

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**WEDNESDAY, 2 AUGUST 1911**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

WEDNESDAY, 2 AUGUST, 1911.

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

QUESTIONS.

CHANGING "NORTH PINE" TO "PETRIE."

Mr. LENNON (*Herbert*) asked the Chief Secretary—

"1. Was the name of the locality known as "North Pine" changed to that of "Petrie" at the request (by petition) of the residents?"

"2. How many signatures of bonâ fide residents of the district were attached to the petition?"

"3. Was a counter-petition, protesting against any change of name, received by the Chief Secretary?"

"4. How many signatures of bona fide residents of the district did such petition contain?"  
 "5. What public purpose was served in changing the name against the wishes of the majority of the residents?"

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

"All these questions are based on the incorrect assumption that the name of the locality known as "North Pine" has been changed, whereas only the name of the railway station has been changed to do honour to the memory of one of the noblest and most unselfish pioneers and patriots any Australian State has known."

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

#### RETIRING AGE OF CIVIL SERVANTS.

Mr. LENNON asked the Chief Secretary—

"1. How many officers of the civil service have reached the retiring age—(a) clerical division; (b) professional division?"

"2. The average annual salary paid to such officers—(a) clerical division; (b) professional division?"

The PREMIER replied—

"1. (a) Nineteen; (b) eight.

"2. (a) £452 18s.; (b) £407 10s.

"I may add that twenty teachers have reached retiring age, and average salary is £267 13s."

#### MONEY EXPENDED ON BLACKMAN'S GAP ROAD.

Mr. THEODORE (*Woothakata*), on behalf of Mr. Breslin, asked the Secretary for Railways—

"1. The amount of money expended by the department on the Blackman's Gap road, between Miriam Vale and Glassford Creek?"

"2. Under what conditions was this money granted?"

"3. With whom was the agreement?"

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

"1. £758 15s.

"2. That the traffic from and to Glassford Creek Mineral Field was conveyed by the railway.

"3. With the Glassford Creek Copper Mining Company, Limited."

#### SUGAR-WORKERS DETAINED IN STRIKE CAMPS.

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mackay*) asked the Home Secretary—

"1. Has his attention been drawn to reports to the effect that men are against their will forcibly detained in strike camps?"

"2. If so, will he take the necessary steps to stop such illegal practices?"

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

"Any instances of forcible detention are being dealt with by the police."

#### PERMITS TO HOLD ART UNIONS AND LOTTERIES.

Mr. MURPHY (*Croydon*) asked the Chief Secretary—

"1. How many permits to hold art unions or lotteries were granted by the Attorney-General for the year ended 30th June last?"

"2. To what persons or bodies, and at whose request, and for what purpose, were such permits granted?"

"3. What was the total amount of fees paid to Mr. Macrossan in connection with the late betting prosecutions?"

The PREMIER replied—

"1 and 2. The information is in course of preparation.

"3. Mr. Macrossan's fees have not yet been ascertained."

I may say that it has taken a few sheets of foolscap already. (Laughter.)

Mr. MANN: He has bought a motor-car out of it. (Laughter.)

The PREMIER: The foolscap is used in connection with the answer to No. 2.

#### SUGAR WORKS BILL.

##### COMMITTEE.

(*Mr. J. Stodart, Logan, in the chair.*)

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

"That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to authorise the construction and establishment of sugar-works by means of moneys advanced by the State, and to provide for the repayment of such moneys and for the maintenance, management, and control of such sugar-works, and for other purposes connected therewith."

Mr. MANN (*Cairns*) asked the Treasurer how many mills it was intended to establish?

The TREASURER: The intention of the Government, of course, was to carry out the recommendations of the Sugar Works Commission. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. NEVITT (*Carpentaria*) asked whether the Bill was going to be extended to refineries? That was a branch of the sugar industry which the State could reasonably and well undertake, particularly at the present time. He was of opinion, and others were also of that opinion, that if they had had State refineries in Queensland they would not be in the midst of the great industrial upheaval that they were in at the present time. He hoped the Treasurer would take the matter into his serious consideration, if he had not already done so, and try to extend the measure to sugar refineries.

The TREASURER drew the attention of the hon. member for Carpentaria to the fact that there was a motion on the business-paper before the House dealing with that matter, and until that was disposed of he could not give an answer to the question.

Mr. MULLAN: Does the fate of the Government depend on that motion?

Mr. THEODORE: Will the Treasurer support that motion?

Question put and passed.

The House resumed. The CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee had come to a resolution, and the report was agreed to.

##### FIRST READING.

The Bill was read a first time, and the second reading made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY.

##### RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

\* Mr. O'SULLIVAN (*Kennedy*): In rising to add my little criticism to the Address in Reply I do so without any thought of going over a lot of ground that has been gone over by various members on both sides of the House. I rise as a duty I owe to my constituents and

to the State in general to say that I am very much disappointed at the programme put before members of the House in the Governor's Speech. One would think that, after the great prosperity the country has been going through for a considerable time past, we would have had the nationalisation of hospitals proposed. I am sure I have expected it ever since I have been in the House, judging by the expressions of opinions held by members sitting behind the Government. I find on perusing the speech of the hon. member for Moreton that he practically apologised for the Government not having brought about the nationalisation of the hospitals, and he said the reason was through the very heavy interest bill that we had to meet owing to the loan policy that the Government has gone into. I think it is very wrong on the part of the Government, who presume to look after the interests of the people, to neglect that very essential duty of looking after the sick of the State. They are rushing into the foreign money market so as to make that an excuse for not doing their very obvious duty—that is, to look after the hospitals.

Mr. MURPHY: Queensland gives more to the hospitals than any other State in Australia.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: I do not care what Queensland does or does not do. I am asking them to do the right thing. I am sick of hearing that Queensland does this and Queensland does the other. Why don't they do the decent thing and nationalise the hospitals? They have nationalised the hospitals in Western Australia, and why can't we do it here? The only thing that I can see in the whole of this programme that is of any material benefit is the State Children Bill. That will, of course, incidentally, give a little assistance to our orphans, but I should have thought, seeing that the Orphanage Act is such an old one, we would have had an amendment of that Act. As you know, Mr. Speaker, that Act is something like forty years old, and one would have thought the Government would have brought in an amendment to bring about more modern ideas as to what is right and fit and proper for the assistance of our orphans.

The PREMIER: If you look at the State Children Bill you will see that is the very object of it.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: I say the orphanages should be brought up to date, and more in conformity with what are the present needs of modern times. The cost of living is going up in every way and in every direction. The Government can see that is so by conceding a small concession to their lower-paid civil servants. Why not, then, see the need of further supplementing the payment to widows for the upkeep of their orphans? You know very well that the purchasing power of money is just as little in the hands of the widow as it is to the wife of the wage-earner. Look, for instance, at the position of the widow with four or five children who is only getting in the aggregate 18s. 6d. a week! Surely the Government might have seen their way clear to have brought down an amendment of the Orphanages Act so as to give the widows the same amount of money that is being given to foster-mothers. The same thing applies to our homes that are subsidised by the Government. I see by the returns that the amount per head is very small—5s. 10d. per week. That is a very

small amount for those institutions to be able to do the right thing with those entrusted to their care, and undoubtedly they do do good work. But I say again, the present high cost of living makes it very hard for those institutions to do justice to those submitted to their care under the State. The amendment of the Agricultural Bank Act I hope will be such that it will make that bank far more beneficial to the agriculturists, to the orchardists, and to those who may be in need of assistance from such a bank. At the same time, we have seen that the Federal Government are going into the banking business in a thorough way, and that we will have a great rival in the Commonwealth Bank so far as the Agricultural Bank is concerned, and I hope it will do the Agricultural Bank good. I hope the Federal banking system will be on such broad principles and will be so liberal that it will make the Agricultural Bank toe the mark, which, I think, would be of great benefit. I want to say a few words on the immigration policy of the Government. I find, since we have had autonomous government—that is, for something over fifty years—we have spent £3,500,000 in bringing immigrants to this State, which, at £10 per capita for each immigrant brought into this country, would mean 350,000 persons have been brought into Queensland under this immigration policy. I know there have been grave complaints, not only in this Chamber but throughout the State of Queensland, that the right class of immigrants are not coming to the State, and I cannot see how we can expect any of the right class of people to come here, seeing that the agricultural population of the older countries is decreasing to a very great extent, which makes it difficult for those older countries to supply their own needs for agricultural labourers. Since 1880 the agricultural population in Germany has decreased from being 42 per cent. of the whole population to 28 per cent., which means that that country is not to be drawn on for agriculturists to the extent it might have been two or three decades ago. The same thing applies to the other civilised countries of the world—to France, as we all know, and to the countries that we spring from—that is, the British Isles. In reading the debates of another place, I saw that a gentleman was advocating that we should go in for attracting immigrants from the United States of America. I think it would be very foolish on the part of the Government to go to the United States for any immigrants to come and take up our lands.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I think he said Canada.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: I stand corrected. But, if the Government have any idea of going to the United States for immigrants, they are doing a very wrong thing. That country is suffering from a depletion of its rural and agricultural population, and in the words of Sir Horace Plunkett, the greatest authority on agriculture—speaking of the exodus of the farmers from the United States to Canada, he says that the American farmer was a robber of the soil. He robbed the soil of the United States, and he was tracking across to Canada to rob Canada of its fertility. He explained the reason was this: That the American farmer's idea of agriculture was to get a large territory, to mortgage himself right up to the hilt, and then, having a millstone round his neck, to simply skim the

*Mr. O'Sullivan.]*

agricultural productiveness of the soil and extort the last cent out of it to pay the overdraft to his bank, and so forth. We do not want that kind of spirit in this country. We have enough of it at the present time, unfortunately. Therefore, I say the Government cannot expect, in any country that we wish immigrants drawn from, to get the right class of immigrants to come out here. I say that after spending hundreds of thousands of pounds in bringing immigrants here and finding our population has not been increased in the ratio it should have—seeing that after bringing out 350,000 persons by the aid of immigration since we had autonomous government, and our population to-day is only just over 600,000—I say it is up to the Government to look around for some other means of populating our country. How are we to do it? We will do it principally by making the conditions of the country attractive, so that we will draw to this country persons from other countries of their own volition, and we will be able to make it practicable for young men and women to take on the duties of marriage. It is no use shutting our eyes to the fact that in good times the marriage rate goes up, and consequently the birth-rate goes up. But how are we going to populate our waste spaces—our Northern districts that the Premier was speaking so anxiously about? The Premier said his object was to get the vacant spaces filled up, and that was one of the reasons why he was anxious to establish extra sugar-mills on the Sugar Commission's recommendation. How are we going to do that if the Government, in their own mills, only pay the small wage of 22s. 6d. to 25s. a week and keep? That is not an incentive for men to take on the duties of matrimony. Again, in paying a bare subsistence wage to their own employees in the railway works, are they doing the right and just thing in trying to populate our vacant spaces? How is a man in Brisbane, working in the Government goods-sheds here for the low amount of 7s. a day—and only the other day it was 6s. 6d.—with rents varying from 8s. to 12s. a week—how is he going to take on the duties of matrimony and fill the cradles as we want them filled in this young country? A country like Queensland, boasting of its great resources and its great wealth, should double its population in every twenty-five years, and I maintain if the Governments of the past had done their duty and paid better wages to their own employees, and thus given a good example to the private employers, our population to-day would have been a million of people. We would not have had the present unfortunate trouble in the sugar districts had the Government given better conditions in their own mills and given a better example to employers in private mills. There would then have been a great incentive to our people to go into the sugar districts and work there, and have a wage sufficient to keep themselves and wives, and any children that may come from the marriage. But the Ministry is more concerned in bringing in a great amount of unemployed. They unconsciously—I say unconsciously; I will not be severe on them—they unconsciously know that the capitalistic system can best thrive when there is a lot of unemployed about, and that is one of the great reasons—it may be the spring—that

[Mr. O'Sullivan.

they are going in for this great immigration policy; and yet the wages those poor immigrants get when they come out here will not be sufficient to enable them to undertake the duties of matrimony and settle down. These are some of the causes why our population has not increased as it should have done. Before the House rose last session, when the Estimates were going through, I drew the attention of the Minister for Works to the great [4 p.m.] expense of timber and bricks, and urged him to go in for a State brickyard. There are men in the building trades being put off from day to day on account of the scarcity of bricks; and seeing the expansion in the building trade, I think the Government should have made provision for keeping up the supply of bricks at a less price than is charged by private firms.

Mr. HARDACRE: It would have been a very good thing.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: As the hon. member for Leichhardt says, it would have been a very good thing. Incidentally, another good thing would have come from it. It is well known that we are depleting our forests out of all proportion to what should be the case; and if the Government would go in for brick-making, and erect more brick buildings—small ones as well as big—it would leave more timber available for people who want to make homes for themselves, and would tend to cheapen rents which are weighing down people in every big town in Queensland. The whole of our prosperity seems to be bringing about high values in land; and I am afraid that before long this great boom in land values will burst and bring about terrible disaster. I hope it will not, but I am afraid it will do so. We are mainly dependent in this country on our primary industries, which at certain seasons need a great deal of labour. We are not in the position of countries like America and Germany, where hundreds of thousands of people are imported every year to assist in harvesting the crops; we cannot employ people for a few months in the year and then let them go to their homes in foreign countries; therefore we want to maintain our surplus population so as to draw on them from time to time for our primary industries—such as cane-cutting, meatworks, shearing, and wood-cutting; and we must pay them a better wage, so that they may be able to maintain themselves in the off season. That is one of the costs that should be charged against production in Australia; and if we do not do this, we shall not be able to make progress as we should. In America and Canada the farmers give as much as 10s. and 12s. a day to the men who assist in garnering their crops; and they pay a good wage to the labourers also, because of the competition of the cities in drawing on the rural population for labour. And in our large cities we should go in for assisting the worker as much as we can, so that he can settle down in districts where harvesting and similar work requires to be done. But how can we do that when there are men behind the Government who maintain that £1 5s. a week and keep is a fair wage? With reference to the Sugar Commission's recommendation for the erection of more mills, I would impress on the Government the advisability of cutting up their sugar lands into small areas, so that men will be able to do their own farming. By so

doing they would encourage a population to spring up round the mills. It is strange that men in this Chamber and in the Press will say the industry cannot pay a fair wage to the worker. In the name of heaven, if it cannot pay a fair wage with the protection it has, how is it going to pay a fair wage at all? It would be far better for any industry to ignominiously fail than to be fostered at the price of the flesh and blood of the men working for wages. The hon. member for Maryborough last night spoke about the great amount of money invested in this great industry. When he was speaking, I thought I was reading the speech of an anti-abolitionist in America in the slavery days, when it was said that the cotton industry needed slavery—that so much money had been invested in the slaves, and that if they were freed all the money so invested would be lost. I say that, notwithstanding all the money invested in the sugar industry, it is through the tariff which the people of Australia are carrying to make the industry a white man's industry that it is a paying industry; and it was not intended that all those great profits should go into the refineries, or even to the farmers, but that the great bulk should go into the hands of the workers. Here is an industry in connection with which people can afford to pay from £12 to £14 an acre; and at Jarvisville as much as £11,250 was paid for a farm; and yet people had the audacity to say that this industry will not pay more than £1 5s. a week and keep. I hope those who are trying to prevent a living wage being paid will look at the consequences. Notwithstanding the high protection given to the industry, practically all the profits are going to the aggrandisement of the octopus, or several octopuses; and the probability is that if that state of things is not altered, they will take away the tariff and let the thing go hang. If that is done, it will be owing to the stupidity of the millers and those behind them. When I speak like that, I am moved in this way: During the last half-century production has been aided by mechanical invention to such an extent that I think it is time the mere labourer shared in the advantages resulting from those inventions, which have increased the producing capacity of labour from ten to one hundred fold. This is common to every industry; it will apply to the agricultural, the mining, and the manufacturing industry; and I say we should see that the laws are so framed that the mere labourer engaged in the industry should get a larger share of the profits. Take, for instance, the great revolution brought about by the invention of the harvesting machine. Previous to its invention it cost 2s. per bushel to harvest wheat by manual labour, whereas after the invention was perfected it reduced the cost of harvesting to 3½d. per bushel. Does the mere worker get his fair proportion of the great benefits produced by these inventions? No; it is the cry throughout the civilised world that these inventions have been used more to enslave the worker than to benefit him. I say that all should share in the benefits of this great revolution brought about by these inventions; but, owing to the power of wealth, the wealthier classes have shared in a greater proportion than they should. If we are going to maintain ourselves as a people, we should bring in legislation that will ensure to the worker a greater proportion of the produce of his labour. And that brings me to what the Premier said in speaking on the Address in

Reply, when he referred to the great prosperity of Queensland, and said how difficult it was for employers to get labour to keep up with their orders. I shall quote here some figures which I used at the last Federal campaign in support of my argument in favour of the new protection. Owing to indisposition I had not the pleasure of listening to the hon. member for Moreton when he spoke the other night, but I have read very carefully a portion of his speech—that dealing with wages and production—and I find that he spoke about the £21,000,000 paid in wages to persons employed in the manufacturing industry. I have some figures here which are practically the same. Here are a few facts regarding the profits, and wages, of manufacturing in Australia—taken from Knibbs's Production, Bulletin No. 4; Summary of Commonwealth Production Statistics for the years 1900 and 1909. These figures show—That the value added to goods in process of manufacture in 1909 was £42,216,493. Employees' share was £21,105,456. Capitalists' share was £21,111,037. Total, £42,216,493. Had the hon. member for Moreton gone a little further in his analysis, he would have found that the share of the capitalists in that production was equal to that of the employees—that it amounted to £21,111,037. The number of employees was 254,750, and the average wage was £1 11s. 10½d. Add 10s. per week for the 254,750 employees' wages, which would make £6,623,500, leaving the capitalist still with over £14,000,000 as his share. Those wages include the salaries of officials, accountants, clerks, and everyone employed in that production, and the figures show that the prosperity that we are experiencing and that the hon. member for Moreton shouted so much about, saying that we should get others to come here and share our prosperity, is going—or the great bulk of it is going—into the hands of the capitalists. The workers are getting very little. That is one of the reasons which I put before the people of Queensland to show that they should go in for the new protection. Notwithstanding that our tariff is not high enough to protect many of our industries against industries in the Old World in which lower wages are paid, the bulk of the profits derived from those industries go into the hands of the capitalists. Now, I desire to say something in connection with my own electorate, particularly with regard to railways. Last session I asked a question as to the number of men employed on the Northern Railway at that time and for ten years previously. The answer to the question will be found at page 2487 of vol. cxvii. of *Hansard*. It went to show that the number of lengthsmen then employed on that railway was much less than it was ten years ago. There is great dissatisfaction among the lengthsmen, owing to the fact that when the permanent way is very much disturbed by the protracted rainy season they are taken away from their own lengths and sent to neighbouring lengths in order to assist the men there in the upkeep of the permanent way. I maintain that it is not a fair thing to send lengthsmen who have taken pride in keeping their own lengths in good order, to those lengths in which the inspector finds something wrong, as when they return to their own lengths they have to make up for the time lost during their absence. A lot of kudos has been given to the Government for their tardy increases to the pay of public servants, but I think they would have done much

*Mr. O'Sullivan.]*

better had they given a larger increase to the lower-paid men than they have done. The increases given to the whole of the public servants receiving from 6s. to 10s. and 11s. per day works out at a ratio of about 6½ per cent. In my opinion it would have been much better to have given an increase of 1s. a day to those men who are living on the border line of existence, and that greater consideration should have been shown to lengthsmen. Every other servant in the Railway Department receives an extra allowance when he is sent away from his home. For instance, station-masters, guards, and engine-drivers have their emoluments increased by something like 2s. or 3s. a day when they are sent away from home; but when a lengthsmen is sent away from his home he is not allowed extra pay unless he is absent over fourteen days. At one time an allowance of something like 6d. a day was paid to lengthsmen, but now the regulations lay it down that they are not to be paid anything extra unless they are absent from home over fourteen days. Lengthsmen should be treated in the same way as other railway servants, and I hope the Government will take action in the direction I have indicated. Last session I asked the Minister for Railways in the House when a surveyor would be available to survey the line to Blair Athol from Ravenswood or Charters Towers, whichever route was decided upon, and the answer I got was "Somewhere about May." Representations have been made to me by the local Chamber of Commerce, asking me to urge this matter upon the attention of the Government, and I have written two or three times asking when a surveyor would be available for the work. The last notification I received was that a surveyor would be available about May. Now we are just entering into the month of August, and there is no surveyor available yet to carry out that survey. We need a railway very badly in that part of the country, because the depletion of timber is going on by leaps and bounds, and we require the coal to carry on mining in and around Charters Towers and in my own electorate contiguous to Charters Towers. It would be good policy for the Government to open up that beautiful country in what is termed the Burdekin Valley by a railway, as whichever route is adopted it will tap some very good country. Last year a deputation from the district waited upon the Minister for Railways to urge upon him the construction of this railway. It was one of the strongest and most representative deputations that has ever waited upon the Minister in connection with railways. The Minister replied that he would do all he could to get a resurvey made of that particular railway. Such a line would carry coal from Blair Athol to the Northern Railway, and that would mean a saving to the Government. This railway was surveyed by Mr. Geo. Phillips in 1897, and, speaking of the resources of the district, that gentleman says—

"On the banks of the Burdekin there is generally to be found a belt of rich alluvial soil, and as the stream is perennial, with a large supply of water percolating through the natural filter of sand and gravel, characteristic of this river, I have no doubt in process of time the Burdekin Valley will support a considerable population engaged in industrial pursuits of one description or another, such as mining, dairying, and farming, in which I include the products of the orchard, the silk-worm, and the vine. It is

[Mr. O'Sullivan.

remarkable that, with the exception of the Burdekin delta, where sugar-cane is successfully grown by means of irrigation, the existing settlement on this great river is confined to an occasional cattle station occupied by two or three white men and half a dozen aborigines."

If the Government would build a railway in that district, instead of spending millions of money as they propose to do in the far Western country, they would be doing a greater service to Queensland, because I have not the slightest shadow of a doubt that they could place more people on the land in the Burdekin district than they could along the whole of the Great Western Railway. People can live in the Burdekin district under favourable conditions, as it is a country teeming with mineral wealth and agricultural possibilities. Mr. Phillips, in his report, says there are hundreds of square miles of country there suitable for wheat culture, and I take it that with the adoption of modern methods of cultivation we could establish an industry there which would not be dependent upon any tariff. I ask the Government to think these things over. They are going to spend a lot of money on an industry that is dependent on the [4.30 p.m.] tariff, and which needs particular fiscal laws to make it profitable to exist in this country, while they are neglecting other areas that do not need any protective tariff for their development. It would be far better for Australia to develop its natural resources and go in for this latent land, the land now lying waste, if they would only go in for an up-to-date progressive policy for opening up the country with the assistance of the latest scientific instructions from their Agricultural Department. I hope that the remarks I have made to the House will show that this railway that has been asked for will run across country that will maintain some thousands of people in course of time. I hope when the session is over that we will have something to show for our work. I am very much disappointed that there are not several things brought forward that might have been. I think that more consideration should be given for the assistance of the widows and orphans, and we should nationalise our hospitals.

\* Mr. MACKINTOSH (*Cambooya*), who was received with "Hear, hears!" said: I am very pleased indeed to have the opportunity of saying a word or two in connection with the Address in Reply. In the first place, I must endorse the remarks expressed by a great many in this House, and add my personal regret over the death of the late Speaker, Mr. Bell. I knew Mr. Bell as long as I was in the House, and before I came here, and it would be impossible for me to say too much in his praise for his courtesy and general cordial demeanour, not only to me, but to everyone else in Queensland. It is unnecessary for me to say more, except that my regret and sympathy are offered to his relatives at his demise. We have had other changes in this House. I do not like flattery, Sir, but there are times when one must express his sentiments even if they do savour of flattery. I am glad to see yourself in the Speaker's chair. I knew you when you were a boy, and you were a manly boy. I have known you as a man, and I can say that your career has been most creditable and honourable in every way, both privately and publicly. I am sure you will fill the position of Speaker with dignity and credit

to the House and country and to yourself. I anticipate, and fully believe, that your decisions will always be impartial, and if at any time you call me to order I will be convinced in time that it was through my own fault. (Laughter.) We have had many Ministerial changes since last session, and many important ones, too.

Mr. LENNON: They are not done yet. (Laughter.)

Mr. MACKINTOSH: I am sorry to say that the late Premier, under circumstances known to himself, was obliged to retire from the honourable and successful position he held in this House. I have had a fair knowledge of all the Premiers we have had in Queensland from the first to the present one, and I must say that I consider the Hon. Dr. Kidston to be second, if not equal, to any we ever had. There is only one Premier that I might give first place to, and that is the late lamented Sir Thomas Mellraith.

