keep up with their work, while they are tumbling over one another down in George street putting in time.

Mr. WALKER: They are working hard.

Mr. ALLEN: They are not doing one-fourth of the work which the men have to do in the country districts. Then if you go into electorates like mine you will find they have no officers at all.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Your electorate has disappeared.

Mr. ALLEN: Not at all. It will disappear at the expiration of this Parliament, but I will not disappear. (Laughter.) They simply depend on the police to do their work, but the police cannot do everything, and the result is that the work of the Lands Department is not carried out properly. When I first came into the House the then Minister for Lands, the present Premier, accepted my representations with regard to certain lands in my electorate, and determined to try and see how grazing selection would get along, although it was in direct opposition to the advice tendered by the Crown land officials. The departure was a success—a limited success, certainly—but that was through no fault of the trial. Dummying, of course, has spoilt it. It was proved that there were local people and people from outside who were prepared to take up land under grazing farm tenure, and yet the Minister, through his officials, was advised not to make the attempt. The reason for that was that there were not enough officials in that district to do the work. There should be a permanent land official stationed in Thargomindah, who would be in a position to know what the demand for land was; he would also know who were genuine settlers and who were not, and would give the department advice at first hand. But we have not got it; the money is swamped in Brisbane. Clerks are tumbling over one another down in George street putting in time, and the department is starving the outside officers, and will not put anyone at all in Thargomindah.

Mr. WALKER: Have they not got rangers in those districts?

Mr. ALLEN: No; I thank the hon. member for the interjection. In one case when a block was selected the selector had to wait nine months before getting possession. There was no ranger nearer than Charleville, and he had got his hands full and was not able to come till about eight months after selection. At first there were twelve selections opened on the Bulloo River, and on the opening day, although there was competition for one block, in all there were only two taken up. The same thing applies to lands in other

[Mr. B. F. S. Allen.]



districts. It has been found that on the opening day a small percentage has been selected, yet within twelve months the whole lot has gone. These lands were about 140 miles from the railway, and there was a limited local demand, but in course of time people from outside began to inquire about the land, and three or four of them went to great trouble and expense to inspect the blocks; but they found that perhaps an hour before, or a day before, Mr. Sydney Kidman, the cattle king, had put his dummies in, and they had their trouble and expense for nothing. You can imagine their feelings, after going out 140 miles by road, when they found that Mr. Kidman, with the assistance of dummies, had euchred them.

Mr. MORGAN: He must be a bad lot.

Mr. ALLEN: He is a bad lot for Queensland. You hear people complaining about the rabbits, but I say that Mr. Kidman is a greater pest to Queensland than the rabbits.

Mr. MORGAN: How does he compare with the pear?

Mr. ALLEN: He is worse than the pear, so you can guess how bad he is. My contention is that if the Lands Department had an officer at Thargomindah, he could have informed the department the minute this dummying started, and it would have been nipped in the bud. Two of the alleged selectors had their selections confirmed before the facts came to the ears of the department, but inquiry is being made in regard to the other two. I have no hesitation in saying that these four persons are not genuine selectors, but purely dummies acting on behalf of Mr. Sydney Kidman; and it is a shame to think that comparatively poor men have been bamboozled.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Do you mean to say that there is such a thing as dummying now?

Mr. ALLEN: Dummying is rampant.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Only in the Bulloo.

Mr. ALLEN: In the Bulloo and in other districts. In connection with land settlement in the far west, I think much more encouragement should be given to the comparatively small man. It would be of great advantage to people in grazing areas if they could be free from paying rent for the first four years on condition that they put certain improvements on the land. It would tend to increase the number of comparatively small holdings in the West; people would be on the land; they would rear families; we would not hear so much about absentees or see so many advertisements in the papers for married couples without encumbrance. I also hope, in connection with the amendment of the Agricultural Bank Act, that very liberal provisions will be made for granting assistance to grazing farmers, who are out in the cold as far as the administration of that Act is concerned. With respect to water conservation, I have a great grievance against the Government. We have a lot of hanky-panky irritating regulations.

The TREASURER: The statement was made last night that the regulations are being amended.

Mr. ALLEN: That is very satisfactory.