Mr. MURPHY: You will always praise a Scotchman.

Mr. MACKINTOSH: I hope that I will be in a position to praise you some time, but in the meantime I cannot do so. (Laughter.) The late Premier had the courage of his opinions. He was a strong man with a strong back. He had a backbone, and he was not much taller than myself, but people of my build are pretty good when backbone is wanted. I regret his absence from the House very much, but I am in hopes that our present Premier will fulfil all that we anticipate from him. We have no reason to doubt that, because he has got excellent colleagues with him. With regard to one of them, I would say that I have had a good deal to do with the State schools of this colony for the last forty years, and I think that the present Minister for Education was born for the position. During the short time he has been in office I have had communications from many school committees mentioning some grievances, and when I took them to the Minister they were attended to to their satisfaction without any circumlocutory circumnavigation, but he came right to the point at once. We have several new Ministers. We are taking them on trust, but they are possessed of legal knowledge and literary knowledge, and I have no doubt that in time they will prove themselves efficient in the positions which they occupy. With regard to the Minister for Lands, I consider that the Lands Department is the most difficult department in the State to manage, because it is out of the land that we get everything. I have had dealings with the Minister for Lands in his legal capacity, and I found him very straightforward, and very reasonable in his charges. (Laughter.) All the same, I have always thought that a good, sound, practical man would be better in charge of the Lands Department than a lawyer. (Laughter.) I do so because a lawyer's profession is to make him look for legal technicalities. (Laughter.) We had an instance of that from the senior member for Townsville the other night. It seems to me to be most extraordinary that a grazing farmer cannot take up a lease; but, as the hon. gentleman pointed out, a lessee can take up a grazing farm. No doubt the lawyer will say that he must administer the Act as he finds it. But if a practical man were in charge of that

department he would not suggest that new causes should be put in every Act. The lawyer will look to see if there is a syllable too short, or if there is a letter too short in one syllable, and he will find out that there is something wrong in an Act which the practical men would not do, but would act more upon the spirit and intention of the Legislature. At the same time, I have every confidence in the present Minister for Lands. Then there is my friend, the Minister for Agriculture, I have known him since he was a little fellow, too. (Laughter.) I think a great deal of him; he has been a great friend of mine, and he has done as much for me as I have done for him. I am sure that I gave him a greater amount of abuse than he ever attempted to give me. (Laughter.) He has all the necessary knowledge to fill the position, and as he has been rubbing shoulders with farmers from the time of his youth up to the present, he must have learnt something from them. There is an old saying that if you want to get on you should rub shoulders with a rich man, and some of it might stick. I have every confidence in the Minister for Agriculture. His department gets a good deal of blame, and I do not know if there is any reason for it. I think that the department should be there to show the farmers how to grow their produce at a profit. They should supply them with seeds and plants, but at present I believe they get all the knowledge from the farmers themselves. I believe the present Minister for Agriculture is making things lively, and stirring them up a bit in the department. Later on, perhaps, I shall have something to say in connection with that department. It may be said that the Government departments are a sort of asylum for a man to get a billet there who could not even make a living for himself, and a man generally gets a billet as an expert of something. Well, that is not a good thing for the State. One thing I was interested in was the remarks of the hon. member for Maranoa last night, when he said that there was dissatisfaction amongst the members of the Government party with the members the Premier selected to join his Ministry. He had not the slightest reason to say that. As far as I am concerned, although I do not say much in this House, I think a great deal. (Laughter.) My ear is also pretty sharp, although I am deaf when it does not suit me to hear. (Laughter.) Without any egotism, I think I should be the last man in the House to be accused of trying to get into a Ministry, although I am quite capable of carrying on any department if called upon to do so. I have accompanied and associated with Ministers so often that I am fully up to how to receive deputations and send them away smiling. You never know what you can do until you have to. (Hear, hear! and laughter.) During my life I have had a great deal of responsibility, and I have always been able to keep my accounts on the safe side; but I am always more prepared to support competent men in a Government than to be there myself. I have every confidence in the present Government—that they will be able to carry on for the benefit of the State. I am glad that the hon. member for Maranoa is here, and I can tell him now that his whole ambition is to get into a Cabinet. (Laughter.) If he got the slightest chance of getting into a Cabinet, if it was only ephemeral—if it was only for

*Mr. Mackintosh.*]



twenty-four hours—he would be delighted to accept it so that he could say that he was once a Minister of the Crown. (Laughter.) I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman would fill a position in the Cabinet very creditably. I know that when the Labour party get over here, if the hon. member for Maranoa is not included in the Cabinet, then the fat will be in the fire. (Laughter.)

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: Didn't you say in Warwick that you should have been Minister for Agriculture?

Mr. MACKINTOSH: I say it now, from my point of view, if necessary. (Laughter.)

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: So you should have been.

Mr. MACKINTOSH: But when I can get other people to do the work I am quite satisfied. I have listened to the greater number of the speeches made here, including that of the acting leader of the Opposition. That hon. gentleman is a particular friend of mine. I have known him for a good number of years longer than he has known me, because he was once in a better position than I was, and is now also for that matter. Now, in connection with his finding fault with immigration and the class of people who come here, I have been several times to the Immigration Depôt and have seen these people, and I can say that the immigrants that we are getting here are very superior men indeed—families, single girls, and single men; and there is no place that I know of that can absorb a lot of people better than the electorate of the hon. member for Herbert. Take the country round the Mourilyan Harbour, that is now called Inisfail, right on to Atherton. There is no finer canegrowing country than that, and I am sure hundreds of families could be settled there comfortably, but they will never be settled there while the Labour party are agitating and causing strife amongst the men. While that goes on a man will never make a fortune or a good living on a wage. It doesn't matter what he gets. I have known people living comfortably on £100 a year, and know the same people getting £300, and they were in debt—they were never out of it. In fact, I am a labourer myself; I am one of the few labourers in this House. I must say it is my belief that the other side are animated for the good of this country and for its prosperity and advancement, but they are going the wrong way about it. In inciting these men to get more for their labour than the industry they are engaged in can afford to pay, they are doing wrong. If the industry is so flourishing and those connected with it are so wealthy, I would advise those men to take what they are getting for this season, and, when the season is over, to select their own land, say fifty or sixty of them, clear it, and burn it off and plant cane in between the stumps, and while it is growing up put in more, and leave that cane grow until it is ready to cut. They could then cut it themselves. By and by they could double the numbers, and in ten years' time I am sure they would have their own sugar-mills and their own refinery established, and they would divide the profits amongst themselves. The report this morning says there are nearly 2,000—1,800—men up there idle. Just fancy that! All these men idle. I am sure that they are good men, and yet they are idle. How did the farmers on the Darling Downs and

[*Mr. Mackintosh.*]

in West Moreton get on, Mr. Speaker? You know very well. In the busy times on the stations, when settlement was not so close as it is now, they went about shearing and fencing, and when the slack times came they fenced in their own little plot, and went out again next year and earned more. And how are they now? They are the wealthy people of the country.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MACKINTOSH: I am sure the hon. members for Cunningham and Aubigny, and all members representing districts on the Downs, can bear me out that all the settlers on the Downs are independent.

Mr. GRAYSON: Hear, hear! Quite true.

Mr. MACKINTOSH: How did they make it? On 15s. a week and tucker—(hear, hear!)—and very likely treacle and black sugar—you could cut it with an axe. You could see white streaks through it. Now they get loaf sugar—they would not take crystallised brown sugar. (Laughter.) Very healthy sugar, too. And those men opposite instead of going to Childers to cause strife and fighting, should have advised the men to work. I am sorry to say my hon. friend, the member for Bulloo, was frightened when he got there. He turned pale and would not fight. (Laughter.) In any case, it is a good job he did. If they were wise they would tell those men to take what they can get, instead of trying to embarrass a primary industry, and by and by take up land for themselves. The industry would then go on profitably. The hon. member who has just sat down advocated something being done for the farmers, and yet they are doing all that is possible to crush the unfortunate farmer. We have wages boards, arbitration boards, and still that will not do. They must go on strike and stop work. I cannot understand it. (Laughter.)

Mr. MURPHY: They are entitled to take a holiday sometimes, you know.

Mr. MACKINTOSH: I was very sorry indeed to hear what was reputed to have been said by the Premier of the Commonwealth. I do not think anyone believed he said such a thing unless in some weak moment. Even if he did, I do not think he is of such great importance that anybody would take much heed of it. But he did another thing. He said Australia was a good field for immigrants—no strike and turmoil about it; and still those strikes were going on, and he must have had knowledge of them at the time. What answer can he give? None.

Mr. LENNON: When did he say that?

Mr. MACKINTOSH: We saw it in the Press the other day.

Mr. LENNON: You do not believe all you read, do you?

Mr. MACKINTOSH: Of course the Government policy is to get more people out here, and we can absorb all the people we can get. If we spent £200,000 a year on immigration it would be money well spent, because we have a very large territory. There are three things necessary to make prosperity—land, money, and people.

Mr. LENNON: And low wages.

Mr. MACKINTOSH: Bother wages. Cannot we make wages?

Mr. GRAYSON: A living wage.

Mr. MACKINTOSH: None of these are of any use without the other two. We have any amount of land and we have any amount of

money, but the people to till the soil we have not got, and we must get them. Just fancy 400,000,000 acres of land in this country; and granted there is a large percentage not cultivable, but they are metalliferous. There are any amount of minerals in them, and how can we develop the resources of this great country without the people? We got some new people who went to Wallal at 9s. a day with plenty to eat and plenty to drink, and they must go on strike.

Mr. GRAYSON: And stretchers provided for them.

Mr. MACKINTOSH: We must get more people to construct railways to open up this country. We have the finest country in the world. There is no question about that. As far as I can judge, the class of immigrants we are getting out is a very superior one. Of course there are some undesirables. There may be some undesirable people in this House, but at the same time we must put up with them. The people sent them here, and the Government of the country brought those people out, and if there are any undesirables they are consumed somewhere, and no doubt with good treatment they will produce something. I think the railway programme of the Government is a good one. I believe that the Minister has been presented with as many implements in opening railways as will enable him to build a railway himself. (Laughter.) Just fancy this country, with about one-third the population of New South Wales, and yet we have hundreds of miles of railway more than they have! We have the greatest length of railways per head of population than any country in the world. What we want now is plenty of people to utilise those railways. It is impossible to have too many railways. During the discussion last week, I think it was the hon. member for Aubigny who referred to the carriage of cream, but when we consider that a great deal of the cream that is manufactured into butter in this country is carried in a most inconvenient manner a distance of over 50 miles, you fully expect it to get in an unsound condition. The cream has then to be graded by the manager of factories, and for that butter to fetch a price equal to the best English butter in the market, I think, is very creditable to all concerned in connection with the production of butter in Queensland—both those who supply the cream and the managers of the factories that manufacture it into commercial butter.

Mr. THORN: What about cheese?

Mr. MACKINTOSH: Cheese! For the information of the hon. member, I might say that all the cheese we can afford to send from Queensland has obtained a high price in the London market. If it does not top the market it is very little behind it; it has frequently topped New Zealand cheese, and I trust the hon. member will mark that down and put it in his hat in case he forgets it. (Laughter.) As regards railways: Of course we want more of them, and now is the time to build railways, when the State is prosperous. We passed railways last year—the Great Western Railway and the Northern Railway. I have not the slightest doubt that both of those railways will be remunerative to the State, and pay a percentage on the cost of construction. The percentage on the Western line will not be so great as that on the Northern, but I have every faith in the line from Rockhampton to Cairns. I believe that railway will pay from the start. With regard to the

line from Warwick to Maryvale, I hope the *via recta* will be completed in connection with that line; and I have no doubt that its construction will lead to a great deal of traffic. At one time I wanted the Goondiwindi-South-western line to go by another route instead of from Warwick; but I will do all I can to bring about its completion

[5 p.m.] by the present proposed route as soon as the financial state of the country can afford it. In respect to the railway policy of the Government, it must be remembered that we supported it on the condition that it would not interfere with the construction of railways into places already settled and localities likely to be settled in the near future. Nominally, I represent the Cambooya electorate, still I have an interest in the whole State. (Hear, hear!) If one part of the State is backward it affects the whole; and if one part is doing well, it does good to the whole State. Those people who have borne the brunt of pioneering settlement and industry should not be neglected; and I trust that our producers will be afforded facilities for putting their produce on the markets of the world. And in that connection there is one thing that should not be forgotten, and that is the credit that is due to our freezing establishments. You can now get £8 or £9 for a beast that would not fetch £2 10s. before the freezing works were established; and it is the same with sheep, fowls, and pigs. They all go to the home market in as fresh a condition as when they leave Pinkenba. Still people cry out about the capitalists! What would we do without them? And there are 2,000 men advised to remain idle in order to get more out of the capitalist who is engaged in sugar-growing. I remember the time when the sugar industry was a burden, and hundreds of thousands of pounds were lost by people engaged in the industry. When I was in the North in 1884 to 1886, and again in 1889 to 1890, you could have got a plantation for a song. The kanakas, whom the growers required to carry on the industry, were taken from them, because the Premier of the day came to the conclusion that the kanakas must be sent out of the country. With reference to the erection of more sugar-mills, I think it would be a wrong thing to do anything of the kind until the Government get a guarantee that these strikes and turmoil will be put a stop to. I believe there are £7,000,000 or £8,000,000 invested in the industry by private enterprise and the Government, and I cannot understand why more mills should be erected under present conditions. We are paying 25 per cent. more for our sugar than we were years ago. The industry is protected to the extent of £6 a ton; and I would not be sorry to see the duty taken off, because sugar is a necessary article of consumption, and the sooner we can get it at a fair value the better. The industry has been spoonfed and nursed for fifty years; but we get no protection for the produce we grow on the Downs, and I see no reason why sugar should be protected. We are often told that the mining industry is being neglected; but if a mining company starts to make a few thousand pounds, there is a cry that it should be taken from them by increasing the miners' wages. I would do the same with mining as with sugar—let those engaged in the work club together and share the whole of the profit or the loss. Another matter of great importance is the prickly pear. I remember advocating many years ago that the Government should compel

Mr. Mackintosh.]

everyone to eradicate the pear on his own land; and it is a pity that was not done—it would have been easier then. It is a pest that must be taken in hand, and the sooner the better. I do not say it can be destroyed immediately where it is very thick, but the spread of pear ought to be arrested as much as possible. I have practically no pear myself, but I have been making experiments for some time, and have tried all sorts of specifics. I recollect visiting the State farm at Westbrook, when Mr. McLean was agricultural adviser, and a specific was being tried. The pear was knocked down and sprayed with a solution; and it is worse there now than ever. I have also seen what has been done at Chinchilla—under Government supervision, I believe—where an ex-member of Parliament was cook. They had a trolley with a 400-gallon tank on it, with a hose on each side spraying. No good whatever was done; it was only spreading the pest. After working three months, there was pear growing where no pear grew before; and I don't know how many hundred pounds the experiment cost. Since then I got a specific which I believe is very effective. If you get a stool of prickly pear with thirty or forty leaves, and make an incision with a knife, and put in a small quantity of the specific, in three weeks' time it will all be in pulp right to the roots. I tried it on a patch only 6 feet through, and I got a letter from my son saying it is all in pulp.

Mr. MULLAN: What did it cost?

Mr. MACKINTOSH: The cost is small; and I advise the Government to secure the right to manufacture it, in order that it may be obtained more cheaply than if it gets into the hands of a capitalistic company. A board of professional men has been appointed to inquire into the prickly-pear pest, and I hope the gentlemen constituting that board will be successful; but I would like them to have two practical men with them. I have no doubt that one of them will be able to report as to the position the pear occupies in the vegetable kingdom, another that a most useful liquor can be distilled from the fruit, and another that the leaves, if pulverised and mixed with some ingredient, will make splendid fodder for stock. I will give an experience of my own in connection with these professional men. I took a sample of water to be tested as to what it was good for; and I may say it was something like brine. I got a description in Latin, which I got translated; and it was to this effect: First, it was clear. Anyone with eyes could see it was clear. Secondly, it was brackish. Anyone with his sense of taste could tell it was salt. Thirdly, it had the smell of rotten eggs. If you had a nose, you could come to no other conclusion. (Laughter.) The last thing he said was that it was unfit for domestic use. "Good heavens!" I said, "do you expect anyone to make tea out of brine? How is it for stock?" I was told that I was in a better position to find that out. "Do you mean to say," I said, "that if it killed stock it would be injurious to them?" He replied "Yes." "And," I asked, "if they thrived on it it would be beneficial for stock?" "Yes," he answered. I thought it was not much use paying a man like him a high salary and travelling expenses to give an opinion like that. If the members of the prickly-pear commission are going to act like that, what will be the good of them? A man who holds a high position in the city expressed his regret to me that there were not one or two practical men on the commission,

[Mr. Mackintosh.

for, he said, if they are going to apply a remedy to deal with the pest and exterminate it, they must have a practical man who knows how to apply the remedy and who can tell what it will cost. I trust that the Government will consider this matter, and that if they secure the remedy they will see that it is worked as cheaply as possible, as that will help those who require it, and will be a benefit to the State at large. Something has been said about the Agricultural Bank and the difficulty applicants have in getting money from the bank, and so forth. We have been told that Western Australia, with a very much smaller population, lends more money through her Agricultural Bank than we do in Queensland. I think that fact speaks volumes for Queensland, as it shows that the people here have less need for loans from the Agricultural Bank. The less money that people on the land borrow, the sooner they will get over their difficulties. However, the fact that Queensland, with five times the population of Western Australia, advances only about one-fifth of the money advanced by the Agricultural Bank in Western Australia speaks volumes for this State. If the present Act is going to be amended, I hope that it will be amended in a way which will benefit the settler. As far as I can see, they do not get much benefit from the bank at the present time. It has been said that applicants have to wait a long time before they can get the money they require. Well, it must be remembered that an inspector must inspect the property of an applicant before the trustees can grant an advance. At one time the money advanced was paid upon vouchers that certain work had been done, but now I believe the applicant gets full control of the money, provided the property offered as security is sufficient to cover the advance. Referring again to the prickly-pear pest, I notice that crows are blamed for distributing the seed of the plant to a large extent, and it is suggested that steps should be taken to destroy them. But it must be remembered that the crow is one of the best friends the sugar farmer has in the North, as it destroys the beetle and many insects which are injurious to the cane. Therefore, it might be unwise to exterminate the crow, though he is a very obnoxious bird. As soon as a lamb is born he takes the eyes out of it, when a sheep goes down he takes the eyes out of it, and when a hen lays an egg he is there to take the egg. I once laid a trap to catch a crow, and put an egg in the trap. After a while I heard a great rattle and thought I had got the crow, but when I went out to see what was the matter, I found that the hen had got into the trap and that the crow had flown off with the egg. (Laughter.) There are many irritating taxes which the farmer has to pay, and which I think should be abolished. The farmers on the Darling Downs have to pay a tax for the destruction of marsupials, though there may be no kangaroos in their district. They have also to pay a rabbit tax and a cow tax. I am sorry that the Government have given no intimation that they intend to do away with these irritating imposts. A person who keeps a cow in order to supply milk to his children has to pay the obnoxious cow tax. I really cannot understand why the Minister who was responsible for that tax introduced it.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: You supported it.

Mr. MACKINTOSH: I support this Government because I believe that the Premier and the Treasurer are both very

straightforward men, and because I believe in their general policy. With regard to the Bills mentioned in the Opening Speech, I am not going to discuss them now, because I do not know what their provisions are.

Mr. ALLEN: Haven't you been to the caucus?

Mr. MACKINTOSH: Oh, that is a secret. In any case, I hope that when the measures come before us we shall use our own discretion in dealing with them, and that we shall deal with them honestly. The Elections Act Amendment Bill is one that I should like to say a few words about. What alterations are going to be made in the electoral law I do not know, but I have property in different electorates, and I do not see any reason why those properties should not be represented in Parliament. I hope that in the new Bill the obnoxious principle of one man one vote will be done away with.

Mr. MURPHY: Why, you voted for it in 1904.

Mr. MACKINTOSH: It's only a fool who never changes his mind, and I say now that I see no reason why that principle should be retained in our law. With regard to the Bill to amend the State Education Act, I am sure that if a proper amendment is proposed by that measure the whole of the members of the Opposition will support it. I was opposed to the Bible in State Schools Bill, and I now find that it is not the Bible that is taught in State schools, but only fragments taken here and there from the Book—fragments which will lead children astray. If we are going to have Bible-teaching in State schools, let the children have the Bible, and do not give them fragments of it. Of course, if the majority of members are in favour of Bible-teaching in State schools, those who do not believe in it have to submit. If, however, the proposed measure will do away with Bible-teaching in our primary schools, I will support it. I believe that the rising generation should be taught the Christian religion, because in countries where that religion is taught and practised the people prosper; but you cannot teach the Christian religion by the reading of the fragments of the Bible contained in our present school books. If that Bill is of a character which I approve I shall—

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Strenuously oppose it.

Mr. MACKINTOSH: I shall oppose it if it does not go in the right direction, but if it meets with my approval I shall support it.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Would you support State aid to denominational schools?

Mr. MACKINTOSH: I would support State aid to denominational schools if the education given in our State schools is not such as all denominations can take advantage of. With regard to the erection of more sugar-mills by the Government, I think they should be very careful about investing more money in sugar-mills, unless they have some assurance that such strikes as the one which is now in progress are not likely to take place, and they have a guarantee from the acting leader of the Opposition that members on that side will do all they can to keep down these things as much as possible. Members of the Labour party have talked about an eight-hour day on farms, and having three shifts to do the work. How is that possible? Where is the money to come from to pay for work done in that way? Members opposite want to control the farmers, and

they say that children should not be allowed to be employed at milking until they have reached the age of fourteen or fifteen years. If children are to be kept from doing any work until they are that age, it would be better for the parents if they had never seen them. Is there any man who has come into prominence that has not had to work at nine or ten years of age? I know that I had to do so, and my sons, who got grammar school scholarships, and my daughters, who have received a high education, were all good at milking cows. I have seen

two of my boys, one on each side [5.30 p.m.] of a cow, milking away and vying with each other before they went to school, to see who would get the most milk. (Hear, hear!) If some of the parents of the children who are now asking for all these conditions in farms to-day were to have asked for the same conditions themselves in the past, then there would be no dairying industry to-day, as it would not pay. It is impossible for the farmers to have the same conditions as exist in cities, as the farmer does not get a sufficient price for his produce to enable him to do so. My friends opposite say that the conditions on the farms are bad, but they do not know what they are talking about. Let them come to my farm at any time, and they will see six or seven stalwart men there as strong or stronger than I am. And the men you see going about demanding eight hours a day and all that sort of thing are little puny things like mushrooms. (Laughter.) I trust that the Premier will go on with the vigorous policy that he has announced, and if he does so he will get my undivided support. (Hear, hear!) I am sorry that the late Premier did not stick to his guns, but the present Premier will get all the support I can give him, as I have every confidence that the present Premier will carry out the late Premier's work.

Mr. MURPHY: He is more courteous than the late Premier.

Mr. MACKINTOSH: I may say that I am sorry that I ever came to this House at all, but now that I am here I intend to stay here. (Laughter.) At one time I thought the prosperity of the country would not go on unless I was here. (Laughter.) I thought I would be able to convince the people that so long as I was here the country would go on and prosper. But I made a great mistake. (Laughter.) Let some of those who are talking about bad conditions go and cut down some of the Northern sugar land scrub as we had to do in the old days on the Darling Downs, and succeeded in making prosperous homes for our families. All the lower classes want to be in the middle class. There will never be any socialism in the British-speaking race, because all the lower class want to be in the middle class. Every man should be made to make a start for himself, and, if his food is meagre at first, he will be satisfied because he will make a happy home for his wife and children. That is where the Labour party make a mistake in giving bad advice to the men on strike. I must congratulate the Minister for Railways on the increases that are given to the lower-paid men in the railway service. The hon. member for Aubigny forestalled me in asking what was going to be done in the matter of reducing the freights for the benefit of the farmers. There is nothing done to help the farmers on the Darling Downs at all.

Mr. MORGAN: What about the railways?

*Mr. Mackintosh.* ]

Mr. MACKINTOSH: The railways are not constructed for the benefit of the farmers but for the benefit of the city. We are producing at a great sacrifice, and we should be given every opportunity of sending our products to the market. I have spoken about the necessity for the Mount Russell Railway, and there are other railways that are wanted, not in one electorate but all over the State. I paid a visit to the Northern portion of the State with the Home Secretary, and it was a very great treat indeed. I was up there several years ago, and I am sure that we want railways to develop our territory. We want a railway from Mount Russell to Cecil Plains towards Dunmore, and it can be further extended to open up thousands of acres of very good country. Then there is another branch line wanted from Cambooya to Ellangowan and Leyburn; also an extension of the Millmerran line in the direction of St. George, opening up a large area of Crown lands fit for dairying and pastoral. It would go right into the prickly-pear country, and it would enable something to be done to get rid of this pest. The only way to get rid of it is by close settlement, and if you do not get the land taken up now it will be useless in a very short time. There is also magnificent timber in that country, and any amount of ballast can be got there. The Minister for Railways was up there, and there are two or three deputations coming down here next week to wait on him. There is a deputation of 300 coming down during Exhibition week if the Minister can provide sufficient room to receive them.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: We will take the Exhibition building.

Mr. MACKINTOSH: The measures that are to be gone through should be passed now and not kept till the end of the session and then rushed through. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that for many a day after I am gone you will still be there. I am sure you will fill the Chair with as much dignity as anyone who ever occupied the Chair before, and you will fill it with credit to Parliament and the country and honourably to yourself. (Hear, hear!)

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN (*Burrum*): I think that the programme which the Government have laid before us at the present time is one of which any Government might very well be proud. If the measures foreshadowed in the Governor's Speech become law, then I am quite sure of one thing, and that is that it will do a great deal for the social and material advancement of this great State. I listened very carefully to the Premier when he was speaking on the Address in Reply the other night, and I was particularly interested in what he said with regard to the Sugar Commission. I am sure that anyone interested in sugar, or who has had anything to do with it, must recognise that that commission carried out their duties in a very able fashion indeed. The personnel of the commission I do not think could have been improved upon, and, if their recommendations are carried out, it will have a very beneficial effect on one of the most important industries that we have in Queensland at the present time. I was equally interested in noticing from the Governor's Speech that it is proposed to establish some additional sugar-mills. Those of us who look upon Queensland as a place that must be defended, must recognise this: that there is no better outlet for labour on our south-eastern coastline than in sugar-growing. We must also recognise that dur-

[*Mr. Mackintosh.*

ing last year the total output of sugar in Australia amounted to 204,000 tons, while during the same period we imported some 24,475 tons of sugar grown by black labour, and we must further recognise that with a vigorous immigration policy and the increased consumption that must necessarily ensue, it must be apparent to all of us that there is here a very good opportunity for the development of one of our most important industries. I do hope that this trouble that is taking place at the present time will not have the effect of influencing, injudiciously or prejudicially, the intentions of the Government in that regard, because I feel sure that those coastal lands, which are so well situated within what we call the wet belt, with the soil good and the climate, all that could be asked for, is certain to do much to add to the material prosperity of the State, and also to make it very popular in countries overseas. Much has been said during this debate on the question of sugar. It has taken one of the most prominent places in it, and anyone listening to the remarks of hon. members on the other side of the Chamber would be inclined to look on the sugar-planter as some most horrible creature endeavouring by every means to squeeze the last drop of blood out of his workmen.

Mr. MAUGHAN: That is incorrect.

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: Let me disabuse your minds of any such thing. So far as the sugar-planter is concerned there is no more liberal employer in the whole State. I can assure you further that I have known instances where, instead of being at all unkind to their employees, I have known the farmers to go without meat on their tables, and without the necessaries of life, so that the workmen might have their full rations. I am not speaking without the book, but I am speaking of something which has come within the scope of my own observations. What are these fabulous sums of money that the sugar-planters are making at the present time? I have in my hand a letter that was sent to me by a sugar-grower just previous to the visit of Mr. Tudor to the Bundaberg district. I need not mention the name, but I will be pleased to give it to any hon. member who asks for it afterwards, and if any hon. member disputes this man's figures he can have access to his farming accounts. Nothing can be fairer than that. He says in his letter—

"I am submitting the following figures in the hope they will throw some light on the sugar industry, and assist to secure a satisfactory solution of the present trouble. To quote a concrete case, I would like, in the first instance, to take my own farm of 90 acres. On this farm last year I cut 60 acres, from which I got 1,108 tons cane. This is slightly below the average for the district, and I was paid £1,043, including bounty. Out of this I had to pay £550 7s. 8d. for wages. Other expenses, including horsefeed and haulage, amounted to £242 14s. 2d. No allowance for renewal of plant is included in this sum. You will therefore perceive that this leaves me a balance of about £250.

"This property and plant are worth £4,000; in fact, I refused this sum for it a few weeks ago, so that if we take the interest on the capital outlay at 5 per cent, which is very low, considering the risks of drought, frosts, grubs, and other troubles, it leaves about £50 for my personal exertion and renewal of plant. Besides this, I am expected to contribute to the hospital, churches, shows, etc., etc., which the working man seldom subscribes to. I might

point out that this is a particularly easy farm to work, being level, and has the tramline right through, which does not apply to a good many farms.

“Mr. Tudor pointed out that he did not consider £1 10s. a week for eight hours per day any too much as a minimum wage. That means £2 2s. a week for the slowest man in the field. A good average man is worth 1s. a day more than the slowest man, so we may say his wages will be £2 8s. per week, or 8s. a day of eight hours. In Java the labourer is paid about 6d. per day for twelve hours. That means for every man we employ they can employ twenty-four. Under these circumstances it seems to me £6 per ton protection is too low. When talking of the difference in freight, Mr. Tudor said it was the shipping combine that stood in the way; but it must be remembered that ships coming from Java are loaded and manned by cheap labour, while our own shipping have, I believe, to pay the highest rate in the world.

“In the United States of America they have the best of coloured labour in Honolulu—to wit, Japanese—who get about a dollar a day; and in the Southern States, where they have negro labourers who have been born and bred in the sugar industry, they yet find it necessary to impose a duty of £9 per ton to keep out the Java sugar that is at our very door, and has to go across the Pacific before it can reach their ports.”

That, I think, places very concisely before you how the sugar-growers stand, and, if I may be permitted for one single moment to say in connection with these matters, which occupy such a very great portion of our time and thought at the present moment, the chief danger, and the chief penalty that is being paid is by the sugar-grower. He is the man who is suffering at the present time. This very man whom I point out, at the present time, is making a bare wage at the business. The worst of dealing with sugar is this: That we seem to come up against people who are entirely ignorant of the facts surrounding the industry. It was only the other day I read in the *Bundaberg Daily News*—it is not a Labour paper, but it is a paper with Labour sympathies—a telegram of what Mr. Hughes, the Acting Prime Minister, said. It reads—

“I, for one, and I do not, I am sure, only express my own opinions, will not have the slightest hesitation in repealing the duty at the first possible occasion. The men are only asking for a living wage. It is scandalous that we have to pay £579,000 bounty and £6 duty per ton, and yet the men cannot get a wage upon which they can live.”

Could anything be more preposterous than a statement of that kind? Does anybody, who understands anything about the tariff proposals of the Federal Government, think for one second that they are giving us on the one hand, a protection of £6 a ton, and on the other hand, a bounty of £579,000? The situation is this: They give an import duty of £6 a ton on sugar; that is to say, sugar coming into the Commonwealth is subject to a duty of £6 a ton. But the manufacturer of sugar in Queensland, or any other State in Australia, has to pay an excise duty of £4 a ton on every ton of sugar that he manufactures. From that £4, which the Commonwealth Government receive from the manufacturer, they return, by way of bounty, £3 a ton.

Mr. ADAMSON: Who pays the excise?

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: The manufacturer pays the excise.

Mr. ADAMSON: The consumer pays the excise.

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: Will the hon. member tell me this: What is the effective duty on sugar in Queensland at the present time?

Mr. THEODORE: I do not know.

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: I know perfectly well, if you do not know. It is simply this, and that is the thing we have to fight against—it is not so much what we are fighting for—it would be perfectly simple if we were fighting men who understand the business, but they do not understand the business. Surely it must be as plain as daylight to anyone if, in the first instance, they put on a tariff of £6 a ton on sugar coming into the Commonwealth. But they go further and they say, “Seeing we are giving you £6 a ton protection, we ask you, the manufacturers, to hand us back £4 of that,” and from that £4 they pay back £3 to the grower.

Mr. THEODORE: The manufacturers pass it on.

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: That is the situation in a nutshell, and yet we have the Acting Prime Minister of the Commonwealth making an official statement that he was taking this step merely because the sugar-grower and sugar manufacturer not only had a protective duty of £6 a ton, but that he had also received during last year a bonus or bounty of £579,000. It is preposterous, and that is the danger and difficulty we have to contend with. Nothing is harder than to argue with a man on a subject with which he is not conversant; but surely it says very little for the Federal Acting Prime Minister that he did not take the trouble to make himself acquainted with the facts of the case before making a statement of that kind. Another statement has also been made by Mr. Hughes—that he would abolish the tariff. Evidently he got into what youngsters call “a pet,” and he said he would do away with the duty altogether—he would wipe it out. As far as one can find out the action that he threatened to take was directed against the Colonial Sugar Refining Company. If Mr. Hughes understood the matter, he should know perfectly well that nothing could be better for the Colonial Sugar Refining Company than taking away the duty altogether. They could then dump their Fijian and Java sugars here much cheaper than we can produce sugar here. Their troubles about the Queensland mills! They could take up their plants to-morrow and ship them over to Java. They could grow sugar there under labour conditions quite different to those existing in Queensland. I think they pay labourers 1s. a day and find themselves. They could grow their sugar there, bring it into the Commonwealth free of duty, and sell it much cheaper than anything we could produce here. So if Mr. Hughes was simply offering a threat to the Colonial Sugar Refining Company by wiping out the duty altogether, he was simply doing one of those things which no doubt would have been one of the most excellent proposals that could have taken place as far as the Colonial Sugar Refining Company was concerned.

Mr. MANN: They might sell it at the same price, too.

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: They need not reduce the price, and they could bring it in free of charge.

*Lieut.-Colonel Rankin.*]

Mr. LENNON: Mr. Hughes's action is calculated to bring the canegrowers to a sensible and true position of the state of affairs.

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: That may be so, but I do not read it in that way. There is another difficulty raised by Mr. Hughes in this connection, and that is this. He pointed out how much the people of Australia were suffering through this protection of £6 a ton. One would almost have thought by the way he spoke that it is some extraordinary protection we are getting.

Mr. ALLEN: So it is.

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: He says, "See how it is hanging up jam making; see how it is hanging up biscuit making, and a hundred and one things that require sugar to carry on." Why, anybody who looks at the figures for one single moment will see that such is not the case. The very State he was speaking in—Victoria—had a £6 duty before federation.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: Then how could it affect those industries in Victoria at the present time?

Mr. LENNON: New South Wales had a £3 duty, and he is a New South Wales member.

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: Under Sir George Reid's freetrade tariff it was £3 in New South Wales, but previously it was £6.

Mr. LENNON: No; £5.

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: And Queensland itself had a duty of £5 a ton. Tasmania had a duty of £6 a ton. So you see all this talk was so much utter bosh. There is nothing in it. The people are not being touched to anything like the extent Mr. Hughes would like to make out. So far as the abolition of the duty is concerned, if he thinks he is going to do an injury to the Colonial Sugar Refining Company by taking that line of action, he never made a more fatal mistake in his life.

Mr. THEODORE: You are apologising for the Colonial Sugar Refining Company.

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: No, I am not apologising for the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, but I do feel somewhat inclined, when I meet people in the street, to apologise for some members of this House for the statements sometimes made.

GOVERNMENT laughter, and interjections by OPPOSITION MEMBERS.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: Going further, you will find, although it has been pointed out there is a £6 duty, which, I dare say is high, as a matter of fact, if you take it in conjunction with the tariff on other articles, it is not particularly high. But look at other countries and see what they are doing. Look at America at the present time—where, mind you, competition is much less than it is in Australia. They have to shut their ports against the Java and Fijian sugars, which is much nearer to our shores than to the American ports, and they impose a duty of £9 a ton. Surely, then, we cannot for one single moment take the present duty as being in any way prohibitive or a high one. One word with regard to immigration. It is, I think, distinctly gratifying to those of us who have read the Governor's Speech, and to

[Lieut.-Colonel Rankin.

those of us who listened to the Premier the other night, to learn that the number of people coming to our State is steadily increasing. I notice that the number last year was 6,923. Although that is one-third of the total people who arrived in Australia, I submit it is but a paltry number, so to speak, when you consider the immense vacant spaces that we have to fill up. I look with favour on the energetic action being taken by the present Government to secure a larger number of people coming here. I am especially delighted to see the very big amount of energy in connection with advertising our State. This, I think, is the age of advertising, and I do not believe that at any time in the history of this State has Queensland been advertised as well as it is just now. I have received several letters quite recently from home, and they all mention that whereas Queensland was practically an unknown quantity before people were now speaking about it, and thinking about it, which, I think, is one of the best things that could happen so far as getting people to come out here is concerned. Our friends opposite are, to some extent, antagonistic to immigration, but I would point out that not only does it mean development of the country, but even if you look at it from a purely business point of view—looking over the figures I perceive that the 6,900 people who came out last year cost us some £80,000, practically £12 a head. Well, if you remember that every person who comes to Queensland is worth £1 5s. a head per annum to us, I think it is perfectly good business. I do not think that even now, with all the energy that has been put into this question and with all the work that has been undertaken by the Government to bring settlers to these shores, that we are securing anything like the number of people we ought to have brought here, and I sincerely hope that that energy which has characterised the actions of the Government in the past will long continue. I was pleased to hear the Premier refer to the question of ports as one of great urgency. If we are to become

[7 p.m.] anything in the nature of a nation, it is essential that we should be able to foster oversea markets, and that can only be brought about by giving the best facilities for transport to those markets. If we are to take advantage of the benefits with which nature has endowed us, we should have in every district the means of transport to markets; and, speaking for my own district, I have long advocated a deep-water port there. I had the pleasure a few weeks ago of taking the Treasurer over the ground where we propose to establish that port; and I think he was sufficiently convinced to admit that everything being equal, and reports being favourable, the site was in the best position for the purpose. I think there are three things necessary in connection with what I am advocating. First, it is necessary that the port should be suitable; secondly, that there should be products to ship from the port; and, thirdly, that there should be a market for those products. First as to the question of the port. I received a short time ago from the Treasurer a copy of Mr. Cullen's report on the proposed Urangan harbour; and, taking a few extracts from it, I find Mr. Cullen says—

"From a critical examination of the charts, and from some personal knowledge of the coastline there, I am of opinion that Urangan Point is the only locality possessing claims worthy



of consideration as a deep-water port; moreover, it could be connected with the railway system of the district without prohibitive cost."

Further on he says—

"To get to Urangan from the sea there are two bars to cross. The outer one, 8 miles from the jetty site, consists of fine ocean sand, and has a depth of 19 feet at low-water springs; the inner one is about 1 mile from the site, and consists of soft material overlying hard clay. It has a depth of 18 feet at low-water springs. Access from sea for larger vessels is therefore limited to the high-water period, when vessels drawing 24 to 25 feet of water could enter.

"At the site selected there is a depth of 26 to 28 feet on the outside berth, and 24 to 25 feet on the inside berth at low-water springs, with ample room to turn, and good holding ground for anchoring. It is, so far as the strata are concerned, favourable from a construction point of view.

"The site being exposed to the north, and the off-lying banks having at high water a depth of about 15 feet, over them, some sea could, on the very unusual occurrence of a northerly gale, be experienced at a jetty there, but not enough in my opinion to do more than possibly delay any shipping operations until, say, half ebb.

"Any accommodation for oversea shipping should be able to receive the B.I.S.N. Company's contract steamers, and in the site selected there would be berths of 24 feet and 27 feet at low-water springs, which would be ample for any conceivable requirements."

That is the report of our chief expert in matters of that kind in Queensland; and I think it clearly goes to show that the first point has been established. It would be impossible to get better evidence. He refers to two bars, the one outside consisting of a sort of ocean sand, and the inside one of a soft clay, both of which can be easily dredged to 24 feet or 25 feet. At present they are 18 feet at low-water springs, and the Maryborough Harbour Board have at their disposal, I think, £14,000, which would do far more than dredge those two bars, and give a free run with 24 or 25 feet of water to the jetty. Within the last few weeks the people of Maryborough have subscribed amongst themselves sufficient cargo to make it possible for the British-India Steam Navigation Company's boats to call; but they simply lie outside the White Cliffs, and cargo has to be lightered up the river; but the establishment of this port would enable them to berth alongside the wharf, and goods could be taken by rail to Maryborough, Bundaberg, Gympie, or elsewhere. The point is, I think, hardly worth labouring further. I think it must be conceivable to members generally that so far as the port is concerned we have nothing to fear. Some time ago when the Treasurer was there Captain Boulton was referred to, and he said he knew Newcastle in the early days, and our port was a great advance on what Newcastle was then. Consequently, as far as the port itself is concerned, it does not need any further championship on my part. The chief point of importance is the question of the quantity of produce likely to be shipped from Urangan; and first of all we come to that most important factor—namely, coal. I will give the figures for 1909, because the figures for 1910 are not yet available. In that year we find that Queensland imported from New South Wales 55,362 tons as against 54,804 tons in 1908, besides importing 55,539 tons of coke. There is not only the question of the coal

imported, but with the establishment of a port we should be able to develop many other industries which are languishing for want of an outlet. It may be asked, and rightly so, whether the coal is available in the event of the port being established. Let me briefly give you a short history of the coal trade there. In 1833 the output of the State was 104,000 tons, and of this the Burrum produced 8,000 tons, and Ipswich 96,000 tons. In 1909 the output of the State was 756,577 tons; and of this the Burrum produced 92,573 tons, and Ipswich and other places 664,000 tons. So that while in 1833 the output from the Burrum was 8.1 per cent. of Ipswich and 6.1 per cent. of the State, in 1909 it had risen to 14.4 per cent. of Ipswich and 12.2 per cent. of the State. I think that is sufficient to show that we have here an industry that is capable of very great expansion, given the necessary facilities. At the present time we are depending on purely a local trade. With 12 feet of water in the Mary River, and 9 feet in the Burnett, it is impossible that anything in the nature of an oversea trade can be developed. In these days of cheap freights it is essential that we should be able to carry large cargoes in one bottom; and that is why Newcastle, with greater facilities than we have, can export 55,000 tons a year to our Northern ports.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Where does that coal go to?

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: Chiefly to Townsville and Charters Towers. Questions have been asked as to the quality of the coal; and it has been stated that the quality is not of the best. Let me once and for all set down any argument of that nature. In a calorimeter test made by the Government some time ago the Burrum coal gave an evaporating efficiency of 8.508 as against West Moreton 8.377, Darling Downs 7.866, New South Wales (Northern district) 8.122, and New South Wales (Southern district) 8.143. In the whole of Australia the Burrum coal came first in that test. Compared with other coals they found Welsh coal 8.64, Newcastle (England) 8.523, Lancashire 8.109, Scotch 8.160; while in the mechanical energy evolved in a test of thirteen different cases, including two from New South Wales—namely, Duckenfield and South Bulli—the Burrum coal came easily the highest.

Mr. MAUGHAN: What are you quoting from?

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: This is from a report by Mr. Fryar on the coal resources of Queensland. I think I have shown as far as the port is concerned that the possibilities are assured; I think I have also conclusively shown that the coal industry of the Burrum is an increasing one; and I feel sure that, given the facilities which other ports enjoy, we shall be able to prevent any coal coming in from Southern States. There is, of course, the question of cost to be considered—a very vital thing indeed; and perhaps we can best gather information on that point by looking back to what has been already accomplished. Taking the proposition in detail, I find that there are 4½ miles of railway to build—that is, from Pialba to Urangan—and that the cost may be put down at £10,000. There is a jetty, which Mr. Cullen estimates will cost £44,000. That makes the outlay roughly £54,000. If we take the interest at 3 per cent., the

*Lieut.-Colonel Rankin.*]



amount required of that sum is £1,630. If we take the running charges on the same basis as that of the present Pialba line—namely, £800—we find that it comes to £2,400—that is, the interest and working expenses in connection with the railway. I may further point out that the revenue from 30,000 tons of coal for 20 miles—from Colton Junction to Urangan—taking it at 1s. 8d. per ton, will amount to £2,500. I take the quantity at 30,000 tons, notwithstanding the fact that we are importing at the present time 55,000 tons of coal and coke. When the Pialba line was brought forward some fifteen years ago it was pooh-poohed as being a railway which would be absolutely a dead letter. The length of that railway is 16 miles; it cost £52,000 to build; the revenue from it in 1909 was £5,564, and the expenditure £3,525, leaving a net profit of £2,039, equal to £5 18s. 4d. per cent. That is what has been done by a line in that district which was pooh-poohed when it was proposed.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Pooh-poohed by whom?

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: By this House. The balance paid back to the guarantors, as far as my recollection goes, was £1,200. So that, if we make our calculations on the basis of the earnings of the Pialba line, we see that the expenditure is so small and the possibilities of revenue so big, that we can feel perfectly sure that it will be a paying proposition from the start. But we have not only coal in that district. I have spoken of coal first because it will necessarily be the largest product for some considerable time. But sugar is also produced in that district.

Mr. CORSER: 18,000 tons per annum.

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: It was more than that last year. The output of sugar for the district last year was 25,341 tons. All that sugar at the present time is conveyed to market by rail, at what I believe is hardly a payable rate, even to the Railway Department. However, that is by the way. I feel sure that if we are given the shipping facilities that I advocate, the whole of those 25,000 tons of sugar will find its way over the wharves and be shipped from Urangan. Turning now to the dairy products of the district, I find that last year the output of butter was 683 tons, valued at £72,727. About 236 tons of that quantity were shipped to London, and the most of it came to Brisbane by rail. Those are but a few of the products of the district that might be mentioned. We have also a fair output of fruit. Last year 50,000 cases of oranges were sent away from the district, and most of that fruit went to Melbourne. If we could ship direct to Melbourne, the fruit could be carried in freezing chambers, and it would reach its destination in good condition. At present it is shipped from Brisbane, and—

Mr. MAUGHAN: Nobody disputes that it is a fine district.

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: I am glad to hear the hon. member say so.

Mr. MAUGHAN: You are talking as if we all disputed it.

LIEUT.-COLONEL RANKIN: No; not for a single moment. I am merely trying to impress upon members the necessity of giving us the port I have mentioned for that district. At present we have no port from Brisbane on the south to Port Alma on the north. There is Gladstone certainly, but

[Lieut.-Colonel Rankin.]

hon. members know as well as I do what good Gladstone is to the district. The land carriage to Gladstone would be more than the whole of the produce is worth. I submit that if we look along the whole coast we can only endorse what Mr. Cullen has said in his report—that from his personal knowledge of the coast line, and from his knowledge of the chart, there is no better place for a port for that district than Urangan. I have so far dealt with the export of coal and other produce, but we must remember that there are other industries in the district. For instance, there is the foundry, there are sawmills, and the other secondary industries that we have at Maryborough and its neighbourhood, all of which will provide traffic—far more traffic than is required to pay interest and working expenses. I hope, then, that this proposal is now near its fulfilment, and that we shall soon realise the establishment of a port for the district of Wide Bay, as that is the best thing that can be done for the district. With the establishment of a port and the building of a railway to that port, there is no reason why we should not have a meatworks and other industries established in the district. I read the other day an article in which the writer spoke of the advisability of our going in for the manufacture of iron. Well, we have coal there, and there is iron ore and lime in the neighbourhood. So far as markets are concerned, I have shown that we must raise 55,000 tons more coal than we are raising at the present time in order to meet our own consumption, and there is no reason in the world why we should not be able to send coal abroad. There is no reason why the Philippines should not be supplied from here, and there is no reason why some South American ports should not take some of our coal. We have sent coal there in small vessels; but, given larger bottoms, capable of carrying more cargo, I am sure that an oversea trade of considerable dimensions could easily be established. I wish now to say a few words on land settlement. At the present time there is in course of construction a railway from Cordalba to Dallarnil. One thing that has struck me in connection with that line is that the Government should throw open the adjacent lands as early as possible, so that when the line is open there will be traffic to run over it. At present most of that land is locked up, and I would recommend the Minister for Lands to take steps to throw it open as early as possible, and so enable people to settle on it and raise produce to carry over the line when the railway is opened for traffic. I only mention this in passing, in the hope that the mention of it may have the desired effect. In conclusion, I desire, in common with other members, to express my sense of deep sorrow and regret at the death of our late respected Speaker, Mr. Bell. Mr. Bell was one of Queensland's brightest sons. Whatever he took up he did very well. He seemed to have taken for his maxim the word "thorough," and he was thorough in everything. We all learnt to esteem his qualities, and during my sojourn in this House I have always found him an excellent friend, to whom one could go if one wanted advice. I am sure that we all feel his loss very deeply, and that our esteem for him is expressed in that best of all words, "He was a man." At the same time, I congratulate you, Sir, upon your elevation to the Speakership. I am quite sure that when you leave the chair you will have done credit to the

position and to yourself. We hope that you will long occupy that distinguished office, believing that when you leave it you will leave behind you the reputation of having filled it according to the best traditions of the position.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ADAMSON (*Rockhampton*): I should just like to offer a few words of criticism, and perhaps some words of commendation, in regard to the matters dealt with in the Governor's Speech. With regard to the first paragraph, I think we all rejoice to know that the throne of the Empire has been filled by a constitutional monarch, who we expect will seek to govern in every way for the highest welfare of the people of the Empire. Personally, I regret that the late King Edward—"Edward, the Peacemaker," as we called him—died at the time he did. (Hear, hear!) However, in the language of the time, I say, "The king is dead, long live the king." There is a sentence in the opening of the second paragraph which I think everyone feels is a fitting expression concerning the disaster which took place on the Queensland coast. There is one particular clause in that paragraph which I should like to read, because it affords me great satisfaction in view of certain things that have been said in some newspapers, and which have been emphasised by prominent men in the Government of Queensland. The clause I refer to reads as follows:—

"There seems to have been no foundation for the opinion at first expressed that the disaster was due to defects in the lighting of our coast."