At the present time we are proposing to spend a lot of money on railways into the far West, and my contention when the Bill was before the House was, and still is, that water is of more importance to people out

there than railways are; but I contend that the department are not as serious with this question as they ought to be. When they do grant assistance in putting down bores it is their duty to see that the money is expended to the best advantage, and not left wholly to the shire council. I can show some scandalous maladministration on the part of shire councils, and I hold that the Treasury Department is also in part to blame. They are entrusted with the spending of public money, and it is their duty not to shirk their responsibility, but to see that the money is spent to the best advantage. When public money is put into a bore, that bore should be put down for public purposes, and not for the advantage of one particular individual. In some parts of the country it appears to be a case of one shire councillor one bore, and hang the public. I wish to lay special emphasis on the great need there is for a bore or for some provision for water at Canterbury. That place is some 60 miles west of Windorah, which is the objective of one of our spur railways. It is also the centre of a 60-miles dry stretch on a very important cattle route, and in any ordinary dry time it is absolutely impossible to get stock through, and the department is doing nothing to help. We are going to build a railway to Windorah, and yet the back door of Windorah is shut to us. Now, where is the business in such a proposal? This place is right on the farther border of the Bulloo Shire Council, and of course there is no councillor living there, and consequently their chances of getting any consideration from the shire council are practically nil, more especially as the shire council, I believe, has already a great load to bear in its policy of one councillor one bore and hang the public. I sincerely trust that the Government will see some way out of the present difficulty, and will render some assistance to the people of Canterbury. They have been agitating for a permanent water supply for ten years to my knowledge, and they have always been put off with some pettifogging excuse, and all the time we are losing trade. This Government pretends to be a great Government for State rights and for Queensland rights, and yet they are allowing this stock route to be closed and nearly all the cattle on the Diamantina and the Georgina are going to South Australia. Now, is that any good for Queensland, and will that be any advantage to the railway when we get it built to Windorah? Another place in the Bulloo that is very badly off for water is Pinendery, some distance west of Thargomindah. There is lovely sheep country there—lovely Mitchell grass rolling downs country—some of the finest land you will see in the back country, but it is very dry. There is an agitation for something to be done. The people cannot get the shire council to take action, though I do not think the shire council are altogether to blame, seeing that the land is all the property of the Crown. If the Government put down a bore, it would place an increased rental value on those lands and at the same time it would open up the roads.

Mr. WIENHOLT: They are doing that in places.

Mr. ALLEN: My trouble is that they are not doing it in these places. I should like now to refer to the itinerant teachers. Those officers are doing splendid work, and the Education Department is to be congratulated

*Mr. B. F. S. Allen.*]

on the success of the system. But I think that these teachers are spending too much time in travelling. Means ought to be provided for them to get over the ground quicker, and I would suggest that motor-cars should be placed at their disposal. The country in the portion of the State that I have the honour to represent is country over which motor-cars can travel with a fair degree of safety. There is only the ordinary risk of breakdown, and the country is fairly level and the roads are fairly good. As it is now, a teacher may be two or three days on the road before he comes to a family. He may put in a couple of days there, and then perhaps be a week or a fortnight before he reaches another family. In wet weather it is not possible to travel at all, though, of course, it is not often wet out there. In dry weather they have to take their horses very carefully. I think the department would be well advised to make the experiment. If it proved a success, it would mean a great deal to the children of that portion of the State, because the teachers would be able to give at least twice as much time to the work of teaching as they can do now. A few months ago we had a visit from a Royal Commission from South Australia inquiring into our educational system, and one member of that commission was greatly astonished at the poor salaries that we pay to our teachers.

The TREASURER: They were increased last year.

Mr. ALLEN: The increases to head teachers were very much a myth. They looked well enough on paper, but, when they came to be critically examined, it was found that the department was making a saving by the innovation. In connection with the assistant teachers and classified teachers generally, there has really been no rise given. The older officers have got no increases by the change that was made last year. All the department did was to shorten the time in the grades in Class III., and consequently the Class III. teacher will now get a rise of £40 in the same time that it took before to get a rise of £20. That is all the difference; it only affects the younger teachers. I hold that it would have been much better if, instead of shortening the time in the grades, the amount of the grade increases had been increased from £20 to £30. That would have given a great deal more satisfaction all round, and at the same time it would relieve Queensland from the stigma of paying its teachers miserable salaries. I notice that we are to have another amendment of the Education Act this session. It is too much to hope that the sectarian clauses that were inserted last year will be repealed; but in the new Bill some provision should be made for raising the standard of education in the primary schools, and also that the number of days upon which it is compulsory for a child to attend school should be increased. I also hope that the school age will be raised from twelve to fourteen years.