I am glad that that sentence is incorporated in the Speech, because by that statement the stigma sought to be cast on the Federal Labour Government has been removed, and removed on the high authority of the Governor of this State. With the hon. member who has just sat down, and with other members who have spoken, I concur in what is said in the third paragraph of the Speech, and I do not think I can do better than read it again to the House. The Governor says—

"Since I last addressed you, death has deprived the Legislative Assembly of one of its most distinguished members, Mr. Speaker Bell, whose eloquence, culture, and charm made him a fascinating figure in our public life. Our regrets that his brilliant career had so early a close are mingled with deep sympathy for his bereaved family and grateful appreciation of his services to Queensland."

I believe that every man in this House—members on both sides of the House—will subscribe to that statement. Sometimes we came into conflict with the late Speaker, but I believe that we all feel that he sought to do his duty, and that he lived for the welfare of the State to which he belonged, and worked for her in the political sphere from that standpoint. Let me say just one other word along these lines. I wish

[7.30 p.m.] you, Mr. Speaker, in the position to which you have been called, the greatest possible good a man can wish—I wish you life. I hope you will not die during the recess. (Laughter.) I wish you health, and I wish you something else. I wish you that broadness of mind so that when you have completed your term as Speaker, I wish that it may be told concerning you that you have been a most impartial Speaker—one of the most impartial Speakers that has ever sat in the chair in this House. (Hear, hear!) I would also like to congratulate the mover

and seconder of the Address in Reply. I was struck with the business-like speech of the hon. member for Dalby, and also with the business-like speech of the hon. member for Enoggera. Of course, I am sorry that we did not defeat both the hon. member for Dalby and the hon. member for Enoggera. I would have liked to have seen the Labour party score a victory at each of those elections, but those gentlemen are here, and I congratulate them on their first appearance as speakers in this House. Another thing that has struck me while I have been here during the last few weeks, is the great change that has taken place in the tone of the debate in this Chamber. When I was here before we were constantly in crises, and constantly having recriminations and bickerings. I must say that, although I disagree very much with the leader of the Government, still his courteous bearing and urbane manner and that kind of thing, at any rate, tends to keep peace in this Chamber, and I hope that while he is in that position that conduct will always characterise him. Another thing I wish to mention is the Rockhampton election; and here I come right up against some of the opinions expressed by the Chief Secretary after that election was over. He said that the victory of the Labour party in Rockhampton was due to sectarianism, or to some "ism," but he never said what "ism." I want to say that, so far as I am concerned at any rate, I never heard anything about sectarianism during that fight. I had nothing to do with any "ism." I fought the battle on the Labour platform, and distinctly said so from time to time, and we won on the Labour platform, and I am in this House to stand for the policy enunciated by the Labour party.

LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ADAMSON: I want to say another word about another subject. There has been a great deal said during this debate concerning the appointments made to the Government, and concerning the appointments made of the men sitting on the front Government bench. I do not know why some of them were placed there, but I would not criticise them. I would give credit to them. Just as I give credit to one man in this House for not being an office-seeker, but who sits in his place for the welfare of Queensland, so I would give credit to these men who have been appointed to the Government of doing the same thing according to their lights and according to their belief. I hope that all men who come to this House will have the one aim, and one aim only, and that is the welfare of Queensland, and the promotion of the highest good and the truest welfare of her people. I was reading some time ago a book written by Professor Henry Jones, called "Idealism as a Practical Creed." The Premier, at the time our University was opened, said he hoped that the University would turn out men who would be better politicians and better business men because they had attended the University. I heard the representative from New South Wales reply to that, and he said that the aim of the University was not to make politicians, but to make men of character, and Professor Henry Jones says practically the same thing. This is what he says in the book that I referred to—

"There are men for whom the best things in life are not real, and we call them shrewd. They are the men who interpret the motives and actions of their fellows by their meanest aspects, and think thereby that they see

*Mr. Adamson.*]

beneath the show of things. The man of the world does not believe in goodness that seeks no reward. Devotion to the public good for its own sole sake, the simplicity of heart that does not care very much for power, or rank, or consideration, or wealth, is either false display or folly."

I hold that Professor Henry Jones is one of the brightest intellects in the Glasgow University, and he said the thing that wants to be felt in all the political life of Australia, and he dedicated those lectures of his—because they were delivered in Sydney—he dedicated them practically to the Australian people. I hold that that is the spirit in which men should engage in political life or in any other life so far as the State is concerned. (Hear, hear!) I have a word to say concerning my hon. friend, the hon. member for Fitzroy, Mr. Crawford. I was sorry to hear him make the statement he did in the House the other day. I am sorry that it has gone forth to the world that this party sent him out of the party on the ground of his vote for the religious instruction in State schools. I want to say that that is not true.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ADAMSON: And no one knows it better than the hon. member for Fitzroy himself. I told him that I was going to make these remarks so that he could be present and hear what I had to say. Whatever his Workers' Political Organisation did in that matter, the Labour party refused to deal with him on those lines. The only thing we dealt with was that he made certain statements, and said certain things concerning the Labour party in his speech at Mount Morgan. We gave him a chance to retract those statements, but he refused to do so, and we simply said that, "Having made those statements—that we were not free men, that we were manacled, and that we would be glad to break away from certain influences if we could—having made those statements he had lost the confidence of the party." That was all that was said.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Didn't you say that politics was a dirty game?

Mr. ADAMSON: Yes, I said that, and I am not going to withdraw it. But if there is a man in this House who should hold his tongue about that sort of thing, it is the member for Never Never—the hon. member for Woollongabba. He ought to be the last member in this House to talk about dirty things, because he has been called by members in this House a name that I will not use in the House to-night. The hon. member for Fitzroy has not treated this party generously or fairly. No man in this party need be a slave or need be manacled unless he has got the slavish spirit. I know I am not a slave. No one interferes with my freedom at all. I signed the Labour platform because I believe in it, and I am a free servant of the Labour party, and some day we will know what a free servant means a great deal better than we do to-day. I want to say in relation to this matter of slavery talked about our party—

"They are slaves who fear to speak  
For the fallen and the weak;  
They are slaves who will not choose  
Hatred, suffering, and abuse  
Rather than in silence shrink  
From the truths they needs must think;  
They are slaves who dare not be  
In the right with two or three."

This party has never enslaved me, and

[Mr. Adamson.]

no man and no party can enslave me. That is what I want to say in relation to Mr. Crawford's attitude to this party. There is another matter dealt with by members opposite, and by the public Press, and it is a matter that has been used to seek to injure the Federal Labour party and the State Labour party as well. Our loyalty has been questioned. Mr. Fisher has been traduced, and he has denied the whole thing, yet we do not hear any regrets about what has been said concerning him. Since what Mr. Stead said has got into *Hansard*, I think it is only right that Mr. Fisher's words should get into *Hansard* too. Here is what was in the *Brisbane Courier* of the 31st of July—

"Colombo, Saturday.

"The Right Hon. A. Fisher, Prime Minister of Australia, who arrived here this morning from England, showed considerable agitation on learning the sensation that had been caused by the report published in the *Review of Reviews* of his interview with Mr. W. T. Stead, which he described as a grotesque misrepresentation. He immediately cabled for a fuller report of the interview, and later cabled to Mr. Stead, stating that the report of the interview was grossly misleading. Mr. Fisher stated: "Mr. Stead and I had a brief and hurried interview one morning, and, in answer to questions, I repeated to him what I have stated hundreds of times in public speeches in Australia, and recently in the United Kingdom—namely, our objective is peace among the nations of the world, and a policy of effective defence and unity among the British nations. This can best be attained and maintained by trusting His Majesty's Governments in the United Kingdom and the Dominions as responsible Ministers of the family of nations. The interview is not mine, and is misleading in material points. The expression, "Haul down the flag," has never entered my mind. "Keep the flag flying" is my ambition, with all its best traditions. Nor have I harboured any idea that Australia should break away from the Empire, nor do I wish to escape the duty of defending its honour. No one who knows me will believe that I used these words, nor anything like them. I spent much time in advocating a wider organisation of the nations who desire peace and industrial progress for the welfare of their people, and no nation and no flag stands higher for this idea than our own. I had given Mr. Stead an interview of seven minutes, at the most, and have never seen a proof of the report, nor has my secretary. Such expressions would not be disloyalty, but insanity. They would be brutal and monstrous." Mr. Fisher stated that he had received a cable message reporting Mr. Hughes's statement on the interview, and he approved of it."

Mr. Fisher is a man I respect very much. He is a sincere, honest man, and in political life he strives for the best he knows. Thus does he deny a thing which was too readily taken up and used by the Press against him, and by members of this House as well. I want for a moment or two to see what patriotism means. There are a lot of people always talking about patriotism, and here is a quotation from one of the most eminent American writers on the subject—

"As he has well said: "The sentiment which expresses itself in the maxim, "My country, right or wrong," is spurious patriotism. It is nothing but self-love somewhat diluted. Note the logical gradations: My country, right or wrong; my State, right or wrong; my which expresses itself in the maxim, "My country, right or wrong," is spurious patriotism. my voting precinct, right or wrong; my family,

right or wrong; myself, right or wrong." Mr. James Russell Lowell very finely ridicules this idea of patriotism—

"The side of our country must oillers be took, An' President Polk, you know, he is our country;

An' the angel that writes all our sins in a book,

Puts the debit to him, an' to us the per country.

An' John P. Robinson he

Ses this is his view of the thing to a T."

There are a great number of people always willing to cry "My country, right or wrong," and the same writer strikingly describes true patriotism—

"To say that patriotism is love of country begs the question, for love of country must itself be explained. It cannot mean the love of a country's soil, of its trees and hills, and rocks and rills. If that were its meaning, a large proportion of the inhabitants of every nation would be without love of country, for most of them have none to love. Not a rood of old mother earth belongs to them, nor can they use any of it without paying toll to some more fortunate patriot. Love of country, to be truly such, must be nothing less than love of one's neighbours within a nation's boundaries.

"But love of neighbours means more than a sentimental affection for what one may call his own—as his wife, his family, his friends, his house, his horse, his cattle. Love of one's neighbours within the boundaries of his nation—love, that is, of one's countrymen—if it be love of them in very truth, must consist in devotion to those ideals and institutions of the country which guarantee equal rights to all its inhabitants."

"If that be patriotism, however, then is there a larger patriotism, a patriotism which embraces the world and is the political expression of the golden rule."

"In the purview of this larger patriotism it is treason to make war save for the preservation of natural rights. It is treason, as well as criminal aggression, to pursue a policy of forcible annexation. For he who truly loves his neighbours within his own country, who loves them to the extent of cherishing their rights equally with his own, cannot draw the line at his own country. He must abhor any invasion by his countrymen of the country of others which he would repel if his own were the country invaded. This, then, is the difference between true and spurious patriotism. Whereas the spurious patriot worships the flag of his country, and is loyal to her officials, right or wrong, the true patriot honours his country's flag as the symbol of her ideals, and regards her officials as servants who are entitled to loyalty and respect always when they are right, but never when they are wrong. The soldier may fight for his country, though the country be wrong, yet be a patriot."

This is what I want some hon. members to understand—

"But the free citizen who votes to put his country in the wrong, or keep it there, is a traitor."

Lowell expresses the highest and purest patriotism in the following lines:—

"I love my country so as only they

Who love a mother fit to die for may.

I love her old renown, her stainless fame;

What better proof than that I loathed her shame."

I say that some of the men who have been traducing Mr. Fisher, the Prime Minister of Australia, are not as loyal to those great ideals of the best traditions of the British flag and the British Empire as he. Why,

he has tried his best, and is trying now to bring about a league of English-speaking nations. He wants the English-speaking people to dominate the world in a peaceable way.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ADAMSON: That is what I say in relation to that matter. I think it was right to say it in defence of a man whom I respect so much as I do Mr. Fisher. I want to say a word or two about the land policy of the Government. There has been a wonderful lot said about the vast areas of land which have been settled during the past few years, but I want you to realise this: That our land settlement has not been as great as the land settlement in some other States of Australia—a very long way from it. Our land settlement has been very largely pastoral, and while I believe that the pastoral industry is one of the great industries of Australia, and ought to be conserved in every way, the pastoral industry does not tend to closer settlement, and does not tend to an increase of population, as agricultural settlement does. Here are some figures in proof of that. The land settlement in 1909 was 5,860,364 acres. Of this, 4,623,803 acres were for agricultural farms or pastoral pursuits, and 1,236,561 acres were agricultural. So far as agricultural settlement is concerned, I say the other States have beaten us hollow, and West Australia, which was behind us fifteen years ago, is a long way ahead of us now. Even some of the newspapers which stand for the Government, and uphold it, have been criticising them very much in relation to this of late. Dealing with this question, the *Daily Mail*—and I say there have been articles in the *Daily Mail* recently which, in my opinion, have been of very great worth indeed, and very informing on many matters, as there has been in some other papers I could mention if necessary—the *Daily Mail* of 13th April says—

"In Queensland we are accustomed to plume ourselves on the rapidity with which land is being alienated from the Crown, much of it for comparatively close settlement. But our selection for close settlement means chiefly the establishment for grazing farms running from 2,000 to 40,000 acres in extent. We have about 27 per cent. of the horses in the Commonwealth, nearly 33 per cent. of the cattle, about 18 per cent. of the sheep, and only 13 per cent. of the population. So that in pastoral progress we occupy an advanced position as compared with any sister State. But when we compare the land under crop, our backwardness becomes at once evident. The total area is only 607,000 acres as against 3,000,000 acres in New South Wales, 3,500,000 in Victoria, 2,500,000 in South Australia, and 722,000 in Western Australia. So that, with 13 per cent. of the population of the Commonwealth, we have only 5½ per cent. of the average land under crop. To keep pace with the average of the other States in this respect, we should have 1,400,000 acres under crop instead of 607,000. In Western Australia there were up to fifteen years ago 98,000 acres under crop; at the same time there were in Queensland over 285,000 acres under crop. To-day Western Australia has multiplied her area under crop by more than six times, while Queensland has, with more than twice the population, little more than doubled her cultivation. We cannot admit that the agriculturist has a better chance in Western Australia than in our own State, apart from the help he gets from the local railway company that has entered upon the Canadian system or policy of the "ready-made farm."

Mr. Adamson.]

Now, I want you to notice this, Mr. Speaker, that the Scottish Agricultural Commissioners, when they were out here, said there was plenty of land in Queensland, but there was very little of it ready for men to go and take up. They went home and said this. That is their criticism. If there was time to give Mr. Weedon's figures to-night I would do so, and if time permitted I would quote Mr. Knibbs's figures. It can be shown we are going back so far as wheat production is concerned, and I think it is very desirable that areas in this State, which are said to be capable of yielding a very high average of bushels per acre of wheat—there should be something more done as far as that is concerned. I was very glad in reading the Sugar Commissioner's report to notice that the Government are acting on that report, and that they are going to encourage the expansion of sugar-growing. I trust that the sugar labourer and the sugar farmer, as well as the sugar manufacturer and refiner, are to be put on a condition of greater equality than hitherto. I trust that certain things will be done that the men are asking for at the present time. In relation to my own district, they are asking for a sugar-mill there. I was round the Alton Downs district a few weeks ago, and I saw some 10 or 12 acres planted with cane, which was as fine cane as I have seen anywhere in Queensland, and there is a great deal more in that district; so, if there are to be sugar-mills erected in one place and another, I hope there will be one erected in the Rockhampton district. I would like to see these sugar areas made as small as possible. I would like to see as many people able to manage their own farms as possible, and I would like to see, also, sugar-workers' homes, just as I would like to see shearers' homes, so that men would not lead a nomadic life, moving about without a home, without a wife, without children that go to make life really happy, really desirable—just simply nomads. I once heard when I was in the West—and I was in the West a great deal—I once heard a great dignitary say, "They were the Bedouins of the bush." That is the truth. The Governments of this country in the past are largely to blame for those men with a nomadic tendency, and "the Bedouins of the bush" ought to have our pity and sympathy rather than our sneers and contempt. The hon. member for the Burrum, who has just sat down, asked me if I knew what the effective protection was in the sugar industry. I did not catch what he meant, and I was not going to give myself away by replying off hand. I hold, that the effective protection is the £6 a ton. Of course they tell us it is £5. That is all bunkum so far as I am concerned, and since there has been so much said in connection with the sugar question to-night, I want to read a few things that I would not have bothered about otherwise, but it is very desirable that they should be read. My sympathies are with the sugar-growers and with the sugar-workers. I believe that the sugar-growers are being injured by a great monopoly, just as they are being compelled, in their own turn, to do things which they would not do if they were free so far as the sugar-workers are concerned. I know a great number of the sugar-growers are prepared to pay what the men want,

[Mr. Adamson.

and are prepared to give an eight-hours day, and I think it is up to the Government to give an eight-hour day in the mills. (Hear, hear!) They can do it, and they could settle this question if they wished it. Of course, by taking that action they would bring the other people to consider very carefully before they go any further in this matter. I say more than that. If necessary to fight the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, the Government of the day should be on the side of the sugar-grower and sugar-worker against that great monopoly.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ADAMSON: Listen to these figures—

THE COLONIAL SUGAR REFINING CO. (SYDNEY):—		To Reserves.	Dividends.	Profits.	Reserves (not including Depreciation Fund).
Mar., 1904	£100,412	£412	10 p.c. = £100,000	£100,412	£22,913
Sept., 1904	105,111	503	10 " " 104,508	105,111	423,416
Mar., 1905	155,322	—	15 " " 164,705	155,322	414,033
Sept., 1905	112,343	2,379	10 " " 108,965	112,343	416,411
Mar., 1906	112,042	2,042	10 " " 110,000	112,042	418,453
Sept., 1906	111,679	1,679	10 " " 110,000	111,679	420,132
Mar., 1907	118,937	827	10 " " 110,000	118,937	420,659
Sept., 1907	£75,000 of reserves capitalised	8,057	10 p.c. = 114,000	£75,000 of reserves capitalised	429,016
Mar., 1908	134,782	10,745	10 p.c. = 124,037	134,782	354,016
Sept., 1908	146,483	21,698	10 p.c. = 124,850	146,483	384,761
Mar., 1909	£360,000 of reserves capitalised	17,608	10 p.c. = 142,500	£360,000 of reserves capitalised	386,369
Sept., 1909	162,632	21,132	10 p.c. = 142,500	162,632	36,369
Mar., 1910	168,881	26,381	10 " " 142,500	168,881	66,501
Sept., 1910	175,590	33,090	10 " " 142,500	175,590	82,682
Mar., 1911	196,714	54,214	10 " " 142,500	196,714	115,972
Sept., 1911	£150,000 of reserves capitalised	57,428	10 p.c. = 150,000	£150,000 of reserves capitalised	170,156
Mar., 1911	207,428	57,428	10 p.c. = 150,000	207,428	20,186
Sept., 1911	..	..	..	..	77,614

"There probably never was a time when this company was told a cheerful tale at its half-yearly meeting. The bigger the profits, the more dismal the lamentations, as a rule. The future is always full of gloom. "As it is certain that the mills now working in Queensland and New South Wales can easily make all the sugar needed in Australia, during the next four years at any rate, some loss may be expected to follow the over-development of the industry," says the chairman, alluding to the Queensland Government's determination to help in establishing more sugar-mills. Still, "only one-third of the loss can fall on us, this being our share of the present production of raw sugar in the Commonwealth." Nevertheless *The Bulletin* hasn't any expectation of seeing the company's profits diminished by £65,000 or so per half-year. True, the company may produce only one-third of the raw sugar, but practically all the producers of raw sugar have to send their output to this company for refining, and if the company can't make its 10 per cent (with a bit up its sleeve) one way, no doubt it will in another. As to that 10 per cent, note that it is only nominally 10 per cent. During the past three and a-half years alone no less than £575,000 of profit has been capitalised. That is to say, though the shareholders put up only £2,425,000, they get the dividend on £3,000,000; so the 10 per cent. is really 12½ per cent. And that is on the basis of the capital paid up in 1907, and on the assumption that all the capital up to that

time had been bona fide paid up by shareholders. As a matter of fact, though, there had been previous bonus distributions, so that the dividend is actually more than 12½ per cent. And what it could pay, if it divided all its profit, there is no telling. The plain fact is that the bonus distributions alone during the past four years have averaged over 5½ per cent. per annum.

"The other day Acting Prime Minister Hughes, after reciting some facts and alleged facts, declared that the company was "making at least 20 per cent. profit," and added—"It is not a fair return. It is an unfair return. It comes from the pockets of the people." The chairman referred to Hughes's speech, and asked—"Now, what are the facts?" And he proceeded to show that, in some respects, Hughes was wrong, technically, at any rate. But he did not, and he cannot, say that even 15 per cent. is a fair thing. That is the whole point. The company, splendidly managed in many respects, is too greedy. Sugar is a modern necessity; and this company is making Australia pay anything from £100,000 to £150,000 a year more for this necessity than it should have to pay. That greediness isn't going to pay in the long run. It is simply inviting attack. So far, admittedly, the attack has been repelled—as it was last week. But, of course, last week is not going to end the matter. It is simply a question of a little more agitation. That is the plain situation that the investor has to face."

Mr. Tudor, too, speaking on this matter after he went back to Melbourne, said—

"He wished to contradict the statement that the manufacturers wished to increase the wages if the bounty and excise were abolished. He asked them if they would, in the event of the bounty and excise being equalised, be prepared to meet the Amalgamated Workers' Association's demands, and they declined. At one time he had been in hope of seeing the trouble settled, but now he anticipated serious developments, unless wise counsels quickly prevailed. He trusted that the success of the sugar season would not be jeopardised through lack of conciliatory steps."

If we are having a very serious industrial trouble at the present time in the [8 p.m.] sugar industry, the blame rests with the manufacturers.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. ADAMSON: That is my opinion. I am sorry you call "Order!" in relation to that matter. You have allowed other members to speak about the strike all this afternoon. I am sorry I have to desist.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot allow the hon. gentleman to bring that accusation against the Chair. On every occasion when the matter raised by the deputy leader of the Opposition as a matter of urgent public importance has been touched upon during this debate I have called members on both sides to order.

Mr. ADAMSON: I admit that you have done so; but this afternoon there was one member talking about strikes and you never said anything. However, I bow to your ruling.

The SPEAKER: At the same time the hon. member made an accusation against my impartiality, and I think that on reflection he will be sorry he did so.

Mr. ADAMSON: I made no accusation at all; I simply stated a fact, as everybody in the House knows. Leaving that matter, I think that I have shown that we are not doing

all that should be done as far as agricultural settlement is concerned, and that the progress of close settlement as far as the sugar industry is concerned depends on a different policy. With regard to the railway policy of the Government, I admit that during the last few years we have had a vigorous railway policy, which has been for the benefit of Queensland; but this party is just as anxious for railway construction as that party; and I was glad to hear the broadminded speech made by the hon. member for Townsville last week. With regard to the Western Railway from Tobermory to Camooweal, this was said to be necessary to save the sheep; but I hold that could have been done effectively by linking up Longreach with Winton and linking up Charleville with Longreach—and it would have been much cheaper.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: How would you link up Charleville with Winton?

Mr. ADAMSON: I would leave the linking up of Charleville with Longreach and Winton to be determined by expert evidence. As I have turned up the page in "Knibbs," in which we have given us the route of the Commonwealth railway to the Northern Territory, I am of opinion that this scheme was brought forward to forestall and frustrate as far as possible the aims of the Commonwealth Parliament.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ADAMSON: And I understand they are already considering that the route so hurriedly surveyed by motor-car is not the best route. I think the North Coast Railway is a very desirable railway; and I congratulate the Government on deciding to construct a railway from Rockhampton to Cairns, because close settlement such as the country needs can be brought about there. I hope, however, that the Minister for Railways will not forget that it is about time to start the section from North Rockhampton, where there are men ready to take up the work. Another thing: I hope there are going to be more short feeder lines in agricultural districts so that the people in those districts can get their produce to market. There are lots of small lines that need to be made, and there are also some fairly large improvements required. I was talking to a railway expert not long ago, and he said: "We have been pushing our railways out back, but we should also attend to needs in the way of better stations and shunting yards in our centres of population." I hope that will be done. In Rockhampton the yards are a disgrace, besides being dangerous to the men; and as far as engine-sheds are concerned, to look at them is to condemn them. I am glad to know that the Tinana deviation is coming within the range of practical politics; and I hope the Minister will not forget that Roope's bridge is to be raised, and that the promises made at the Rockhampton election will not be forgotten.

The PREMIER: You might say "Where the floods were."

Mr. ADAMSON: It was a political flood at that time. (Laughter.) Promises were made at Rockhampton, just as they were made at Dalby. We need better stations and better accommodation; and I hope the Minister is alive to the fact.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: They are being attended to.

Mr. Adamson.]

Mr. ADAMSON: With regard to the matter of ports, we heard a very excellent speech from the hon. member for Burrum in regard to a port for the Maryborough district. I agree with him in what he said about that port, but I contend that every port should only be determined after expert evidence has been taken. We have an example in Rockhampton of a railway running down each side of the river to a port, and a lot of people are not satisfied with either; and we have the river as well. I hope that before the Government decides anything about Urangan they will get to know also about Traveston and about Bingham—I hope they will get to know everything necessary about these three places in Hervey's Bay, and determine the matter, not from the standpoint of political exigencies but from the standpoint of the welfare of Queensland. Now, I want the Minister for Railways to take special notice of this: Here is an extract from the Rockhampton *Daily Record* concerning things which have taken place recently in the relaying of the line from Duaringa out West—which, if they are true, should be looked into at once.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: They have been looked into already.

Mr. ADAMSON: This is the article—

"A batch of immigrants from the Duaringa Plate-laying Camp called at the local Australian Workers' Association office on Wednesday, and complained of the manner in which they had been treated ever since they left London for Australia. In the first place, they were induced to emigrate by gross misrepresentations. On their way out, the first mate accused them of being brought out here out of charity, for which he afterwards apologised. This sentiment underlay the whole of the treatment they received on board ship, and they were treated more like beasts than human beings. On arrival in Queensland, a draft of about fifty was sent up to Duaringa to work on the relaying there for the Central Railway. They arrived at Duaringa on Sunday, 25th June, at about 2.30 p.m. A meal was ready for them, consisting of salt meat, potatoes, bread, and duff, with tea. This was the only square feed they had. On the Monday morning they had bread and jam or treacle for breakfast, and the same for dinner, whilst for tea they got salt meat, bread, and duff. On this food, indifferently cooked and uninvitingly served, and for which they were charged 7½d. per meal, they were expected to work eight and a-half hours laboriously. Is it any wonder they jibbed? It would be a physical impossibility for them to keep going. Besides paying 7½d. per meal, they had to pay 2s. 6d. each per week for the cook.

"Out of the first week's pay they drew 14s. 10d. out of £2 8s. earned. The balance, £1 13s. 2d., was absorbed by cook and food £1 1s. 11d., blanket 11s. 3d. Part of the £1 1s. 11d. was for cooking utensils, whether for hire or purchase they do not know.

"Although the men were paying for their food, and asked that a few extras be added, for which they, of course, should pay, their requests were denied, as the Government did not wish to educate the new arrivals to too high a standard of living. The men complained to one of the gangers concerning the food. He admitted it was not anything like it should be, but averred he was powerless to alter it.

"The men are pulling out and scattering all over the country, as opportunity offers. Those before referred to arrived in Rockhampton last Saturday, the 15th instant, and have had to wait till Thursday following to get their pay. What about payment for this wasted time? A private employer would have to pay for it. Then, why should not the Government?

[Mr. Adamson.]

"The local maintenance office is earning a very unenviable reputation in the way it is treating men who are hard up. They want men, and send them away on jobs with a free pass out into any wilderness. Whether the men can get food or accommodation does not seem to bother them. If the men want to reach Rockhampton again except at the department's sweet leisure, they (the men) have to pay their own return fare. The department must pay these men while they are hanging round waiting for their money, and it might as well do it and look pleasant as be made to do it under compulsion. The present Government's immigration policy is a fraud from top to bottom, and must be a big factor in slaying it at the next appeal to the country."

I do not know whether everything in that quotation is correct or not. If it is not correct, the Minister for Railways has a chance to put it right. If it is correct, then I say that the Minister for Railways and the Premier should do what they can to wipe out that disgrace. Now, I want to say a word or two about immigration. There is a great cry about filling up the vacant places of this continent. Nobody is more desirous of doing that than the party which sits on this side of the House. We want to fill the continent with a desirable class of immigrants, but we want those immigrants, when they come here, to get something decent to do when they land. It is all very well for the hon. member for Cambooya to talk about the way he worked for 15s. a week, and how he got rich. But I want to say that he never got rich on 15s. a week; if he had continued to work for 15s. a week from that time up to the present he would not be rich now. He got rich by getting hold of a portion of the public estate. I know a man worth £50,000. He cannot write his name. He went to a place and took up land at 2s. 6d. an acre, and settled there. There is a big population there now, and he has sold that land at a very high price, and that is how he got his wealth. He did not get his wealth by working for 15s. a week, and he is just as hard a worker as the hon. member for Cambooya. It is quite true, as one of the Scottish Commissioners has said, that there is plenty of land in Queensland, plenty of good land, but that they saw hardly any ready to receive immigrants coming out to this country.

The PREMIER: There is.

Mr. ADAMSON: The Labour party say that we should make the country attractive to immigrants, and that they will then come here without any further inducement. We were told that Mr. Fisher did wrong when he told the miners at Tonypanydy that there was room for miners here.

The PREMIER: That is not correct.

Mr. ADAMSON: Whatever the Premier may say, there are members on that side of the House who said that Mr. Fisher was wrong when he told the miners at Tonypanydy that there was room for miners in Australia.

The PREMIER: The senior member for Ipswich said that.

Mr. ADAMSON: The statement was made that miners are not wanted here. I will read a quotation showing the view which the Liberal party take on this question—

"The Prime Minister of Australia, in his last Budget Speech, said—

"They (emigrants) have always been welcomed. There has been an almost inconceiv-

able denunciation of Australia and of the Labour party in that connection. But no party has been more ready and willing to receive persons of European descent in Australia than has the Labour party. Taken as a whole, nobody is more ready than are the trade unions of this country to give such people a hearty welcome. But, undoubtedly, they desire to see maintained the conditions which have been prescribed by Mr. Justice Higgins. They wish immigrants, upon their arrival in this country, to be able to maintain themselves and their families in a reasonable degree of comfort as members of a civilised community. Subject to that condition, there is no party more willing than is the Labour party to see Australia populated."

Mr. McGOWEN, the Premier of New South Wales, in a recent speech, said—

"I want you to know that we, as a Government—we as a party—realise that before we can consider this country belongs to us it must be peopled."

The PREMIER: And Queensland is doing its best to do it.

Mr. ADAMSON—

"We must have men where now we have sheep and gum-trees. (Loud applause.) While other parties have talked about the slender thread by which we hold this country, they did not take the one primary step of providing the land for the people they proposed to bring here. We desire to deal with the rural population. We believe also that the people who come here must have an opportunity of getting land if we are to develop the resources of the State."

The PREMIER: Queensland fills the bill.

Mr. ADAMSON: If Queensland fills the bill, how is it that we are far behind all the rest of Australia in agricultural settlement?

The PREMIER: I can answer that.

Mr. ADAMSON: I shall be glad to hear the hon. gentleman's answer. We ought to do something on the lines adopted in Canada. Those lines are shown in the following extract:—

"Owing to the attractions of the homestead law to all parts of the Dominion, Mr. Scott anticipates an enormous demand for labour in every possible direction this year. "In 1909," he tells us, "37,061 homestead areas were recorded in connection with Dominion Government land; in 1900 the entries amounted to 48,287. As each entry represents 160 acres, this means that 5,929,760 and 7,721,120 acres respectively were given away to new settlers in the two periods." In reply to the suggestion that severe attacks had been made upon Canadian methods, Mr. Scott, with a smile, concluded, "We deal with facts, and not with unhealthy imaginings, and the facts could hardly be brighter or more promising than they are to-day."

Of course, I know the Premier will say that that is all done on the freehold system in Canada. We stand for leasehold, and we believe that if the leasehold is used as the Canadians are using the freehold system—if leaseholds are provided free to men who come here with a few hundreds of pounds in their pockets and a desire to make a decent home for themselves—the leasehold system will prove better for immigrants, better for this State, and better for Australia than the freehold system.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: What are they doing in New South Wales?

Mr. ADAMSON: I know all about what they are doing in New South Wales, and expected an interjection of that sort, but that does not disprove my argument. I had intended to say something about the loan floated by the Government, and their loan policy, but I shall not do so at present. The most trenchant criticisms of the Government loan policy and of their financial policy have come from that side of the House. The most trenchant criticisms of the failure of their loan policy has come from Government supporters.

The PREMIER: No, not failure.

Mr. ADAMSON: I do not propose to discuss that question, as it is not possible for anyone to deal with the public finances in five minutes, and I wish to refer to some other matters. I have a word to say about the Agricultural Bank—about the difference between the effectiveness of that bank in Queensland and of similar banks in other States. The advances made by Victoria up to 1910 amounted to £2,657,713, by South Australia to £1,544,956, by New South Wales to £1,362,853, by Western Australia to £1,057,082, and by Queensland to the paltry sum of £235,793. I know we have a Bill promised to alter all this, to make our Agricultural Bank more effective. I am glad that that is so. But the fact that the Queensland Agricultural Bank has not been more effective in the past than it has been lies at the door of the present Government, and of the present Premier, who has had a good deal to do with Governments during the past few years. Here is a criticism from a prominent newspaper by a man who knew what he was writing about—

"In South Australia the bank was brought into existence in 1895, with amendments in 1896 and 1901. The bank is managed by a board of five trustees appointed by the Government. Its funds are raised by the issue of mortgage bonds carrying interest at a rate not exceeding 4 per cent., and to an amount not greater than £3,000,000. Compare this £3,000,000 with the £250,000 capital of the Queensland institution. Advances are made in South Australia up to three-fifths of the unimproved value and the permanent improvements thereon. If the land has been given a special additional value by cultivation, as an orchard or a vineyard, the amount advanced may be increased up to one-third of this additional value. The amount lent to any one person is not to exceed £5,000 (£800 in the case of the Queensland bank). In South Australia, too, the terms of repayment are a matter of arrangement between the bank and the borrower. When South Australia can do so well in the matter of giving financial assistance to agriculturists, it is not surprising that she should rank so high as an agricultural State. It is evident from the experience of the South Australian bank that its administration has been in sympathetic hands, whereas the Queensland institution was clearly established as a sort of sop to the demand for this form of State socialism. The Queensland bank was never meant to be of use as an aid to agriculture, and it will never be what it should be until the control of the Treasury passes into more sympathetic hands. In reality the Agricultural Bank should play a very big part in the progress of agriculture in Queensland; as things are it is a mere shell without a kernel."

That is a trenchant criticism, and a criticism richly deserved. I desire now to say something about land taxation. Those who condemn the Federal land tax are the men who want to get the land. The Federal

Mr. Adamson.]



land tax is breaking up big estates all over Australia at the present time, as I could prove if I had the time.

Mr. HODGE: How can you break up a 16-perch allotment in Queen street?

Mr. ADAMSON: There is one thing we can do with regard to land of that kind—we can get back some part of the value which has been created by the community, and not by the individual. I can give information showing that in Victoria and elsewhere big estates have been burst up by the Federal land tax. I want to say that when the farmers take into consideration everything that they should take into consideration in connection with a land tax, they will find that a State land tax will not hurt them, but that, on the contrary, it will help them. The people who are doing most harm to the farmers at the present time are the middlemen—the men [8.30 p.m.] sitting on that side of the House.

We are promised a Liquor Bill, and it was to be the first Bill introduced, but I am afraid it is going to be a bomb. It will be a bomb splitting the Government party into discordant fragments.

Mr. TROUT: "Oh, ye of little faith." (Laughter.)

Mr. ADAMSON: I confess I have little faith in the present Government passing an acceptable and useful Licensing Act. I do not think we will see a Licensing Act passed by the present Government. I hope I may be deceived. I will have something more to say on that measure at the proper time, when the measure is introduced. There is to be an alteration in the electoral laws. It is about time that the electoral laws throughout the Commonwealth were made uniform; either the Commonwealth law should be adopted, or else some State law should be adopted. Personally, I think it is better to strike the name out altogether than to make a cross against a name. There are a lot of miserable little technicalities in the Act that should be taken away, so that, when the clear intention of the voter is shown, it should not be declared informal. We saw a lot of things of that kind in Rockhampton. When it is clearly shown how the elector wants to vote, it should be declared formal and not informal. It ought also to be made as easy as possible to get to the polling-booth. In Rockhampton they only had one polling-booth. It was scandalous. We ought to have as many polling-booths as possible all over the State. I hope there will be a clause in the amending Act about making promises on the eve of an election.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Even by Ministers.

Mr. ADAMSON: Yes, even by Ministers. I think that if a promise is made about what a member will get for his constituency if he is returned, it should be made an offence under the Act. There is another thing, and the temperance men on the other side should back me up in this, and that is that if anyone shouts for a voter on the eve of an election with the idea of getting his vote, it should be made a criminal action for which he can be proceeded against.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: What about if a member gives his salary to a hospital?

Mr. ADAMSON: I will have something more to say about this Bill when it comes

[Mr. Adamson.]

forward, and if possible will try to get in some amendments. I was going to speak about industrial unionism. A lot has been said in this House against industrial unionism, but let me say that industrial unionism is the hope of the working man. (Hear, hear!) I hope that the Premier will yet learn to make it political as it will then tend to the industrial salvation of the working man. I have a quotation here which I am going to give. It is taken from an article by Chiozza Money in *The Nation* newspaper. He shows that wages increased 13.3 per cent. in fifteen years, wholesale prices increased 19.5 per cent., and London retail prices increased 17.9 per cent. in the same fifteen years. The gross assessments to income tax increased 59 per cent., and the estimated average increase of income-tax payers in the same period was 38 per cent. Then he goes on to say—

"Why is it that British workmen have not been able to secure a fairer share of the product of mental and manual labour? The space at my disposal does not allow me to examine the matter at length, and the number of possible factors of causation is great enough to make one go warily in attempting to form a judgment. I suggest for consideration, however, that there are many signs that the strength of trade unions, relatively to that of the employers' federations, has diminished of late, and that our trade unions exhibit a lack of expansion which is not creditable to the education, the wisdom, or the collective feeling of the working classes. I submit the following astonishing figures:—

BRITISH AND GERMAN TRADE UNIONISTS.			
Year.	Britain.	Germany.	
1899 ..	1,850,000 ..	864,000	
1909 ..	2,365,000 ..	2,961,000	
Increase ..	515,000 ..	2,097,000	
Increase, p.c.	28 ..	240	

"In view of these facts, I do not think we need be surprised to learn that German money wages have increased much more rapidly than British money wages since 1899. German workmen appear to be flocking to the trade unions. In 1909, as compared with 1908, the German trade unions gained 540,000 members, or 25,000 more than our British trade unions gained in ten years. Is it that a superior education is telling in this direction, as in others?

"And I cannot but contrast the spirit which seems to animate German trade unionists with that of our own tradesmen. It was illustrated at the end of 1910. Arising out of not unexpected local disputes, which were breaches of an agreement between shipbuilders and shipworkers, of a character which makes one wonder how trade unionists could put their hands to it, British shipbuilders locked out their men in the northern yards. Upon doing so, the men's leaders consented to conclude peace on the understanding that the masters should punish their men through their union, if they struck work, by fine, or even by deprivation of employment in any shipyard for six or twelve months. The men, wiser than their leaders, refused to consent to such terms, and, finally, obtained better ones. Curiously, while British shipbuilders were locking out their men, German shipyard workers struck for higher wages and shorter hours, and, with the assistance of the powerful German Metalworkers' Society, the strongest trade union in the world, they won the day. One could not but be impressed by the coincidence: here, a shipyard lockout, and the men barely saved from disaster to trade unionism; in Germany, a shipyard strike, won in a few weeks.

"It is only too clear that our workmen are lacking in holy (or even unholy) discontent; it is not so clear why this should be."

The men who tell us that trades unionism is

a foe to progress are the men who have not read as they ought to read. Trades unionism is uplifting the workers, and it might do more for them in the future than it has done in the past if they are only loyal to each other and care to use it. I am glad that the Home Secretary is moving in the direction of doing something for the hospitals. We ought to have an eight-hour day in our hospitals, and those employed in our hospitals should have better wages. There ought also to be an inquiry into the way that discipline is enforced in our hospitals. So far as the Children's Hospitals are concerned, I know that they work their nurses twelve to thirteen hours a day, and the nurses have to find their own uniforms. They start at 5s., and there is a very peculiar and a very snobbish way of enforcing discipline. I think that that snobbery ought to be stopped in a Government or semi-Government institution. Instead of making our gaols places where the law of revenge prevails, we ought to make them as places where feelings of pity and reclamation prevail, and the men brought there should have a chance again. I hope the Home Secretary will deal as he promises with the insane. Goodna is a disgrace at the present time, as everyone who visits there knows. Certain things are going on there that are disgraceful. It is too overcrowded, and the inmates are not separated as they ought to be. Men having only a mild attack are allowed to mix with others worse than themselves, and that is likely to make them mad. I remember the case of a woman who was placed in the institution many years ago. There were others who were far more insane, and the woman said: "I ought to be taken away from them, because if I am not these people will make me mad continually." I hold that everything that can make these places as humane as possible, and the treatment of these people as kindly as possible, ought to be done. I want to say a word or two about education before I sit down. I am glad the University has been opened, and that continuation classes have been arranged. I hope that the Minister for Education will see that there is closer supervision at our Grammar schools—I am glad that there is better supervision at the present time than that which prevailed a year or two ago. I am glad for what is being done in technical education, but I hold that all examinations for all bursaries and exhibitions, and that kind of thing, should be on the qualifying principle, and not on the competitive principle. (Hear, hear!) I have here something which it will be well for the Minister for Education to read, but I will not trouble to quote it now. I hold that our educational system, good as it is, can be improved, and that everything that can be done to help the poorest boy to get to the highest position educationally ought to be done. I hold that all is not being done yet that could be done. There is one other matter in this connection I want to refer to, and that is the matter of the alteration that has been made in relation to the school curriculum, so far as religious instruction in State schools is concerned. I do not believe that when that Bill passed there were three men in this House who believed in it; it was a matter of political expediency, and not a matter of principle, that carried that Bill through this House, because certain clerics were insistent and

determined men. I hold that the referendum poll was not fair, and that it ought not to have been taken at the time the Federal election poll was taken.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: It ought never to have been taken at all on religious questions.

Mr. ADAMSON: I quite agree with the hon. member that a religious question ought never to be decided by the counting of votes.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ADAMSON: But since it was passed in this House that a referendum should be taken, I hold that it ought to have been taken in a decent way. I think it ought not to have been taken on the day of the Federal election. I do not approve of the way the questions were asked—it was simply a bare "Yes" or "No" in relation to one question. I think the referendum should have been—First: "Are you in favour of clerical entrance into the school?" Second: "Are you in favour of simple Bible reading?" Third: "Are you in favour of denominational education?" Fourth: "Are you in favour of secular education?" and fifth: "Are you in favour of a conscience clause for teachers and scholars?" If the referendum had been taken that way, while I believe it is possible that simple Bible reading would have been carried, I am sure that the clerics with their sectarian tendencies would have been kept out of the schools altogether.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ADAMSON: I hold that it would have been a good thing for this State if that had been so, because where a man goes into the State schools as an Anglican, he carries the smell of Anglicanism with him, and when he goes as a Presbyterian he carries the aroma of a Presbyterian, although he may never say a word about sectarian teaching. If he never says a word about it, by the fact that he goes there and separates the children, sectarianism is in the ascendant while he is there.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ADAMSON: I hold there may be very much done in the way of bettering our educational system. I admit that it has good points, yet I hope that something further will be done. I am not going to continue much longer. I have some notes here upon the child. Every nation in the world to-day is recognising the value of child life. (Hear, hear!) The only men that are not recognising the value of child life are the industrial magnates who will employ children at the earliest age possible, or the men who want to get as much money out of their children as possible. I would like to say something about the Rural Workers' Union and the agriculturists. I have got children, and the principle I laid down for myself when children were born into my fold was that I should do all I could for them, not asking them to do anything for me. (Hear, hear!) Some people think that they are to have children to get all they can out of them, and they boast that that is the reason why they have them—that their children are making something for them. I have sacrificed myself; I consider it a duty. I have done all I could for the education of my children, and have kept them from work as long as I could.

Mr. TROUT: So have others.

*Mr. Adamson.*

Mr. ADAMSON: Yes; I believe you would do so, and I believe there are men on the other side who would do it, but I believe there are some men who are not prepared to do it. The child should be cared for in its natal state, in its post-natal state, and he should never go from school till he is fourteen years of age—and I think sixteen—and some of the best nations in Europe are making it sixteen. If there was time to-night I could dwell on that matter, but I am not going to do it. We want to try to do the best we can for our womanhood, because I know there are men who are prepared to speak in a lowering way of women. It is a pity that a man who does that has got a wife, that he has got a sister—a man who does not respect womanhood.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: And it is a pity his mother ever bore him.

Mr. ADAMSON: I am glad that the Secretary for Railways echoed that. I hold in relation to the position of woman that, if divorce is allowed, it ought to be on equal terms for men and women; if woman does equal work with man under similar conditions, she should have equal pay; in the division of property woman ought to be put on an equality with man; and if a woman is made an outcast because of the social vice, so should man be. (Hear, hear!) If I could alter the evil which is going on, I would alter it in that direction. If we demand purity in our women, the women have a right to demand purity in the men. (Hear, hear!) I hold that a man who would degrade a woman is a man who should be driven out of society, as well as the woman. Of course, some people may laugh, but what do I care.

Mr. TROUT: We are not laughing.

Mr. ADAMSON: I am not speaking about you: it is a pity you take it to yourself. I want to say that we want to stand for the complete economic freedom of women; we ought to try to help her to the highest and best, because if our State is to be the highest and best it is necessary that our wives and children should be the highest and best. Ethel Snowden has put that very well—

"A free woman, she will thus be able to give her love freely. And in the sense that no mercenary motive will influence towards matrimony, and no unhallowed sex-impulse will be the drawing power between the man and the woman, but mutual admiration and esteem and pure affection, there will be free love—love free as the air, and as pure; as radiant as the sunshine, and as warm; as beautiful as Nature, and as holy."

And as Tennyson says in his "Princess"—

"Then comes the statelier Eden back to man:  
Then reign the world's great bridal's chaste  
and calm:  
Then springs the crowning race of human  
kind,  
May these things be!"

By looking after the children and looking after the women we are doing the best thing to people our vacant spaces, by reducing the death rate—whether we increase the birth rate or not—it will be the means of filling Australia with people who know something about Australia. Then there is the matter of the unemployed. What is the Government doing with the unemployed?

Mr. HODGE: We have got none.

Mr. ADAMSON: Who was it the other day who was telling us there was no unemployed labour for the sugar-fields, and yet

[Mr. Adamson.

they are telling us in the same breath that there are thousands of people in Victoria, in the cities, who are out of employment and cannot get it?

Mr. HODGE: They are looking for work and are afraid they will get it.