I notice that among the list of [9.30 p.m.] Bills that we are to expect this year is a Rabbit Boards Bill. I hope that under that Bill we shall have more efficient management of the rabbit question than we have at the present time—that we shall have fewer inspectors, that the inspectors will be more competent, and that the condition of boundary riders will be very much improved. At the present time the condition of boundary riders is far from what we might

[Mr. B. F. S. Allen.]

call satisfactory. Another Bill mentioned is a Bill to amend the Agricultural Bank Act. That measure has provoked a good deal of discussion during this debate. I do not altogether agree with some of the criticism that has been levelled against the trustees of the Agricultural Bank. The old Act is a bad Act. The defects of that Act have been pointed out session after session, the Governments of the day have practically admitted that it is a bad Act, and yet every time a complaint has been made about the administration of the bank the Government and their supporters have blamed the trustees. Although I am of opinion that the trustees may have been rather conservative in some of their interpretations of the Act with regard to their powers, still I hold that the Act itself is not a good Act. The provisions of the Act are far behind the provisions of similar Acts in other Australian States as far as liberality is concerned, and I sincerely trust that the new Bill—it ought to be a new Bill and not simply an amending Bill—will comprise all the good points of the Acts in force in other States. If we follow the South Australian Act, the Government will be able to reduce the rate of interest to borrowers. In Queensland if a borrower is behind with the payment of his interest, we fine him. In South Australia if a borrower is up to date with the payment of his interest, he gets a reduction of 1 per cent.—that is, he pays 4 instead of 5 per cent. I do not think Queensland should allow South Australia to beat her in that respect, and I think we might at least rival Western Australia in regard to the liberality in advances made. The inspection fees at present charged in Queensland should be wiped out altogether. No other bank charges fees for inspection, and these fees are a hardship in some cases. If a man in a small way asks for an advance of only £100, he has to pay a fee of £3 for inspection, which makes his interest for the first year 8 per cent., instead of 5 per cent. Another reason why these fees should be wiped out, or at any rate reduced very considerably, is that the Government are making money out of the customers of the bank. But while the Government are making money out of the bank, applicants for advances have to wait three or four months before inspection is made. I think the Government ought to appoint a larger number of inspectors.

Mr. MORGAN: Don't you know that if a man receives an advance the £3 is refunded to him?

Mr. ALLEN: No, it is not refunded. The hon. member does not know what he is talking about. I have gone very deeply into this question; I have filled up application forms for quite a number of selectors, and I can say that the money is not refunded if the advance is granted. I can say that without the slightest fear of contradiction. If a grant is refused, the applicant gets £1 10s. of his deposit back, but if he gets a grant the whole £3 is kept by the bank. I contend that the inspection fee should be wiped out altogether. Our object, I take it, is to encourage small settlers, and to assist them over their difficulties in the opening days of their work. Even if the department loses a pound or two in making advances to settlers, they get it back in a score of ways.

Mr. MURPHY: It costs a certain amount of money to make inspections.

Mr. ALLEN: Yes, but from the time the Government begin advancing money to selectors they are getting a revenue from them, not only in the form of interest, but in railway freights and other forms of taxation. If a selector buys a few head of cattle, he has to pay the cow tax, and there are many other taxes which he has to pay to the Government. I should like to see the Department of Agriculture make some provision for the establishment of State butter factories. Co-operative butter factories are undoubtedly a success, and I believe that State factories would also be a success. What I suggest is that the State should establish butter factories in newly settled districts, where the farmers have not sufficient cash to spare for investment in a co-operative butter factory. At the present time such farmers are practically at the mercy of private firms.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Oh, no; they can get advances under the Dairy Produce Encouragement Act.

Mr. ALLEN: Yes; but they have to raise a certain amount of money before they can get advances, and many farmers in newly settled districts cannot do that. I had experience during the recess in connection with the formation of a co-operative butter factory, but although the district in which it was proposed to form the company was a particularly rich district, we found that when we came to canvass the farmers that while nearly everyone took up shares we could not get sufficient money to form the company. I think the department might establish factories in newly settled districts, and then in the course of time, when the farmers are firmly established, they might hand over the factory to them. At the beginning of his enterprise a farmer has to lay out his money in other directions, and he has to depend upon the private butter manufacturer, and he is no good to the farmer—he gets at him right and left. And just here, while I am on this point of the butter business, I might point out that the provisions of the Dairy Produce Encouragement Act of 1905 have never been put into operation, and I would like to know why?

Mr. MURPHY: Because they paid all the money back.

Mr. ALLEN: We have got an Agricultural Department, and a Minister and a lot of officers in that department, and yet, when this Bill was placed on the statute-book, they do not see that its provisions are carried out. Why are those provisions never put into operation? Was the Bill passed simply for fun, or just as padding for the Governor's Speech, or is there some sinister influence behind it all? Does it so happen that if the provisions of that Act were put into force it would interfere with the private butter factories?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That must be the sinister influence.

Mr. ALLEN: The other factories, I know, would like to see that Act put into operation, and every factory compelled to send in its returns. One co-operative factory I know sent in its returns for one month, and then sent in no more because they found out that the others were not doing it. The Act was put on the statute-book apparently for fun. If it is no good it ought to be wiped out. We have a Bill here to amend the Workers' Dwellings Act. The Act so far has been a success as far as it goes, but I hope that the amendment will have the

effect of providing homes for workers and not make individuals landlords, as that is the object of some members sitting behind the Government. Another injustice which is being felt by the people of Queensland is the accommodation which the Government provide on the railways. There are few lines in Queensland which are paying better than our Western line.

Mr. FORSYTH: You want an extra train there.

Mr. ALLEN: We want better accommodation and an extra train, too. There are four passenger trains to Roma from Toowoomba every week and two from Roma further west. I think there should be an additional train from Roma west and there should be a daily passenger train from Toowoomba to Roma. The limited service is bad, but the accommodation is worse still. Some of the carriages that you go into I do not think have been dusted for a week. It is a scandal. The money is being lavishly spent in building fine carriages for the interstate traffic. I think it would be better to build the carriages for our own people who make the railways pay. If the Minister went out in one of the Western trains he would come back very much alive to the injustices that we are labouring under.

Mr. MORGAN: If he went into a sleeper he would come back alive. (Laughter).

Mr. MURPHY: Has not the Minister been out West lately?

Mr. ALLEN: No, he has been for moonlight rides looking over railway routes. I notice that the Government are going to introduce a Liquor Bill, but I do not think that they are serious over this question. I was asked a question about some licenses in my district, and I discovered that the Home Secretary issued regulations that the police were to oppose all new licenses.

Mr. MURPHY: Did he really do that?

Mr. ALLEN: No; it was not done in my district. And there are other districts where the Government seem very anxious to get hotels, and places where there are already hotels.

Mr. MORGAN: Where is that?

Mr. ALLEN: Warwick, for instance.

Mr. MURPHY: They are pretty thirsty up there.

Mr. ALLEN: That is what the Government did at Warwick.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: If you make a charge of that kind, you should substantiate it.

Mr. ALLEN: It is not hard to substantiate it. There has been a regulation in force for some years now that no new licenses are to be granted within a five mile radius of a railway under construction and there is a railway under construction from Warwick to Maryvale. We know that there was an application from a rich syndicate for a license for a new hotel in the central portion of Warwick. In view of the regulation which has been promulgated by the authorities, the Bench did not feel justified in granting a license.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The regulation did not apply to Warwick at all.

Mr. ALLEN: In view of the proclamation the Bench did not feel justified in granting the license, and the Government altered the proclamation.

*Mr. B. F. S. Allen.]*

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The proclamation did not apply to Warwick at all.

Mr. ALLEN: If it did not, then I should like to know why the proclamation was altered. There was some doubt about it, and the proclamation was made to suit.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. gentleman knows that it did not apply to Warwick. What is the use of pursuing the argument?

Mr. ALLEN: I am still worried over the fact that the proclamation was altered.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. gentleman knows that it could not apply to a municipality.

Mr. ALLEN: Well, why should it not apply to a municipality?

The HOME SECRETARY: Because we have got no power to make it apply to a municipality. If the hon. gentleman reads the Act he will see that.

Mr. ALLEN: I do not see why it should not be made to apply to municipalities just in the same way as it is applied to outside districts.

The HOME SECRETARY: We hope to have the assistance of the hon. member directly in that direction. (Laughter.)

Mr. ALLEN: I was rather amused last night to hear the remarks of the senior member for Townsville, Mr. Philp, in connection with the Western Railway. That hon. member has travelled over the most of Queensland, and I do not think there is any member in this House who knows the conditions better than he does; and, after all the blowing of the present Administration about their great and magnificent railway scheme—this magnificent piece of statesmanship—it was rather amusing to hear the senior member for Townsville when he cried "Halt." He said the Government ought to examine the southern portion of the route and see if it would not be wise to make a change. I pointed out last year that so far as the report of Mr. Amos was concerned, it carried no weight at all with me, because in his examination of the route from Wallal to Tobermory he simply went by Wallal in the train, and he flew past Tobermory, at the other end, in a motor car, and he did not see one inch of the country between those points. Yet he made a report in favour of the railway. The general opinion of people who ought to know that portion of the State was that the line should have gone from Wallal to Windorah.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That is the position taken up by the hon. member for Townsville last year, and he is quite consistent.