Mr. ADAMSON: It seems to me if there are some men looking for work and are afraid they will get it, they are to be pitied. Before we condemn those people we want to know the man's heredity, we want to know the environment he has grown up in, and we want to know what chances he has had. We want to know whether he has been an honest man, who has refused to exploit his fellow-men, and whether he has gone down because of his honesty, and whether he has been able to enrich himself by getting something he ought not to have got. There is no man in this world who has got rich on his own exertions. It is only when he has been able to exploit some other man, or a number of men, that he has been enabled to get rich. I hope, so far as the unemployed and unemployable are concerned, something is going to be done for the reclamation of the unemployable. I want, before closing, to put a political programme before this House approved by some of the very finest men in America. I want hon. members to listen to it. This is from the American *Outlook*, and is as follows:—

"We deem it the duty of all Christian people to concern themselves directly with certain practical industrial problems. To us it seems that the churches must stand—

"For equal rights and complete justice to all men in all stations of life.

"For the right of all men to the opportunity for self-maintenance, a right ever to be strongly safeguarded against encroachments of every kind.

"For the right of workers to some protection against the hardships often resulting from the swift crises of industrial change.

"For the principle of conciliation and arbitration in industrial disputes.

"For the protection of the worker from dangerous machinery, occupational disease, injuries, and mortality.

"For the abolition of child labour.

"For such regulations of the conditions of toil for women as shall safeguard the physical and moral health of the community.

"For the suppression of the "sweating system."

"For the gradual and reasonable reduction of the hours of labour to the lowest practicable point, and for that degree of leisure for all which is a condition of the highest human life.

"For the release from employment one day in seven.

"For a living wage as a minimum in every industry, and for the highest wage that each industry can afford.

"For the most equitable division of the products of industry that can ultimately be devised.

"For suitable provision for the old age of the workers and for those incapacitated by injury.

"For the abatement of poverty.

"To the toilers of America and to those who by organised effort are seeking to lift the crushing burdens of the poor, and to reduce the hardships and uphold the dignity of labour, this Council sends the greeting of human brotherhood and the pledge of sympathy and of help in a cause which belongs to all who follow Christ."

Mr. LENNON: It practically agrees with the Labour platform.

Mr. ADAMSON: This is a programme that no man need be ashamed of, and I hold the Queensland Labour platform is based on the best economic thought, the best political thought, and the best ethical thought of the world, and I want to conclude with a quotation from a man I have quoted already, Professor Henry Jones, who, speaking on the ideal Government, says—

“It must be social and political freedom: a form of government and a mode of life in which a whole people seeks a common good, which is alone democracy. For democracy is more than a claim to rule on the part of all the people. It is the consciousness of the obligation and the privilege of service. It is a “kingdom of ends,” to use the great phrase of Kant, “in which all are sovereigns and all are subjects”—a form of public life not clearly conceived as yet, far less attained by any community. Such freedom as this—the freedom of perfect service—has hardly become the conscious purpose of any modern State thus far.”

I hold that until men believe that they live to serve each other instead of exploiting each other, there will always be strife, because if a man is trying to get the better of another—that is what is done in commercial life continually—every other man will try to prevent this. If one is too weak to get the better of another in one way then he will resort to some other method, but if men will believe that service to each other is the thing which will help forward humanity, then a crisis like we have in Queensland at the present time will be utterly impossible. I have detained the House longer than I intended; but, really, I felt that others having had their say upon the Address in Reply it is only right that I should have my say.

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mackay*): I should not like this debate to close without my paying my tribute to your predecessor, Sir. I can only say that the late Speaker would have been an acquisition to any Legislature in the world. I do not think I can say any more than that. I should also like to say I am pleased to see you in your present position. I sat under you during one session when you were Acting Speaker, and your conduct in that position last year gives me every confidence that you will fill that high position with credit to yourself and to the House. While the thing is still in my mind I should like to deal with a statement made by the hon. member who has just sat down. By inference he insinuated that this party, as a party, were not as humane as regards women and children as the party sitting opposite. Now, Sir, I believe in deeds and not in words. What happened last year? There was a Mines Regulation Bill before this House, and in that Bill there was a clause prohibiting women from working underground, and I want it to go into *Hansard* that the Labour party, as a party, voted against that clause.

Mr. THEODORE: You are quite wrong.

Mr. SWAYNE: You voted against that Bill, clause by clause, in Committee.

Mr. LENNON: We did not vote against it.

Mr. SWAYNE: You voted against it when it was going through Committee.

Mr. THEODORE: It was a mistake.

Mr. SWAYNE: I know they say they did it as a party matter. The excuse they made was that it was in objection to the Sessional

Order. All it wanted, if we were the inhuman lot they say we are, was a few members on this side of the House to step outside the bar when the division was taken and that clause would have been knocked out.

Mr. LENNON: You are utterly wrong.

Mr. SWAYNE: You can look up *Hansard* and see for yourself. In that Bill there was also a clause dealing with the employment of youths underground, and I think the Labour party will find, on looking up *Hansard*, that they voted against that clause also in Committee. Regarding the programme submitted by the Government this session, I think the country at large will be highly satisfied with it. I notice that two very important features in it are immigration and railway construction. We all know that in a young country like Queensland these are most essential factors. Regarding immigration, taking it broadly, here we have 617,000 people trying to hold 670,000 miles of territory, one of the finest countries on the face of the earth; and if we are to hold this country for our own people we must have more people of our own race and of our own colour to assist in doing so.

Coming to some of the measures [9 p.m.] in the programme, the Licensing Bill has been looked forward to by all sections of the community for some time; and I trust it will tend to retard the growth of an evil which I think we all regret. With respect to the Land Bank Bill, I do not think it deserves the hostile criticism to which it has been subjected. But I am pleased that amendments are to be made; and one alteration I would like to see made would be to include lands mortgaged to the Treasurer under the Sugar Works Guarantee Act, in which case the security would be quite equal to that of a selection. I am pleased that the Government are going to introduce a Sugar Works Bill. For the last two or three years I have urged the extension of the old Sugar Works Guarantee Act; but I did not take the same view as the hon. gentleman leading the Opposition. That hon. gentleman used to talk, in his enthusiasm, about seven or eight mills being wanted, but my view was that three or four would be ample, or we should be faced with over-production; and I am pleased that the Sugar Commission took the same view as was taken by me, and recommended the addition of three mills. In view of recent developments, I think it would be only business on the part of the Government to officially inquire of the Federal Government whether they have any intention of interfering with the existing duty on sugar, because I know as a practical man that without that protection it will be impossible to carry on the industry. Before I leave this subject I would like to refer at length to some statements made by Mr. Hughes. This is from Melbourne, and is dated 28th July—

“In the course of a statement about the Queensland sugar strike, Mr. Hughes to-day declared that he would not have the slightest hesitation, and that he was not speaking for himself alone, in a declaration in repealing the Customs duty on sugar-cane as a solution of the prevailing difficulties in the industry.”

He further mentions that the influence of the Colonial Sugar Refining Company is too great; but that has already been refuted by the hon. member for Burrum. He says further that “this is not a dispute between

*Mr. Swayne.*]

the farmers and their employees," but I maintain that to a great extent it is.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: No!

Lieut.-Colonel RANKIN: Who is suffering?

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: The workers and the farmers.

Mr. SWAYNE: Mr. Hughes also said that though this year "it is estimated £579,000 will be paid in bounty, the actual benefit to the grower is very small." I know it is not as large as it should be—it should be nearer £700,000—but that is a matter resting with the Federal Government themselves. As to his reference to the price of sugar, I would like to point out that it is not nearly so high as would be justified in view of the increased prices in the world's markets. By any increase in price the producer benefits. I do not think it is generally known that over £19 a ton is paid for 1A sugar, and that 90 per cent. of any rise above that goes to the raw sugar-mills, not to the refiners, who only benefit to the small extent of 2s. in the £1, and not so much as that, because the refiner's bonus is paid on the basis of the raw sugar. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down referred to the enormous profits made by the Colonial Sugar Refining Company; but if they are so great, the Federal Government have power to deal with them, because, under section 51 of the Constitution, they have power to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of trade and commerce extending over the boundaries of one State. If this is such a great octopus as has been described, I would recommend the Commonwealth Government to look into the matter, and see if they cannot deal with the company. Coming again to the price of sugar, about which Mr. Hughes makes a great deal of capital, and taking the Hamburg market as a criterion, I find that sugar has risen since January last from £11 to £15 3s. 4d. per ton; and Australians have not been asked to pay half that increase. Mr. Hughes was also misleading in what he said about the effect the removal of the duty would have on the refiners and of the effect it would have if the amount spent in bounty were added to the price of imported sugar. We all know that at times sugar has been sold in Australia at only £1 5s. over the price at which sugar would be landed under free trade conditions. We should be paying something like £9 per ton over the landed price if he was right in his contention. Again and again the question has been raised as to who pays this bounty. The hon. member who spoke last contends that it is paid by the consumer, but I would point out that such is not the case, and that has been admitted over and over again by prominent members of the Federal Parliament. For instance, Mr. Tudor brought it home very forcibly on one occasion when he asked Federal members whether, if they had to pay their salary of £400 into the Federal Treasury and only got £300 of it back, they would consider that a benefit. Yet that was a directly analogous case to our position. Again, Mr. Fisher himself, in 1902, very emphatically said that the grower paid the excise. To emphasise the point, I would point out that it is intended as a penalty upon one class of growers—that is the producers of sugar by the employment of coloured labour. Now,

[Mr. Swayne.

if it is not the grower who pays, it would be no punishment to him if the bounty were stopped. Most certainly it was designed in the first instance as a penalty on the coloured grower. I am afraid I have not got the judgment in the Harvester case with me, or I would read what Sir Samuel Griffith said on the point. I know that the Act under which the case was brought before the High Court was declared to be unconstitutional, but that has nothing to do with the illustration. Sir Samuel Griffith clearly pointed out that the excise imposed under that Act—which was similar to the sugar excise—was intended as a penalty upon the producer who produced under unfair conditions. Again I ask, if the producer is able to pass it on to the consumer, what penalty it would be on the producer? It is obvious that in both cases the excise was designed as a penalty on the producer under certain conditions, and that, as a matter of fact, it does rest on the producer. With regard to Mr. Hughes's threat, I do not think for one moment that he seriously contemplated doing what he said. I think he made the statement in a moment of spleen and in a fit of temper. Still, it is a question for the public to consider whether a man who injures the prospects of such an industry as the sugar industry, and a man who speaks lightly of it in that way in the heat of the moment, is worthy to be the Acting Prime Minister of Australia.

Mr. CORSER: Mr. Tudor said the same thing.

Mr. SWAYNE: I have here a report of a deputation that waited on Mr. Fisher on 12th August last year—

"Mr. Bamford, member for Herbert, to-day introduced to the Prime Minister Mr. Horton, of the Johnstone River, who presented a petition stating that if the Government of the Commonwealth should decide to meet the demands of Australia for more sugar, by guaranteeing the money requisite for a mill, there was no more suitable site in Queensland than on Liverpool Creek."

Of course, various reasons were advanced in support of the petition; but this is what I want to lay before hon. members—

"The Prime Minister, in reply, agreed that the Australian point of view must be taken. At the past elections, clear lines of policy had been put before the people. The former Government proposed to take evidence by Commission, prior to adopting legislative action, but his view had been different. It was that there must be security of tenure as far as legislation went. It was therefore decided to take out the time limit, and leave exactly the same incidence of protection until such time as more sugar was produced than was required."

Now, there is a distinct promise made by the Prime Minister in August last that the present rate of protection on the sugar industry would be retained until more sugar was produced than Australia could consume, and here, a few months afterwards, we have his *locum tenens* threatening us with the abolition of the duty because a certain section of the growers cannot accede to demands which would leave them with absolutely no profit for themselves. I think that under the circumstances I am quite entitled to say that Mr. Hughes's threat involves repudiation. Further, I would like to point out that this industry that Mr. Hughes threatens is carried on under ample safeguards for the protection of those who are employed in

connection with it. Section 4 of the Act which was passed last session, re-enacting the Sugar Bounty Act of 1905, provides—

“ 1. Every grower of white-grown sugar-cane or beet who claims the bounty payable under this Act shall, in making his claim, certify to the Minister the conditions of employment and the rate of wages paid to any labour employed by him, other than the labour of members of his family.

“ 2. If the Minister finds that the rate of wages and conditions of employment, or any of them—

“(a) Are below the standard rates and conditions of employment prescribed by any Commonwealth or State industrial authority; or

“(b) In the absence of any such standard applicable to the case, are below the standard rates payable and conditions of employment obtainable in the locality in which the sugar is grown; or

“(c) In the absence of any such standard rates and conditions of employment respectively, and on application by the Minister to the President of the Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration, declared not to be fair and reasonable by him or by a judge of the Supreme Court of a State, or any person or persons who compose a State industrial authority to whom he may refer the matter—

the Minister may withhold the whole or any part of the bounty payable.”

Therefore, the industry, so far as the growers are concerned, has been carried on under regulations laid down by Mr. Hughes's own Government.

Mr. THEODORE: He did not threaten the growers. He threatened the Colonial Sugar Refining Company.

Mr. SWAYNE: Where does the Colonial Sugar Refining Company come in? Regarding the milling portion of the industry, the wages paid are those laid down by a wages board award.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: In the Mackay district.

Mr. SWAYNE: Of course, that award only applies legally to the Mackay district, but the mills throughout Queensland have signified their intention of abiding by it.

Mr. THEODORE: When it suits them.

Mr. LENNON: It has no jurisdiction outside the one district, and very little there.

Mr. SWAYNE: They are voluntarily bringing themselves under its jurisdiction. We shall see what Mr. Bowman said about the Wages Boards Bill when it was being passed.

Mr. LENNON: He had not any knowledge of its working at that time. Don't forget that.

Mr. SWAYNE: The system had been tried in Victoria, and no doubt Mr. Bowman had studied it. I do not think he would have spoken in the emphatic way he did, and given it the approval he did, without having first carefully studied it. I would like to read what he said about this measure that is now so abused—at any rate, so belittled.

Mr. LENNON: He was not aware of the partisan character of a great many of the chairmen who had been appointed.

Mr. SWAYNE: I do not think it is fair to attack the character of any man who is in that position in such a way. I believe that the chairman of this particular board is a man who will hold the scales of justice evenly between man and man, and between section and section of the industry.

Mr. LENNON: Isn't he a Colonial Sugar Refining Company nominee?

Mr. SWAYNE: No.

Mr. THEODORE: Yes he is, excuse me.

Mr. SWAYNE: He was appointed under the Act by the Minister in charge of the administration of the Act. What has the Minister to do with the Colonial Sugar Refining Company? I think members on the other side have the Colonial Sugar Refining Company on the brain. As I said the other day, one of the worst things that could happen to the party opposite would be the abolition of the Colonial Sugar Refining Company. It would deprive them of about the only election gag they have got at the present time.

At 9.20 p.m.,

The SPEAKER vacated the chair, which was taken by Mr. Stodart, as Deputy Speaker.

Mr. SWAYNE: Mr. Bowman, the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, speaking on the second reading of the Wages Boards Bill in 1907, said—

“The measure introduced this afternoon by the Secretary for Public Works is one which I am sure appeals to both sides of the House. I was very pleased when I found the Minister introducing it apart from the amendment of the Factories and Shops Act with which it was combined last year. The arguments used this afternoon go to show that wages boards tend towards the improvement of wages of those who do not consider they have been getting fair remuneration for their labour. One thing has been largely overlooked by many members who have spoken on the Opposition side, and that is that wages boards have been introduced to prevent the recurrence of the strikes which have taken place in the past. We are anxious to effect a settlement of any dispute that may arise between employer and employees. Hence our desire to get some form of legislation that will meet the requirements of those who have clamoured for it so long.”

The hon. member's prophecy has been fulfilled, for we find that, taking the wages boards' awards generally, wages have been increased by from 15 to 20 per cent. The hon. member went on to say—

“I cannot understand the hon. member for Moreton. He talks about it being more likely to lead to strikes. I will tell you what it will do. It will give an opportunity for a body of men who have a grievance to ask permission to come under the protection of that board.”

At twenty-one minutes past 9 o'clock,

Mr. THEODORE called attention to the state of the House.

Quorum formed.

Mr. SWAYNE, resuming: Again, Mr. Bowman said—

“When I compare the wages of many trades, and some were quoted by other hon. members to-night from “Coghlan”—when you compare these wages as they were compared last session with the wages paid here and the wages paid in Melbourne—I think that any hon. gentleman who desires to see a change in the affairs of Queensland regarding wages and putting down

*Mr. Swayne.]*

the sweating that exists—I think ought to heartily endorse this Bill and widen its scope as far as possible. I am informed by certain employees in different trades that they are anxiously looking forward to the passage of this Bill.

\* \* \* \* \*

“Some hon. gentleman this afternoon seemed to think the enforcement of these penalties would be too stringent, but I do not think so, as any award given by these bodies should be carried out.

“Hon. E. B. FORREST: By both parties?  
“Mr. BOWMAN: Yes; by both parties. No party should be allowed to violate the award which has been come to after due deliberation and decided on for a specified time. It would be unfair to both employers and employees if that award were not carried out until the time lapsed according to the agreement made by the board.”

That is the attitude which was taken up by the party opposite when that measure was before the House, and there was not a single member of the party who gainsaid what the hon. member said on that occasion.

Mr. LENNON: What does that prove? Your party advocated it.

Mr. SWAYNE: Yes, we supported it, and we are not disowning it, but members opposite are. That is the difference between us. With regard to the working of those boards in Victoria, I have an extract from the *Federal Hansard*, No. 33, page 4936—

“Sir JOHN QUICK: The sixty wages boards in Victoria affect industries employing 67,000 hands, and the result of their decisions has been to increase the wages earned by no less than £500,000 per annum. In the five States I have named there is a most liberal and generous exercise of the powers of government for the settlement of disputes in the interests of labour, and also, I hope, of employers. The workers in those States enjoy the benefit of the sound and impartial judgment of the industrial tribunals which have been set up.”

The hon. member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. Bowman, expressed a hope that the awards would be binding on both parties. I think it is only fair that they should be binding on both parties. Any law that affects one section only is an unfair law. If we go to law and the verdict is against us we have to abide by that verdict and take the consequences. The question is what can be done to make these awards binding—how the awards can be carried out so as to accomplish the purpose intended when the Act was passed—that is, the prevention of strikes. I am well aware that there was a time when a strike was the only weapon the working man had to secure justice. We know that the working man at one time laboured under many wrongs, and that the only way in which he could assert himself was by means of a strike. But now that we have legislation for settling industrial disputes, strikes should be a thing of the past. Bodies of men have no more right to take the law into their own hands than an individual has, and we would not approve of a man assaulting another man because he owed him some money. Why, then, should we approve of similar conduct in industrial disputes? I notice that other States are taking steps to penalise men who stir up industrial disputes needlessly, as is shown by the following extract:—

“Recently in the New South Wales Parliament (a Labour Government be it remembered) Mr. Beeby brought forward his proposal to

[Mr. Swayne.

consider the expediency of bringing in a Bill to provide for the regulation of the conditions of industries in certain particulars by means of industrial conciliation and arbitration, and for the repression of lockouts and strikes; to establish and define the powers, jurisdiction, and procedure of an industrial court and certain subsidiary tribunals; to preserve certain awards and industrial agreements; and to repeal previous Acts.

“It was proposed to impose penalties on any individual in the State who provoked a strike without giving reasonable notice to the Minister as to industrial unrest existing in the industry. Where a strike did take place, the individual would be subject to a fine, which would be enforceable without the alternative of imprisonment. It would be enforced upon his wages wherever he worked until the fine was paid. Any persons who aided or abetted an unlawful strike would be subject to a fine, and in addition the court might grant an injunction restraining them from repeating the offence. If the injunction was disobeyed the court would be empowered to commit them for trial for a misdemeanour. The man would be committed for trial for the offence of disobeying an order of the court. Any union aiding and abetting a strike would be liable to a fine of £1,000, and in addition the extra power would be conferred on the court to take away from the union benefits it was enjoying under an award.”

Again we find that section 6 of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act provides that—

“No person or organisation shall, on account of any industrial dispute, do anything in the nature of a lockout or strike, or continue any lockout or strike. Penalty, one thousand pounds.”

I commend that proposal to the attention of the Government when they are introducing amending legislation this session. Any right-thinking person will agree that these disputes are an evil, and that there is need to stop them. Taking the losses which have been caused by three strikes only, I find that they amount to an enormous sum. The losses in wages caused by the strike at the Broken Hill Proprietary Mine amounted to £200,000; the losses from that strike in connected industries £500,000; the losses in wages through the Newcastle strike amounted to £2,022,688; and the losses from the Harvester strike amounted to £60,000. Roughly speaking, there was a loss over these three strikes of £2,700,000, and

I say that it is time these strikes [9.30 p.m.] were stopped. The loss in output in connection with the Harvester works owing to the strike was also estimated at £300,000. Next to the question of immigration and railway construction, this is the greatest question which we have before us. Before I sit down I should like to refer to a speech made by the hon. member for Bowen with reference to his refusal to accompany a deputation to Melbourne last year to ask for an increase of the so-called bounty, but it is really a rebate on the excise granted to white-grown sugarcane. The hon. member for Bowen identifies myself and the Australian Sugar Producers' Association with the suggestion made by the Premier, Mr. Denham, that the £1 difference between the bounty and excise should be funded and used as such, in case of over-production, to encourage an export trade. Speaking personally, I do not agree with the Premier's views on that point. I take the ground that that £1 difference belongs to the grower, and it should be given back to him in the shape of a bounty. The hon. member for Bowen said he would challenge any member on this side to show that our request for the return of £1 would mean

that it would go to the grower. Well, if it is done in the form in which I ask for it, it must go to the grower, as no one else could get it.

Mr. FERRICKS: What is to prevent the manufacturer taking it off the producers' cane?

Mr. SWAYNE: They have not got the power to do that. Take some of the co-operative mills, for instance. I ask the hon. member for Bowen how it could be taken from the grower in that case? At the beginning of the season a basis price is struck which is, in the case I am referring to, the lowest price they can afford to pay. It is generally fixed at 12s. per ton, and they know that they can pay that. Certain fixed charges, such as interest and redemption for the Government, are provided for, and the cost of manufacture is also provided for. At the end of the season anything that is left over is paid over direct to the grower, shareholders and non-shareholders alike. In such a case as that, how can it be taken from the grower? I am not going into the question now, because we will have it all again to-morrow, and after hearing the hon. member for Bowen to-morrow I may have something to say in reply to him. If the mills find the refiners grossly unjust, as he says, then they can make for the open market itself.

Mr. THEODORE: Why did the millers refuse the offer made to them by Mr. Tudor to equalise the excise and bounty?

Mr. SWAYNE: That is a different matter altogether. You know we debate strike matter now.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the hon. member for Mackay to address the Chair. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. SWAYNE: That is what Mr. Ferricks said the other night in reference to his refusal to accompany the deputation to Melbourne—

"The junior member for Mackay the other night also touched upon this subject, and made certain mention of his belief that the deputy leader of this party and myself had not done the correct thing when we refused to join him in visiting Melbourne to ask the Federal Government for the equalisation of the bounty and excise. The hon. member for Herbert and myself never discussed this matter before giving our respective answers to Mr. Swayne, and, to my recollection, we have not discussed it since, except to pass a casual remark. My reasons for refusing were that I was not going to wax enthusiastic on any approach to the Federal Government to have the excise and bounty equalised, unless I could see that the extra £1 was going to the sugar-growers."

Well, I made it clear that it would go to the growers—

"And the fact of the Premier's scheme being made public, showing that it is going to be placed in a pool and placed to a fund to enable the sugar refining monopoly to compete with the export of the world's sugar, gave every justification for our refusal to join in that deputation."

The Premier's scheme was not made public then, nor mentioned for months after—

"It is not quite a fair thing that that extra £1 should go into the Federal revenue, but, in my opinion, that would be more desirable than for it to be hoarded up and put to the benefit of bousting up the Colonial Sugar Refining monopoly. Assuming the Premier's scheme

were carried into effect, it would mean that the Colonial Sugar Refining monopoly, who can import sugar into Australia from Java—not so cheaply as the hon. member for Cairns says, but still a little under the cost of production of our sugars in Queensland—they could import their sugars from Java, refine them here, and then supply the needs of the Commonwealth, or something approaching them, and then they could use our Australian-produced article for export over the world, backed up by this £1 per ton, which the Premier, in his scheme, desires to take off the growers of sugar. They take the £1, and the Premier is going to back them up, and the scheme has received the smiling approval of the Australian Sugar Producers' Association, and that in itself should be sufficient condemnation of any proposal emanating from that source."