Mr. ALLEN: I am not condemning him at all. He is quite right. What I am condemning is the action of the Government in rushing on with the proposal without giving it further consideration. I sincerely hope the venture will be a success, but at the same time I hold it is the duty of the Government to take every possible precaution that they are doing the right thing, and I contend they are not justified in taking the steps they did on the limited information they had at their disposal. In building up a reputation for statesmanship by diving into such a scheme they are simply building on sand, and I hope, before it is too late, the present Premier, in his wisdom, may see fit to suspend

[Mr. B. F. S. Allen.]

operations until he is doubly certain he is doing the right thing. The question of route, of course, may be looked upon as only a detail, but it is a very important detail.

The PREMIER: A very important detail.

Mr. ALLEN: It should not be treated in the flippant manner in which the Ministry treated it last year. I feel quite sure if hon. members sitting on the front Treasury bench put their own money into such a scheme they would take care that they had more exact reports than they had last year. Anyhow, if the Government still persist in going on with the present scheme, there is this fact to be borne in mind: It is going to cost money; we have no exact idea of what it will cost, and if that line costs more than is expected, and if it does not pay, it simply means that we will have to stop building railways.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You want to give more latitude in respect of deviation?

Mr. ALLEN: No; I want the whole scheme re-examined. We had it from the lips of the senior member for Townsville that, so far as the southern portion is concerned, he does not think the Government is doing a wise thing, and he has been strengthened in that opinion doubly so, one might say, by his recent visit out there. Seeing that that is so, there is a possibility that the same objection applies to the other portions. I know the country from Blackall to Windorah is very poor and subject to floods. I have never been over that route, but that is the opinion I have formed from conversations with a number of my acquaintances who know the country very well indeed.

The PREMIER: Do you recommend that the line should go due west from Eromanga?

Mr. ALLEN: No; I want it to go to Windorah. I hold that Tobermory is no place to take the line to. At the same time, I have this to bear in mind: That a number of people have taken up selections on the understanding that the line is going there and we must be very careful.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Windorah is very many miles north of Tobermory.

Mr. ALLEN: If the line were built from Wallal to Windorah—

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: It would not go from Wallal to Windorah.

Mr. ALLEN: I say if it were built from Wallal to Windorah the southern portion of the State could be opened up by a line from Cunnamulla to Thargomindah.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: It is not in the same direction.

Mr. ALLEN: The hon. member for Townsville said that later on, if the line were built from Wallal to Eromanga, a line should be built from Cunnamulla to Thargomindah.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: That is a very different thing to what you are advocating—a line from Wallal to Windorah.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Oh, Cunnamulla to Bourke.

Mr. ALLEN: If lines were built from Wallal to Eromanga and from Cunnamulla to Thargomindah, they would be too close. That is the point that I want to make, and, if you want to dodge Tobermory, you could go further north than Eromanga. I hope some connection will be made in the West

with the railway system of New South Wales. New South Wales provides a very good market for the cattle of Western Queensland, and I hold it is the duty of the Government to provide the quickest and cheapest route to markets. If there was a connection in the West, the people would be able to send their stock straight down to the best markets in Australia without travelling them by road. I would just like to refer

to the Agricultural Department [10 p.m.] before I close. We have been expecting a lot since the appointment of the new Minister, and there is a great deal for him to do in that particular department. I want to point out the very careless way the tick question is being dealt with on the Darling Downs. At the present time there is a tick scare in the vicinity of Dalby. Outside that town there is what is known as the buffer area. Cattle come across the range from tick infested country past Jondowaie, where there is a dip, without being dipped, and they go through clean country, past small selectors, into Dalby. There they are dipped and kept in the Jimbour Lane until the second dipping takes place. I would like to know from the Minister why they are allowed to go into that clean country, and kept there for two or three weeks going up and down this plain with ticks practically falling about all over the place? Last summer we had a serious outbreak of ticks in that particular locality. This miserly Lands Department got a bit of a scare over the Jimbour lands not going off as quickly as they should, and in order to make a few pounds they brought cattle in from off tick country on agistment. No precautions were taken, and the result was that ticks were left on the country. One selector came along with his dairy herd, and the result was that he lost thirteen or fourteen high-priced cows.