There was no suggestion that it should be paid into that fund. I have the reports here regarding the Australian Sugar Producers' Association. Officially I have nothing to do with that body, but there is no one here to speak for them, and, as I do not like to see an injustice done, I will quote here the resolution that was passed at a conference of that body held on the 12th of June, 1911. It is as follows:—

"That, in view of the increased cost of production, both in the field and in the mills, this council affirms the imperative necessity of increased assistance to the growers, by way of equalisation of rebate and excise."

That resolution endorsed the view that was expressed in accordance with my deputation to Melbourne, as, in so far as they were concerned, they believed that the excise and bounty should be equalised. Going back to the beginning of the year, the "Sugar Journal" gives the report of the conference held in Maryborough on the 19th of January, in which it says—

"The secretary (Mr. Pritchard), in explaining the steps taken by the association to get the amount of the rebate and excise equalised, said that when legislation was taken up by the Federal Government, with the object merely of extending the operation of excise and rebate, the executive of the association thought it time to bring up the question of recovering for the growers the £1 difference between excise and rebate. So as to meet an objection which had been raised in centres to the effect that the manufacturers might not, in all instances, give the £1 if the excise were allowed to run off, they had considered that the simplest way would be to move an amendment, so that the rebate would be increased to £4, thereby becoming equal to the excise."

Mr. FERRICKS: The Australian Sugar Producers' Association afterwards endorsed the Premier's scheme.

Mr. SWAYNE: No, they did not; they passed their own resolutions. They are quite opposed to the Premier's scheme.

Mr. THEODORE: That article was written after the Premier's speech.

Mr. SWAYNE: Action was taken before. I was speaking from memory about Mr. Fisher's attitude on this equalisation of the rebate and excise, and here I have got the full text of his statement. Speaking on 11th February, 1902, Mr. Fisher said, at page 9900 of the Federal *Hansard*—

"The proposed rebate of 4s. per ton of cane grown solely by white labour and containing 10 per cent. of sugar is equivalent to a rebate of £2 per ton of sugar; and as the excise upon

*Mr. Swayne.]*



sugar is to be £3 per ton, the grower who employs white labour will have to pay an excise tax of £1 per ton."

Again, on page 9901, he said—

"In the very first communication I had with the Government I stated that, in my opinion, the whole of the excise should go to the white grower."

As showing the revenue that the Federal Government got out of us, I find that for the year ending June, 1911, this excise took £146,792 out of the pockets of the canegrowers in Queensland. We know that last year Queensland grew 210,000 tons of sugar, and therefore on that portion grown by white farmers will amount to something like £200,000. I quoted, a while ago, the judges of the High Court, as showing that the excise is paid directly by the producer. I have a copy of the judgment here, which I will read to corroborate my statement. In the judgment on the Harvester excise case, the Chief Justice of the High Court of Australia, Sir Samuel Griffith, spoke thus—

"Goods which are indistinguishable by any physical attributes are nevertheless differentiated for the purpose of taxation, according as certain prescribed conditions have or have not been observed, and that any manufacturer who failed to comply should be liable to a penalty (excise) of so much for every article manufactured."

Showing that the producer, the manufacturer, in this case pays it. I think I have made it pretty clear that Hughes has made a most unwarrantable threat against one of Queensland's chief industries, which will have a bad effect upon the industry unless it is retracted, and I think I have given good grounds for my assertion that the tax of excise and bounty is a tax on the producer of Queensland, and also that the hon. member for Bowen was incorrect when he said that the deputation he declined to join was directed to the making of a fund for the subsidising of future export and not to the grower direct. Coming back to the programme of the Government, there is one thing which should gratify members who are supporting the Government, and that is the weakness of the attack on the Government from the other side of the House—I do not think I have ever witnessed a weaker attack. Boiled down, it consists of charges of maladministration at Goodna, but the Home Secretary made it clear that further provision had been made there. There was a reprehensible attempt to cast discredit on the Government in connection with the "Yongala" disaster. I spoke to shipmasters as I came down the coast, and they held the opinion that no matter what lights had been provided it would have made no difference. In any case, the care of lights is under the Commonwealth Government. In this connection, when Mr. Chapman, the Federal Minister for Customs, was up on the North Queensland coast, I took the opportunity, with others, to draw his attention to the need for a light on Steep Island, between Rockhampton and the Percys. The matter was also pointed out to Mr. Tudor when he was in Mackay. Leaving what is past, I should like to draw attention to the fact that masters of ships on this coast think that unless some provision is made on that part of the coast some disaster will take place there. I think there are something like 120 miles thickly studded with rocks and islets. The Chambers of

[*Mr. Swayne.*

Commerce in Mackay and Townsville both asked that the light should be put there. With regard to our public lands, we put up a record last year in the way of land settlement, the number of settlers being greater than in previous years; in fact, has doubled during the last five years, showing the department is making every effort to cope with the satisfactory increasing demand for Queensland land. One matter to which considerable time has been devoted by hon. members opposite is the question of infantile mortality, and the maladministration of our Pure Foods Act. I quite agree that this is a most serious matter, but on looking up the figures I find there is no ground for the dire apprehensions of hon. members opposite. During the last seven years infant mortality has been reduced from 11.99 per cent. to 7.19 per cent., roughly speaking a fall of something like 4½ per cent., so I fail to see the justification for the various criticisms made on the Government in that respect. I also find that, in connection with the administration of the Health Department and pure foods, 4,553 analyses were taken. Something like 146 tons of foodstuff were tested, and thirty-three convictions obtained. As I said before, I think the Government have placed a very satisfactory programme before the country, and before this session terminates, I hope to see the greater part of it placed on the statute-book.

At 9.50 p.m.,

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Mr. MULLAN (*Charters Towers*): The hon. member for Moreton has already received a severe and well-deserved castigation from this side of the House because of his shameful attack on the Prime Minister of Australia, and I do not wish to unnecessarily further flog that hon. member, although, perhaps, he well deserves it for his unwarrantable attack. But his flogging is doubly deserved when we realise the sordid motives which actuated his statements. He said in his speech—

"We have all along been dependent on Great Britain for the money needed for 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 long, but may do a great deal of harm."

That is the shoddy patriotism we receive from members on the opposite side who speak about loyalty. I say, without parading the actions of the Labour party in Australia, that they have done more for the loyalty of Australia by building up a citizen force and acquiring a navy of our own, than was ever done by the opponents of the Labour party, and if this country were to be invaded, I have no doubt that the hon. member for Moreton would probably be found with his money-bags hidden in a hollow log in the remotest recesses of the Moreton instead of fighting, as the members of this party would be prepared to do. A transformation has come over this Chamber since we went into recess. The once haughty head of the Government has retired into his limbo of rest, and perhaps it might be well to consider what was the reason which prompted that gentleman to make this unexpected and rather irregular retirement. We know very well that he went South early in the year with the avowed purpose of organising a conference

to oppose the referendum. Unfortunately for himself, he found that the Labour party were in power in New South Wales and in South Australia, and they held dominion in the Federal Parliament over the entire continent. He found there was a complete change in the political atmosphere of Australia. The hon. gentleman got a shock that was only equalled by the shock which Lord Chelmsford gave him when he gave a dissolution to the hon. member for Townsville in 1907, and he hurriedly returned a very much chastened politician, and on his arrival he was horrified to learn that bad as the position was below, it was worse here, because a conspiracy was being hatched to dethrone him. So he hastily summoned the gentleman who now leads the Government, and offered to surrender on terms. The terms were, as we all know now, that he should receive the only position that was likely to be available for some time—that was one of the vacancies on the Land Court—and the other substantial understanding was that he should receive a commission to go home and float the £10,000,000 loan, and do a bit of work regarding the conversion of the maturing £14,000,000 loan. He expected to have a nice little commission to deal with £24,000,000. A very nice thing indeed.

Mr. CORSER: What a vast imagination you have!

Mr. MULLAN: As the hon. member for Fortitude Valley says, he did not get this in writing. We know very well the caucus proved false to him, because they went back both on the present Premier and on the past Premier by absolutely repudiating that part of the contract, and I am very pleased the Government members took that stand. After all, what an inglorious ending for a man who, early in this year, was preaching the gospel of the independence of Queensland. Here is a man who one week was preaching that he was going to defend the independence of Queensland, and the next week he was making a rush for a £1,000 per annum billet from that country whose independence was in such danger. Fancy this man deserting his post in the hour of danger! Fancy any man who regarded himself as a patriot deserting his country in the hour of danger instead of manfully coming forward and defending it with the last drop of his blood! Such is the patriotism which hon. members on the other side boast of. Before dismissing that gentleman for ever, I wish to refer to what he said to the Press on retiring. He made the statement that Queensland should have a continual stream of young men coming into her service and pushing her along. My experience is this: That the politicians on the other side of the House are too busy in pushing themselves along to think very much about pushing the country along, and the gentleman who uttered those words was, perhaps, more eager than any other in pushing himself along, and pushing himself into a good billet and pushing the young men he was talking about out of that billet, because after all, I say the men in the Lands Office, who understood the administration of the Lands Department, they were the men who should have had first say for a position of that sort, and I say it is degrading to public life when politicians can, with immunity, command, demand, and secure positions like that from any Government. We know very well that in this arrangement the pre-

sent Premier is responsible, because he condoned the offence. He was quite prepared to give the late Premier anything so long as he did not have to pay for it—so long as the people of Queensland had to pay for it, and so long as he was exalted to his present position. That is not the way the government of a country should be conducted. I hold that the men in the service of the State should have the right to aspire to the highest positions in the State, and it will be a very bad thing for the various departments when the men in those departments come to believe that they have no hope of aspiring to the highest positions. I say the blue ribbon of the service should be available to every man. What prospect is there for our Under Secretaries, for our chief clerks, and for our most distinguished public servants if politicians step in and capture those positions? I say it is not right, and it is demoralising to the tone of public life in Queensland. Even a lad porter, before he enters the service, has to undergo a rigid examination of its kind, while here is a man who steps into one of the highest positions of the land without any qualification whatever except that he happened to be in authority for a time, and he was able to dictate the terms on which he would surrender his position.

Mr. FOLEY: He is a doctor now.

Mr. MULLAN: I will not refer to that except to say perhaps there is some peculiar relation between the fact that he was placed by the present Government on the Land Court to adjudicate on matters with which he was totally unacquainted, and in getting the peculiar title of Doctor of Laws. Now, I would like to say a word about our reconstructed Ministry. To my mind, the present

Ministry is what physiologists [10 p.m.] would call a clear case of political atavism. We know that in Nature there is a constant tendency in plants and animals to revert to the original type. This is called by some a freak of Nature; but it is not—it is an inevitable law. We find that in September, 1903, an alliance was formed between some members of the old Philp party and some of the more advanced elements in the Queensland Parliament, and ever since then there has been a constant tendency for that coalition to revert to the original type; and thus we have a case of political atavism—or a political freak, perhaps—a return to the old Tory party of plunder and blunder. On the front bench opposite, out of seven Ministers we find that six of them once bowed allegiance to the hon. member for Townsville, Hon. R. Philp. The gentleman who led the Government last year said, "My politics must be coloured by those who sit behind me," and the same thing applies to the present Premier; and, seeing that six out of seven Ministers are members of the old Philp party, of course we have the old Philp policy back again—unfortunately for the people of Queensland. Now, a few words as to the personnel of the Ministry. The present Premier managed to secure his post by a practice to which I would be sorry to see any member on this side resort. He certainly possesses ability, but everybody who knows his history must recognise that he lacks stability. If I were to go into the political pedigree of the hon. member, I might say in sporting parlance that he was by Philp out of Oxley.

Mr. Mullan.]

The SPEAKER: Order! I must remind the hon. member that personal allusions are distinctly disorderly.

Mr. MULLAN: Of course, I am speaking in a political sense. One of his first votes in this House was in favour of the poll tax—a most iniquitous tax in any British community. When this party tried to inaugurate the grand principle of old-age pensions, the hon. gentleman voted against the motion for introducing a Bill dealing with the matter. Then the hon. gentleman deserted, in his hour of trial, his old leader, the Hon. R. Philp, for the sake of a portfolio in the Morgan Administration. Then after he was supposed to have been kicked off the "Lucinda" by the late Premier, he went back to the old parent stock. Then he managed to scramble into the "forlorn-hope" Ministry formed in 1907; and in 1908 we find him, like the canine, licking the hand that chastised him and becoming a colleague of the Hon. W. Kidston again. He left Mr. Kidston in 1907 because he said he could not subscribe to the Rockhampton programme; in the year 1908 he comes in again and pledges himself to support that programme. That is a remarkable political history; and it is just as well that the people of Queensland should be told that history. And, lest they should be deceived by the hon. gentleman's silvery oratory, it is as well to remember that he can be very deceptive at times. Here is a statement made by the hon. gentleman at a political meeting in Brisbane to a number of society ladies. It was directed against the Labour party at a critical time, when they wanted the votes of working people. He said, "They should sit with the wives of working men and shake hands with them, even if it was only till the election was over." I read that to place hon. members and electors generally on their guard, and prevent them from being misled. The unwary public are often prepared to believe anything a politician states, and it is as well to let them know the peculiar traits of the hon. gentleman politically. One of the chief objections I have to the hon. gentleman as Premier is that he does not regard the happiness of the people of the State as the prime function of a Government; and I assert that no man should be elevated to that position in any civilised community if he does not believe that the prime function of a Government is to secure the happiness of the people. I will quote from *Hansard* of 1908 a remarkable statement made by the hon. gentleman. He said: "I do not allow that the prime function of any Government is to secure the happiness of the people." Let the people remember that at the hustings.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Is that the whole quotation?

Mr. MULLAN: I will allow the hon. gentleman, when I resume my seat, to make any quotation he chooses to make in reference to the matter. So much for the Premier at present. He has introduced into his Cabinet, as Minister for Lands, the hon. member for North Brisbane, the Hon. Mr. Macartney; and a good Attorney-General has thus been lost to make an indifferent Minister for Lands, because, while nobody denies the hon. gentleman's ability or integrity, we have a right to question his capability to properly administer such a complex department as the Lands.

[Mr. Mullan.

I am sure that the hon. gentleman would not have been in that position but for his candid criticism of the Government last year. He was so candid, and succeeded so well because of his candid criticism, that we have a flock of candid friends on the Government side this session. We know very well that the Secretary for Agriculture secured his position by the very same method that was adopted by the hon. member for Brisbane North, although I must admit that he was not quite so rash—he kept nearer to his boat than the other hon. member did. The appointment of the hon. gentleman is certainly rough on such distinguished agricultural experts as the hon. member for Cambooya and the hon. member for Aubigny. It is pretty rough that those hon. members should be supplanted by a gentleman who, according to the statements made by very excellent judges, is certainly not entitled to the position. We know very well that Mr. Kidston was recognised in this House as a very excellent authority as to who were the best men to administer the various departments. The present Secretary for Agriculture recognised the ability of Mr. Kidston, and swore allegiance to him, and yet that gentleman on one occasion, when speaking of the Secretary for Agriculture at a time when he refused to support Mr. Kidston, said, "His price was a portfolio, and he was not worth it." (Opposition laughter.) That is not my opinion. I am not giving my opinion of the hon. gentleman. I am giving the opinion of an old associate—his old leader. We know very well that the Secretary for Public Instruction was put into the Ministry for various reasons—to save the prestige of the Ministry, for one. We know very well that he was practically put there as a bribe—or as a sop, if I am not permitted to use the word "bribe"—to the electors of Rockhampton; but I am glad to say that the incorruptible electors of Rockhampton hurled the bribe in the teeth of the Government, and put Mr. Adamson at the head of the poll. And this brings me to the remarkable change in public opinion exhibited towards the present Administration as shown by the figures in the Rockhampton, Enoggera, and Dalby elections. Here we have a remarkable revulsion of public feeling, and the only possible conclusion we can draw is that the people who had the opportunity of pronouncing judgment on the Government do not believe in the present party in power. Make no mistake about it, the issue in the Rockhampton election was the present Government as reconstructed, and the vote there was that, whilst in 1909 the Government had a majority of 637, at the last election the people out of disgust at what had taken place—and particularly out of disgust at the Government as reconstructed—returned the present member, Mr. Adamson, by a majority of sixteen. Then in Enoggera we find that whilst the late Treasurer, Mr. Hawthorn, had a majority of 988 in 1909, the majority of the present member, Mr. Trout, has dwindled down to 139, and he was very lucky to be able to save his political skin. Then we come to Dalby—an electorate we could not contest at the previous election, and yet on this occasion we came within 250 of the votes recorded for the Government candidate. The Premier, in a laughing mood, told us how the Hon. Andrew Fisher fell down with fright when he heard the result of the Federal referenda, but my goodness, what kind of nightmare must the Premier have had after reading the figures

which I have just enumerated? If they are an index of what is going to happen when the people have an opportunity of trying conclusions with the Government, I am—I was going to say “sorry”—but I should rather say “glad”—for the fate of the Government. There is a passage in the Governor’s Speech dealing with the wreck of the “Yongala.” Whilst I join with those in this House who sympathise with the bereaved ones in that terrible disaster, I cannot help thinking that there is a great deal of cant and hypocrisy in some of these remarks, when we consider the attitude taken up by the present Premier immediately after that disaster, in the direction of making political capital out of it.

LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MULLAN: If the hon. gentlemen who control the affairs of this country would only let the people know their innermost thoughts—if they were only straightforward—if they were only consistent in the Governor’s Speech with their actions prior to the time the Speech was written, this paragraph would have appeared in this form—

“The Seamen’s Compensation Act of 1909, passed by the Federal Parliament, having been declared *ultra vires* as a whole by the Federal High Court in December of last year, the widows and orphans of the “Yongala’s” seamen were not entitled to compensation. Trade and commerce have thus been exempted from the financial responsibilities of that Act, and my advisers, by assisting to defeat the Federal referenda, have been able to further postpone the day when the shipping companies trading on our coast will be taxed to pay compensation to the widows and orphans of shipwrecked seamen.”

LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MULLAN: That is the real paragraph that should have appeared if the Government wished to be consistent in their writings with their actions.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is entirely out of order in placing words in the mouth of the representative of His Majesty. The Speech from the Throne is the Speech of His Excellency the Governor, and the hon. member has no right to manufacture words to put in the mouth of His Excellency.

Mr. MULLAN: I am quite sure that such a statement was furthest from His Excellency’s sentiments; but, of course, I cannot overlook the fact that His Excellency is but the mouth-piece of the Government, and has to express whatever is practically dictated by the Government. Whilst theoretically we may think otherwise, practically we know that that is so. However, I will dismiss my reference to the wreck of the “Yongala” by stating that, in opposing the referenda and making it impossible for the Federal Government to legalise the Seamen’s Compensation Act of 1909, or to introduce another measure of that nature, the Government have postponed the day when it will be possible for the widows and orphans of shipwrecked seamen to receive compensation such as I have indicated. We have heard a great deal about the prosperous times; but again I wish to state that the working men of Queensland are not receiving their share of the prosperity that is prevailing in Queensland to-day. We know that the tendency at the present day is towards a system which places a few millionaires at one end of the social scale and millions of paupers at the

other. We know that the whole trend of modern society is in that direction, unfortunately, so far as it is represented by the members on the other side of the Chamber. But I am glad to say that our party have inaugurated a policy and method by which that sort of thing will be altered. It is high time that something was done to give to the worker a fair share of the product of his industry. To show that the tendency is towards further exploiting of the worker, I shall quote a few figures. I take as an example the eighteenth annual report of the Commissioner for Labour in the United States of America on the productivity of labour. The figures I am about to quote cover a period extending from 1870 to 1900. The product of pigiron per man in America was 66 tons in 1870, but owing to improved appliances—to the use of steam, electricity, and the other remarkable inventions of mankind—it was 395 tons in 1900, representing an increase of 598 per cent. The average profit made from each worker per annum was 322 dollars in 1870, and 900 dollars in 1900, representing an increase in the profits of 279 per cent. Now I come to the most dismal part of the story. The wages per man per annum were 453 dollars in 1870, and 506 dollars in 1900, representing an increase of only 11 per cent. The whole productivity in that industry increased by 598 per cent., the profits of the capitalists by 279 per cent., and the wages of the unfortunate worker by only 11 per cent. That is the sort of thing that gives us millionaires and paupers in one country at the same time, although conditions may be prosperous. Again, in 1850 the worker received 36.1 per cent. of the product of his labour, and since then it has been decreasing. In 1860 he received only 31.2 per cent.; in 1870, 31.3 per cent.; in 1890, 30.5 per cent.; and in 1900 only 27 per cent. Going on in the same ratio it will come down to 25 per cent. in 1910. How can the workers be prosperous under those circumstances? How can they be prosperous when the profits of their labour are going into the pockets of other persons? I came across a very remarkable statement in a book entitled “Men v. Man,” by La Monte and Meuchen, which proves beyond doubt, if any further proof were needed, that the worker receives nothing like adequate compensation for his work. The writers say—

“If all males between the ages of twenty-five and forty-five worked four hours per day, we could produce enough to keep our whole population in such comfort as to-day requires an income of 5,000 dollars per annum.”

That would be providing every man with the full product of his labour. Those figures should cause even members on the other side of the House to reflect. The solution, and the only solution, of the problem is the realisation of the Labour party’s objective—the securing the full product of their industry to every man and woman in the land. We do not want in Australia the conditions they have in the United States, where millions starve in the midst of plenty, and live in miserable hovels, from which God’s sunlight is obscured by the palaces of the rich. We do not ask for the workers a living wage. The day is past when we should be content with a fair wage. What we want for the worker is a full wage, the full product of his industry. With regard to immigration, I should like to call the attention of the

Mr. Mullan. 1

leader of the Government to the remarkable statements made by the Hon. Dr. Taylor in the Upper House. I am not going into the particulars of those statements, but if his statements regarding immigration be true, then the position is very serious; and whether they are true or not, I hold that it is the bounden duty of the Government immediately to make a most exhaustive inquiry into them, and if things be as they are represented by that hon. gentleman, to have them rectified, because if they are as represented they are not creditable to the Government. The hon. member for Moreton referred the other evening to the amount of money that was spent by the Commonwealth Government on old-age pensions, and said that it was about one-ninth of the revenue of Australia. The deduction which was drawn by the hon. member from those figures was that it was a very bad advertisement for Australia. I think the contrary—that it is a very excellent advertisement for Australia. If we had more laws like that, we would not have to pay people to come here. They would come of their own volition. It should be the policy of the Government, as it is the policy of this side, to create conditions here which of themselves would be sufficiently seductive to induce men to leave the old country and come here to improve their positions. We have been told again and again in this House and in the country that the class of men who are coming here are not poor men, and we have had returns published showing the amount of wealth they have brought with them to Queensland. Is it a fair thing, if they are bringing so much wealth with them, that the unfortunate working man of Queensland should, out of his miserable pittance, have to pay for bringing out men to compete with them who are in a better position financially than himself? I say it is monstrous. I do not know what the miners of Queensland have done that the Government should have taken upon themselves to wire to the Agent-General that no miners need apply. Hon members will recollect that the Hon. Andrew Fisher addressed the miners of Tonypany, who by a strike were manfully asserting their rights: that he told them of the potentialities and possibilities of this country, and that the Premier, fearing that we might get some of those men in Queensland, wired to the Agent-General that we did not want the men of Tonypany, that no miners need apply. I hope the miners of Queensland will remember that when next they have an opportunity of calling the Government to account for their extraordinary action on that occasion. The Government allege that they are endeavouring to promote settlement. I am sorry that they are giving very little evidence of it. We have alienated 22,000,000 acres of land, and we have expended £26,000,000 in building railways to develop those lands. Yet we have the remarkable position of affairs that only 738,447 acres are under cultivation, or equal to 3.4 per cent. [10.30 p.m.] of the total area alienated. It shows that the taxpayer of the country is not getting a fair deal. The taxpayer of Queensland has had to put his hand into his pocket to pay interest on that £26,000,000, and he will later on be called upon to redeem that money when it matures, yet the only purpose it has so far served is to open up 738,447 acres of country and to enormously enhance the estates of gentlemen who have been so fortunate as to get in

[*Mr. Mullan.*

early. If the lands alienated and available for settlement were brought under cultivation, or if the Government took steps to bring them under cultivation, as they should do, then the Government would be able to double their railway revenue inside a couple of years. If this is not done, then a financial catastrophe awaits this country. The financial statement issued by the Government to the country discloses this fact. The total revenue last financial year from all sources was £5,320,008 4s. 5d., and out of that sum the railway receipts came to £2,706,887 13s. 10d., so that over one-half the entire receipts to the consolidated revenue of Queensland last year came from railways. What does that mean? It means that unless we can immediately bring more lands under cultivation and thus enormously increase the freights and fares on our lines—

Mr. PAYNE: They are too high already.