Mr. VOWLES: That was not Jimbour country at all.

Mr. ALLEN: It was Jimbour country, and that is why the tick has got there. There were some bullocks from a station on the Burnett on agistment on Jimbour country. This selector I am referring to came along and selected Jimbour country, and that is what he got. The hon. member says it is not in Jimbour country, but it is very funny that the selector, Mr. Hamilton, thinks it is Jimbour country, and it is also funny that everybody else in that part of the country calls it Jimbour country.

Mr. VOWLES: It is all Jimbour country.

Mr. ALLEN: This is part of the Jimbour Repurchased Estate, and at the present time tick-infested cattle are often found grazing up and down the Jimbour Lane, and I say that if we had an efficient administration the department would not allow that risk to be taken. I sincerely trust that the Minister will look the matter up and see that proper precautions are taken. As it is, there is a scare in that particular locality as to an outbreak of ticks next year. The hour is getting late, and I do not desire to detain the House much longer. I hope that the Government will push on with those measures that they intend to introduce, and that they will see that the man on the land is assisted in every possible way, not only the agricultural selector, but those people who are taking up land in comparatively small areas in the Western districts of Queensland.

Mr. GUNN (*Carnarvon*): I had no intention when the debate first started of saying

anything, but it has gone so far, and so many have spoken, that I am beginning to think that I might as well be in the fashion—in fact, if I am not in the fashion I might as well be out of the world. (Hear, hear! and laughter.) I remember the time when, if I was to meet a young lady going down the street in my younger days, it was easier for me to jump over her head than to walk round her. (Laughter.) At the present time if I meet a young lady in the street she has to stand twice in the one place before she makes a shadow. (Laughter.) Under these circumstances, I think the House will forgive me for saying a few words on the Address in Reply. (Laughter.) There is no doubt that this country at the present time is in a very prosperous condition. I think we are having one of the most prosperous decades that we have ever passed through in the history of Australia, and it is principally brought about by the good seasons and the good prices that we are getting for our produce, and also our good Government.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GUNN: Another sign of the prosperous times—I do not think many people will agree with me, but I think it is a true sign of a prosperous time—is strikes. Strikes are to be deplored. No doubt they are a great calamity, but at the same time they are a sign of good times. If you are getting a lot of your bush horses into the yard after a drought, they have no strength or spirit to do anything, but get them into the yard after a good season, and get on one of those horses, and it will try to throw you off at a moment's notice. (Laughter.) So it is at the present; strikes are occurring, our employees are well fed, they are healthy and in good order, and they are quite prepared to throw off the yoke of their servitude. (Laughter.) That is one of the reasons we have strikes. Another thing is this: The unions recognise that when there is plenty of labour available it is no time to strike; the time to strike is when there are very few people who want employment, and many people wanting men.

Mr. LENNON: The newspapers say that the Government can have all the labour they want for the mills, although there are 3,000 men on strike.

Mr. GUNN: I am not talking about the newspapers. I am saying what I think. I am not tied up to the newspapers.

Mr. LENNON: Not like the Government.

Mr. GUNN: The principal thing is to see that our people are properly settled on the land. We want to see the people settled all over Australia on a fair amount of land—a living area. We do not want to see some people holding a lot of land, other people a small portion, and some none at all. It should be our endeavour to see that people are settled on the land on a living area. I think the present Government have done all that can be expected in that respect. I have no doubt the Federal land tax will be credited with bursting up a number of big estates. I do not know whether it will or not, but my opinion is that it savours of repudiation. Numbers of people were induced years ago to purchase land under the existing laws; and if they are beaten with a land tax until they have to relinquish their land I think it savours of repudiation. I think it would be better to pass a law to limit the quantity that can be held in future than to tax people

*Mr. Gunn.]*

off the land they own now. It would not do for me to sit down without saying something about the pear. (Laughter.) In my first speech in this House I spoke of pear. That was when a lot of people did not think so much of the pest; but to-day they are more alive to it, and recognise what a great pest it is, and are doing their best to get rid of it. And the Government also are doing their best to get rid of it. The fact of having our eyes open means that very likely we shall overtake it in time. With reference to the commission that has been appointed in connection with this matter, I am not much in favour of commissions at any time; but if the pear is to be eradicated it will be by some scientific method, such as microbe or disease, and I hope the commission will find some means of getting rid of the pest. I very much doubt, however, if they will be able to do so. I am glad to say that land cleared of pear is found to be more fertile than if it had never been infested; and when the State becomes more thickly settled we shall be able to fall back on the land in these pear-infested areas for purposes of settlement. I do not believe in rabbits or in rabbit boards. I would like to see the boards done away with and the lessees supplied with netting by the Government to fence their holdings. If we had no barrier fence, and the rabbits had been allowed to go to the Gulf of Carpentaria, I believe we would have had less of the pest. Putting up a barrier to keep out rabbits is like putting up a dam to keep back the water—when they get past the barrier the trouble is all the greater. Another thing—which some people may consider a small matter, but which I think is of some consequence—is the question of doing something for the protection of the poor opossum. (Hear, hear!) He is getting wiped out, and I think something should be done. Opossums might be protected by allowing a close season for a couple of years to help them to increase.

Mr. HAMILTON: Have another portfolio—namely, prickly pear, rabbits, and opossums. (Laughter.)

Mr. GUNN: There are experimental farms for this thing and that; and I think an experimental farm for opossums would be a good thing. It might be a valuable experiment to bring opossums here from Tasmania.

• Mr. MAY: Hear, hear!

Mr. GUNN: In reference to immigration, I do not intend to "sool" the Government on to unrestricted immigration. I think the more who come here the better, but I would like to see them come of their own accord. I do not believe in enticing them—leading the men to believe that the streets are paved with gold for them to pick up, and leading the girls to believe that the first young squatter they meet will ask them to marry him. (Laughter.) I would like to see a free bridge between here and Great Britain; but we have not got that, and I do not believe in enticing people out, because the chances are that when they get here they are disappointed, and the first thing they do is to vote against the Government. (Laughter.)

Mr. MURPHY: Let's bring out plenty of immigrants and get them out of office. (Laughter.)

Mr. GUNN: Reference has been made to pastoralists having a great objection to employing married men with families, but it is not a fact.

Mr. MAY: It is a fact.

[Mr. Gunn.

Mr. GUNN: It may possibly be in the hon. member's electorate, but it is not a fact in mine. I am convinced that we are doing wrong if we say we do not want married people on our farms or stations. The best people we can have are people who are married and do not want to walk about. I have heard some people say it would be a good idea to increase the accommodation for shearers so as to provide for married people. Well, that is not necessary. The shearer is only two, three, four, or five weeks in a shed, so he does not want his wife and family with him. What he wants is sufficient wages to enable him to keep his wife and family in some town where there is a school for the children. But all the people in fixed employment, such as boundary riders, should be married and have their families with them. I will take my own case. The other day I heard that a young fellow who was working for me wanted to get married, and I asked him if it was a fact. He said, "Yes," and then I said, "Well, I hope you will give me a bit of notice so as to let me build a house for you," and he said he would.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FOLEY: That's the idea.

Mr. GUNN: That is the way to encourage people. With regard to the advertisements that we are told about, "Married couple wanted—no encumbrances," it is necessary on nearly every station and farm to employ a domestic servant, or a cook, or somebody to look after the place. You cannot get single girls to go out into the bush and do all the hard work of cooking for the house, and perhaps for the men employed about the place, and the next best thing is a married couple with no encumbrances. They are a substitute for domestic servants. There are always a few couples without encumbrances who are willing to go and work on stations, and why shouldn't they?

Mr. ALLEN: The encumbrances may come along there.

Mr. GUNN: The encumbrances may come along in the hon. member's case. (Laughter.) It is an undoubted fact that there is a great dearth of domestic servants, particularly in the bush. You cannot get them to go out there, and you have to get married couples, and a married woman with a large family cannot possibly do domestic work about the station. The stations and farms in my district, however, are very glad to welcome married people with families. Not only that, but many of the stations have schools where the children can be taught. A great deal has been said about the railways. I supported the great railway scheme that was passed last session, and I am still of the opinion that it is a very necessary thing to throw railways out right through Queensland and eventually to link them up. I think they will prove a great blessing to Queensland, and I hope they will pay. Wool is one of the products that can afford to pay a good tariff, and it does pay a good tariff, and it makes the railways pay. The principal product on the railway that goes past Goondiwindi is wool, and I think that line pays nearly 5 per cent., and any line that pays a thing like that it is advisable to build. Many of the lines that have been passed are in wool districts, and they also will pay 5 per cent.—at least, I hope so.

Mr. HAMILTON: There is a great deal of railway material being carried on the border line, and that helps to make it pay.

Mr. GUNN: When that is taken off, there is still any amount of traffic on the line.

Mr. HAMILTON: It is robbing the Western line, too, and it is carrying goods at a reduced rate, too.

Mr. GRAYSON: Not at all.

Mr. GUNN: It might take a bit of traffic from the Western line, but I know it has taken more from the New South Wales lines, and some from somewhere else; but that does not alter the fact that the line is paying. The Western line is paying too. As we are all on the parish pump, I may say that there is another line wanted in my district. That is a line from Inglewood to Texas. That is a line that would pay more than 5 per cent. without any material being carried over it. I would like to say a few words now with reference to State schools. I think that the present Government and other Governments have been very good to the people of Queensland in putting up State schools all over the country. I just went over the list in my own electorate to-day, and I find there are no less than twenty-nine public schools, besides plenty of private ones, and that is a very fair number for one electorate. In this connection I must compliment the Railway Department upon providing schools at construction camps. On the line to Bullamon, which passes where I live, there is a great number of married men connected with the line, although some of my friends on the other side say that we do not encourage married people. The Railway Department have provided a tent school at the end of the line or at Talwood, and I understand they are going to put another at Thallon. When I was at the construction works the other day I saw one man who used to shear for me, and who I knew was a married man, and I said to him, "Hullo, what are you doing here?" He said "I am working on the line." I said, "I thought you would not work on the line." He said, "Well, there is a school here now, and I can bring my wife and family here." I met another man with his wife, and I said, "I thought your wife was living in Goondiwindi," and he said, "We have shifted out here because there is a school." If you can get schools at these construction camps it will induce married men to work on the railway construction works instead of having so many single men. With reference to the immigrants we are bringing out, I have heard many people say that they are not of the right class. Well, my experience is that all with whom I have come in contact are a very good sort. I have seen several domestic servants, who, besides being good looking, are very good workers. (Laughter.) They are a very desirable class of immigrant. To show you how well some of these immigrants do out here, there were supposed to be fifty of them who went to the end of the line at Bullamon. Next day six of them were lost. An expedition went out to look for them, and when they found them there were eight. (Loud laughter.) Thinking that there was some mistake, when they got back to the camp they counted the whole lot, and instead of the original fifty they found there were fifty-two of them. (Renewed laughter.) That is an absolute fact.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: That is prolific Queensland.

Mr. GUNN: They were a real good class of men. I saw some of them working in a cutting, and I noticed one of them—a fine-looking fellow—was wearing a woman's hat. There was a storekeeper standing beside me, and I said to him, "How is it this man is wearing a woman's hat?" He remarked, "Well, he would not pay more than 2s. 6d. for a hat, and that was the only hat I had in the store that I could sell him for 2s. 6d." (Laughter.) Now, a man who will wear a woman's hat, and stand all the derision of the other men for the sake of saving a little money, will turn out a good colonist.

Mr. HAMILTON: Was he a Scotchman? (Laughter.)

Mr. GUNN: I did not ask him. Everybody on the other side whom I have heard speaking during the course of this debate has been exclaiming about the extravagance of the Government, and at the same time they have been "sooling" them on to spend more money here and more money there. This wants spoon-feeding, and that wants spoon-feeding. Well, I do not believe in so much spoon-feeding. We would get on far better if we relied a little more on ourselves instead of leaning on the Government so much. (Hear, hear!) One hon. member said the other day that he intended to go on strike for higher pay next session. (Laughter.) I suppose that is a sign of good times. (Laughter.) Another hon. member on the other side said that even the lunatics were going out on strike. Another sign of good times. (Laughter.) It is not my intention to go out on strike for higher pay.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GUNN: I think £300 a year is quite sufficient, and I think the House was just as good a House before there was payment of members at all.

Mr. MAY: Yes, you are a squatter.

Mr. GUNN: I am not a squatter, unfortunately.

Mr. MAY: But you have the money behind you.

Mr. GUNN: Where would you have it? (Loud laughter.) I am not in favour of increasing the payment to members. We are paid fairly well now for all that [10.30 p.m.] we do. We have been here for a fortnight or three weeks talking a lot of rot. (Laughter.) If we had written out our speeches on foolscap and put them into a bag and handed them to *Hansard* for publication on the same day, we should have been just as far forward as we are now. However, it is now half-past 10 o'clock, and I shall not detain the House any longer. Before sitting down, I desire to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, upon your elevation to such a responsible position.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. J. M. HUNTER (*Maranoa*): I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Question put and passed.

The resumption of the debate was made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

The House adjourned at twenty-six minutes to 11 o'clock.

*Mr J. M. Hunter.]*