Mr. MULLAN: I mean in volume, and unless we do it by putting these lands under cultivation, we must be confronted with a serious and inevitable deficit in the event of a drought. Nothing can save us from a dangerous deficit, because we are practically depending for our solvency on our railway receipts. If we have a drought then Queensland is confronted straight away with a financial crisis, and the only way to avert that is while we have good seasons and while the country is undergoing a certain amount of prosperity to compel these people who hold land to use it or else allow someone else to use it. (Hear, hear!) I would impose such conditions on them that it would not be possible for them to hold unused the valuable land of Queensland. Lands are now being held for speculative purposes, and we know that the £26,000,000 we have spent in development has been spent for the most part in enhancing the value of the land and in putting the land into the hands of speculators and land-sharks. And the worker has to bear the brunt of it all, because the worker has to pay the biggest dole of the interest bill every time. There is nothing very much in the Government programme. I am pleased to see that the Government are going to introduce a Pure Food Bill, but it will not be much if it is tainted with the politics of the gentlemen sitting behind the Government. I will refer to some figures given by the junior member for Mackay. That hon. gentleman pointed out that the necessity for a Pure Food Bill was not so great and that the infantile mortality was not exceptional. I do not know where the hon. gentleman got his figures, as they do not tally with mine. My figures are taken from the Government Statistician's book, and they disclose the remarkable position that the infantile mortality in the metropolitan area in Queensland is 84.22 per 1,000, whilst in the country areas, except the metropolitan area—the mortality is 56.21 per 1,000, showing that the infantile mortality is 28.01 per 1,000 greater in the metropolitan area than it is in the country. What do we take from those figures except that the majority of them are milk-poisoned. We know from analysis that the people of Brisbane are paying a high fee, not for milk, but for water. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. FOLEY: And bad water at that.

Mr. MULLAN: It is a dreadful thing to think that our babies and our helpless

invalids should be at the mercy of those persons, as they are practically being murdered by the milk vendors of Queensland. It is about time that the Government did something in this matter, but I do not expect that they will do anything. They have at last recognised that something should be done, and I hope they will do it. It is about time that we had this so-called comprehensive measure dealing with State children brought forward. The most attractive part of it is the name. The Government have tolerated the position whereby the mother of children can only receive under certain circumstances 5s. per child per week for maintenance, while the foster-mother can receive 6s. 8d. per child per week. It is a monstrous state of affairs that such things should be tolerated by any Government. I am not inclined to blame the hon. gentleman who administers that department, as I believe he is a humane man, but, unfortunately, he is restricted by the greedy, grasping, parsimonious policy of the Government with which he is associated. There is a Liquor Bill on the programme, and my attitude towards that is like that of the deputy leader of the Opposition, one of intense curiosity to see what it contains. But I am surprised to find that gentlemen who prated so much, and who told us so much about the Licensing Bill, have not got the courage to father it and make it a party question. (Hear, hear!) We have had some hints from the other side, and I suppose they disclose in an irregular and informal way some of the discussions in caucus. Sometimes things leak out in this House, and we have had two Government members getting up in this House and telling us what must have been discussed in caucus. We had the hon. member for Murilla, Mr. Morgan, saying he was in favour of the reorganisation and reinstating of the postal-vote, and the hon. member for Cambooya to-day said he wanted to revert to the old property-vote. That is the very thing we suspected. Here we have the Government going back to the old days of the continuous Government. It is the old continuous Government over again. They want to reintroduce the postal-vote and the property-vote. It is just as well that the people of Queensland should realise that.

Mr. FOLEY: It is a wonder they do not want to introduce the baby vote again.

Mr. MULLAN: There is a paragraph in the Governor's Speech which is of particular importance to the electorate I represent, and that is the one referring to the report of the Miners' Health Commission. The paragraph reads—

"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."

Whilst that paragraph as applied to the Opposition is perfectly true—that we are prepared to do all we can to reduce the ravages of this terrible disease—I doubt very much whether the Government is. The only proof of that is that last session when the Mines Regulation Bill was going through the House, and the members of the Opposition were eager to improve the Bill in the direction of trying to deal with this terrible disease, the Bill was guillotined and gagged by the late leader of the Go-

vernment. There are many paragraphs in the Miners' Phthisis Commission which disclose a very serious state of affairs in Queensland. They show that miners' phthisis or fibrosis is on the increase, particularly in the constituency I represent, and that the ventilation of the mines of Queensland are in a very bad way; and further, that the ventilation of the mines on Charters Towers cannot be adequately dealt with under the provisions of the present Bill. I could quote at length the report of the commission on that matter, but I have no desire to do so; I do not want to protract the sitting unnecessarily long, nor do I want to deprive one or two hon. members who wish to speak after me of their opportunity of doing so. I might state that the prevalence of miners' phthisis or fibrosis is, in my opinion, worse than was represented by the commission. I do not blame the commission for being wrong in their conclusion in that connection, because I do not think they had time enough to investigate the matter. The commission has got together a great deal of useful information, but it is a pity that they were not allowed to prosecute their inquiries at greater length, and produce a report which would have dealt more effectively with this question. I am sorry that the Government programme indicates their continuous antipathy to the mining industry; it is a neglected quantity so far as the Government is concerned.

Mr. LENNON: Hear, hear!

Mr. MULLAN: Here we have an important industry which is maintaining a large proportion of our population, the wealth derived from which has amounted to the total of £96,000,000 so far, and from which £3,710,222 was derived last year. I might prove that this industry is being neglected by the Government, by reading the reports of the director of the School of Mines at Charters Towers, which show that the Government year after year have refused to expend on that school the paltry sum of £4,000 for an experimental engineering and ore-dressing laboratory. It is a great pity that the Government cannot see fit to complete that school now that it is going to be affiliated with the University. I hope the present Minister will exercise his influence with the Cabinet to incur this small expenditure. I would like to make a passing reference to the present regrettable position of the sugar industry of Queensland. I want to refer to one big question that has occurred during the last few days. We know that the people of Australia have been exploited within the last week to the extent of £1 per ton of sugar. This £1 per ton represents, roughly, about 2s. 6d. per ton of cane, which shows that if this increased amount which we are being compelled by the Colonial Sugar Refining Company to pay for our sugar were passed on to the producer, who is the cane-grower, he would receive immediately what he has a right to receive, an extra 2s. 6d. per ton for his cane. I want to state another proposition. Mr. Tudor, the Minister for Customs, when at Bundaberg a few days ago, promised to equalise the excise and the bounties, and I find that the difference between the excise and bounties last year amounted to £140,937, which amount would have been made available. Taking the sugar-cane grown last year, it represented a tonnage of 1,163,494 tons. The concession offered by the Minister for

*Mr. Mullan.]*

Customs would have represented 2s. 5d. per ton of cane cut. What do we find? That if the cane-grower in the field were to receive the benefit of the increased price of sugar—£1 per ton—which represents 2s. 6d. per ton of cane cut, plus the 2s. 5d. offered by Mr. Tudor, the cane-grower to-day would receive immediately by those two offers 4s. 11d. per ton more than he is receiving now, and if he were to receive that he would be able to pay all the demands of his employees, and have a handsome balance into the bargain. In making those statements, I am not referring to the enormous profits which have been made by the Colonial Sugar Refining Company. We know quite well without touching this 4s. 11d., the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, with its gigantic profits, could make a huge concession sufficient of itself to placate all the reasonable demands of everybody concerned in this industry. The sugar question has been thrashed out at length, and I do not want to flog it unnecessarily, but I want to point out that the matter could be immediately settled if the Colonial Sugar Refining Company were to transfer its £1 per ton of sugar imposition to the canegrower, and the grower were to avail himself of Mr. Tudor's offer of 2s. 5d. per ton, thus making 4s. 11d. per ton to the grower. The sugar industry would then be on a better footing than it is to-day. In conclusion, I want to deal with what may be a small matter to this House, but a very important matter to my constituents, and that is a dispute that has been waging there for the last six months. In January last the Government engaged a number of men to lay the foundations for some coalshoots at 8s. 6d. a day, and the men represented to my colleague and myself that it was not a fair wage. We waited on the department in Brisbane, and were assured, not only verbally, but by letter, that the men would receive the rates ruling in the district. Now the rate ruling in that district, as determined by the municipality of Charters Towers, the Queenton Shire Council, and other shires around Charters Towers, and by the Federal Government in all its dealing in Charters Towers, is 10s. a day. But, notwithstanding the fact that this offer was made, the men were not paid the ruling rate. We then called upon the late Commissioner, Mr. Thallon, and pointed out that, notwithstanding the promise that had been made, the proper rate was still not being paid, and he said it was some oversight, and, if things were as we represented, then the higher rate would be paid. Then I went North, and we found out nothing had been done, and the men, after being fooled for two months, struck in March, and we asked the Government if they intended to fulfil their promise, and received the extraordinary and unexpected reply that the regulation rates were being paid, and would be adhered to. Here we have the Government deliberately repudiating a promise. Then the Premier came to Charters Towers, and, on being acquainted with the facts of the case, he said, "Yes, the men had a good case." The case we made out was a good one, and the Premier said, when he returned to Townsville, he would consult the District Engineer and have the matter fixed up. I believe the hon. gentleman did confer with the officer, but instead of having the matter fixed up, he gave the evasive reply that he would see into the matter on his return to Brisbane. However, on his return to Brisbane, he did

[Mr. Mullan.

nothing. We have this remarkable fact, that over and over again the Government have told us that men engaged on construction work should be paid the ruling rate in the district. Now, the ruling rate in Charters Towers is 10s. a day, but the Government differentiate between their policy at Charters Towers and their policy elsewhere. We have the Government offering 10s. 6d. to 11s. a day to strangers—to inexperienced men in England—to come out here, yet they will not pay experienced men already here more than 9s. a day at Charters Towers for temporary labour. That is not fair, and it simply shows what we may expect from the present Government. However, as I do not wish to detain the House, I will not deal with this matter further, as I intend to deal with it in another way, and I will therefore conclude by expressing the hope that this side of the House will be able to make some of the Bills that are to be introduced by the Government a little better than the Government themselves wish to.

Mr. HODGE (*Burnett*): I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Question put and negatived.

Mr. HODGE: Mr. Speaker—

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

Question stated.

Mr. HODGE: Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is quite fair that I should be put down in this way. I should like to ask the permission of the House to speak.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member moved the adjournment of the debate. That question was put and the adjournment was defeated on the voices, and the hon. member has lost his opportunity of speaking.

\* Mr. G. P. BARNES (*Warwick*): I would like to make a few observations, and will certainly be as brief as I can, considering the lateness of the evening. I have very much pleasure in congratulating you, Sir, on your elevation to the Speaker's chair. We have had some experience of you during the last session of Parliament, when I think your rulings gave general satisfaction, and at once proclaimed your fitness for the position to which you have now been called. I believe you will prove yourself a worthy successor of the late Hon. J. T. Bell, whose death we all so much deplore. It seems to me that had the last speaker, the junior member for Charters Towers, spoken earlier in the debate, the speech of the junior member for Rockhampton would have been given on different lines, and that instead of rejoicing in the tone of the House having been improved since that hon. member's former acquaintance with it—he would have found it has been reserved for the junior member for Charters Towers to turn, shall I say, the political scavenger of the party. Everything has been wrong. Every Minister has suffered at his hands, or rather he has endeavoured to make them suffer, but at any rate it has come very late in the day. To come to the Address in Reply, I think the Government are to be congratulated upon the retrospect they are able to give, and although the good seasons may have had a great deal to do with it, I think we can undoubtedly affirm that the administration has been good and has been carried on in the interests of the people of Queensland. The development of our various



resources has been encouraged by the pushing out of railways. That has been followed by a record land settlement. Railways and land settlement have encouraged the best stream of immigration that we have witnessed for many years. A great deal has been said about the class of immigrants, but seeing that more than half of them have been nominated immigrants, I think it is bad taste on the part of hon. gentlemen

opposite to speak of them in disparaging terms, because by so doing they disparage the character of the people already in the State. There have undoubtedly been black sheep amongst them, but on the whole they are people of a good class. With regard to land settlement, much has been said with the object of showing that development is not taking place, but I find that in the five years ending in 1905 there were 7,450 portions selected, with an area of 8,979,268 acres, and a rental value of £63,464; while in the five years ending in 1910 there were 14,678 portions selected, with an area of 24,574,744 acres, and a rental value of £165,284. Surely better evidence of successful land settlement could scarcely be given.

Mr. LENNON: What was proved by this side was that cultivation is not increasing.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I agree with the hon. member, and it is a fact much to be regretted; but we have to face the fact that the people who have taken up land here have hit on a way of obtaining value from the land in a direction different from what obtains in the other States.

Mr. LENNON: Unearned increment!

Mr. G. P. BARNES: No. They engage in the wool industry, the cattle industry, the dairying industry, the horse industry—industries which are proving exceedingly profitable; but it is much to be regretted that agriculture is not on the increase. I think something could be done in the matter, and something ought to be done. Notwithstanding the decreased area under cultivation, our wheat crops for ten years ending 1910 averaged more than that of any other State in the Commonwealth, except the island of Tasmania. Our average came up to 13 bushels per acre. In South Australia the average per acre has greatly increased since 1903. Up to 1903 the averages were 5.7 bushels, 6 bushels, and 8.3 bushels; in 1904 the average was 6.7 bushels per acre; after that there was a sudden advance to 11.8 bushels, 10.4 bushels, 11.1 bushels, 11.5 bushels, 13.3 bushels, and 11.6 bushels per acre. That shows that something unusual took place in connection with wheat cultivation in South Australia, and I am assured that the increase is due almost entirely to the use of fertilisers. I think the Minister for Agriculture should depute one of his officers to visit South Australia and inquire into the conditions regarding the growth of wheat in that State. I understand that the character of the soil is of an indifferent nature. The chemist in the Government department there informed me that much of the land yielding large averages on account of the use of fertilisers was of a sandy and poor nature. We have a great area of land of that character in our State; and if such land can be turned to profitable use by the employment of fertilisers, then some good will be demonstrated. I am glad to know that the Minister is already experimenting on a small scale on some of the lighter soils in the

Warwick district, and I shall note the result of the experiment with interest. In connection with land settlement, I think it is to be regretted that the repurchase of estates has ceased to be a part of the Government policy. In my district alone 90,320 acres of repurchased land, to the value of £287,767, were put on the market; and all this area has been selected, with the exception of 786 acres, of the value of £1,230. I think the Government acted wisely in connection with the resumption of estates in past years, but there seems to be a feeling abroad now that the Federal land tax will do the work. If it is bringing about that state of things, it is not being done in the interests of the community to the same extent as if those estates were repurchased and subdivided by the Government. I sincerely hope that the Government will give consideration to the question of repurchasing estates and subdividing them themselves, because it will be in the interests of selectors. Reverting to the programme outlined in the Governor's Speech, I think we have every evidence given that care has been taken in connection with the bringing forward of Bills which are likely to prove of abounding interest to our State. I am very glad to notice that an amendment of the Agricultural Bank Act is to be introduced. I take it that every hon. member has had something to do with the Agricultural Bank, and will be delighted to know that the Act is to be amended. I think it would be unwise to go to the extreme length that some of the other States have gone in this direction, and I think that it is possible that one reason why advantage has not been taken to a greater extent in Queensland of the bank as compared with other States is that, on the whole, money has been fairly cheap in Queensland, and, on account of the value of the security people have been able to offer, banks and other institutions have readily made the necessary advances to our people. I am glad to notice that a Technical Education Act Amendment Bill is to be introduced. I am not aware of the lines on which the Bill will go, but the difficulties surrounding the training of youth, especially in technical matters, on account of the disabilities men are under in the handicrafts through the limiting of the employment of boys, are such that it will be necessary for the country to be able to fall back in time upon those who receive their education in our technical colleges. Here we are in a developing country with no youths coming forward to take their place in trades. Hon. members on the opposite side are adverse to tradesmen coming here from other countries and from the old land. I would like to ask what our position in the future is likely to be unless we have our youths trained to take up the positions their fathers occupy at the present time. Bad as our position is to-day, the dearth of men in all branches of the building trade and in other industries will be extremely serious unless something is done. I notice that a Sugar Works Bill is promised. Well, I think it would be one of the biggest mistakes that could possibly be made if that Bill is introduced under present circumstances, and I hope that even at this late hour the Government will reconsider the matter, at any rate for the present. In the light of the actions of the Federal Government. I suggest that the Government of this State should consider whether it is wise to introduce a Bill which.

*Mr. G. P. Barnes.]*



if passed, will commit the country to the expenditure, probably, of some hundreds of thousands of pounds.

Mr. MACKINTOSH: Hear, hear!

Mr. LENNON: I am astonished.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I am astonished that the hon. member does not agree with what I am saying.

Mr. LENNON: I certainly do not.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: The whole sugar industry is being threatened at the present time by the attitude of the Federal Government. What is the obvious result that must follow the taking off of the duty on imported sugar, which has been indicated by the members of the Federal Government? It is going to crush the whole industry out of existence. And it is going to have another effect. It is going to introduce into Queensland and into all the States of the Commonwealth alien-grown sugar. We objected to sugar being grown by coloured labour, but we are not going to object to sugar being brought in from abroad which has been grown by coloured labour. When I say "we," I mean that the Federal Government have already indicated their intention in this direction.

Mr. LENNON: They have not. You are rushing to conclusions.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I am not rushing to conclusions. I have taken the actual expressions of the Acting Prime Minister of the Commonwealth. He has indicated that he is going to bring the Colonial Sugar Refining Company to its senses, and that he intends removing the import duty on sugar. That is an extremely serious thing, and, if it is carried out, the Colonial Sugar Refining Company is not going to be injured a bit. It can bring in sugar from other places—from Fiji and from Java. That will suit the company all to pieces. Who is going to suffer?

Mr. MACKINTOSH: The labouring men.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Yes, the employees on the canefields of the North, and, in addition to them, the farmers, who, under considerable difficulties, are trying to hold their own in Northern Queensland.

Mr. LENNON: The labouring men are suffering now.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: They are suffering now, unfortunately, largely at the unwisest instigation of agitators. The suggestion made—I take it to have been a suggestion—by the senior member for Townsville the other night that, if the sugar-workers would quietly go to work this year, their demands would be acceded to next year, is a very good one. I took it that the speech of the hon. member was inspired in that connection. That is how I feel in the matter of the Sugar Works Bill. I hope the Government will think twice before they introduce the Bill. It was not introduced previously, simply because there was a degree of uncertainty in connection with the views of the Federal Parliament on matters connected with the sugar industry, and it was unthinkable then. Well, we have arrived at the same point again, and its introduction is unthinkable now. I am sure every hon.

[Mr. G. P. Barnes.]

member will rejoice at the introduction of a Health Act Amendment Bill. There are other good Bills mentioned in the Government programme. Hon. members opposite have not been able to see much good in some of those Bills, or, in fact, in the programme at all; but, at any rate, they have advocated many of those measures in this House from time to time, and now that they are coming forward they ought to feel extremely grateful to see them. We are promised a State Children Bill, and Liquor Bill, and a Workers' Dwelling Act Amendment Bill.

Mr. LENNON: What have you to say about the Liquor Bill?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I will speak about it when I see it. I would like to see the Workers' Dwelling Act liberalised in a direction that may not have entered into the mind of the Government. Any man who has a dwelling at the present time who may have it mortgaged to a building society or somewhere else is not able to come under the provisions of the Act? Why should that be? Why should not the Act apply to the man who has already got a home as well as to the man who is seeking to build one?

Mr. McLACHLAN: We tried to get an amendment in that direction, and you would not support it.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: In connection with the Prickly Pear Bill—whatever that may mean—I do hope that it will be in the direction of helping to deal with the mightiest pest we have. I do not believe any member of this House, any officer of the Lands Department, or any member of the Government, has the faintest conception of the appalling magnitude of the prickly pear pest. I do not believe, from what I can gather, that if we were prepared to expend an amount equal to the whole of our present State indebtedness it would be sufficient to cope with the destruction of the prickly pear. I am very glad that the commission appointed to inquire into this matter is at work. I am sorry that it is not wider in its scope, and that it does not include some practical men, so that we might have had a report on every phase of the prickly pear question. I think the Government might have gone further than they have gone. Still, whatever may be the outcome of their investigations, I am hopeful that it will lead to something practical. We want to know where we are in this matter, and I would earnestly ask the Minister for Lands to obtain from each land agent in Queensland a report on the extent of the prickly pear in his district, together with a map showing the area infested. From those reports and those maps he should have one general report and one large map prepared, so that we may be able to see the extent of the pest we have to deal with, and face the matter as best we can. Reference has been made by the hon. member for Cunningham to a universal Saturday half-holiday. I earnestly hope that the Government will see their way to introduce a short Bill making Saturday a general half-holiday throughout Queensland. At present one town has one day and another another day, and this matter is becoming exceedingly pressing on account of the demands made on various establishments by the Federal Defence Department. On that account alone it is very desirable that the half-holiday should be held on a

Saturday throughout the State. With regard to some of the taxes that the people have to pay, I trust that they will receive the attention of the Government. I should like to see the tax under the Dairy Produce Encouragement Act wiped out. It brings in only a small sum, about £7,738 per annum, and in wiping it out the Government would remove one of the imposts that irritate the people on the land. We might also do away with the marsupial tax. The rabbit tax we cannot perhaps do away with, but I think it is a mistake to allow that tax and the marsupial tax to be administered by boards, which sometimes do not exercise their powers in a way in keeping with the good of the people. I trust, therefore, that the Government will consider the wisdom of taking over the administration of both those taxes into their own hands. With reference to the railway proposals of the Government, following as they do the extensive commitments of last year, they have given widespread satisfaction. I am inclined to think that the proposals came as a thunderclap to hon. members opposite.

Mr. LENNON: Oh, no!

Mr. G. P. BARNES: The hon. member heard what they were.

Mr. LENNON: No, we have not heard what they are.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: We are told what they are in the Governor's Speech. The cry of the Opposition in the House, and right through the country, was that the passing of the large scheme of last year would do away with the possibility of railways in farming districts, and would kill for years to come all railway enterprise in this State. The Premier's speech the other evening is a complete answer to such pessimism. It must be gratifying to the Government to know that not only does this House approve of the Premier's utterance, but that it is approved by the leading Press of the State.

Mr. LENNON: Why, they govern the Government.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: The late Premier was fairly clear and explicit about the railway policy of his Government. The Secretary for Railways also, on more than one occasion, stated very clearly the aim of the Railway Department. But I think I am right in saying that it has been left for the present Premier to express in an unreserved way the intentions of the Government and the Railway Department in regard to railway construction, and I can assure him that no utterance of recent years has given so much satisfaction on the South-eastern Downs, and right away along the border, as his utterance in connection with the projected railway policy of the Government.

Mr. LENNON: You are not in favour of the via recta, are you?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I shall allude to that more directly. I am sure that the statement made by the Premier to the effect that a section of the via recta is to be included in the railway proposals of this session—that is the section from Munbilla to Sandy Creek—has given unbounded satisfaction. The marvel is that an extension to the South-eastern Downs has been delayed so long. The trade of the South-eastern Downs demands it, the border trade demands it, and the interstate trade demands it. All the interstate traffic is interested in it. The border trade, right out to Dirranbandi and

hundreds of miles beyond, is interested in the construction of the via recta. The closely settled districts of Fassifern, Cunningham, Warwick, and Carnarvon have for years been denied close railway connection. I am not including in my estimate the places which will be served by this railway—Brisbane and Ipswich—though both will be benefited by it. But when you remember the area to be benefited by the construction of the via recta, you can form some idea of the greatness of the work, and how essential it is that the undertaking should be carried out. There are portions of that area which cannot be served at all by any other route, and it is a marvel why a work of such magnitude which would benefit such a large district has been so long delayed. I unhesitatingly say that the via recta has no rival in the combination of purposes that it will serve. Brisbane merchants are interested in the construction of the line, as it will bring the New England district—Tenterfield, for instance—practically as near to Brisbane as Warwick is now, and it will shorten the distance between Brisbane and Warwick. Some remarks have been made that the construction of the Tweed line will do away with the necessity for the construction of the via recta. That is not so, and, even if the Tweed line is constructed, the popular cry will ever be for the line via the mountain country—the via recta. There is a distinct advantage to Queensland in this matter. The distance is practically the same, yet Queensland would have a wider share in the traffic. Via the Tweed route, Queensland would have 69 miles of railway, but by the via recta it would have 173 miles. I notice that the hon. member for Rosewood referred to the matter of routes the other night, but the hon. member for Cunningham effectively replied to him. The distance via Rosewood to Brisbane would be 110½ miles, but by the other route it would be 108 miles, and the cost via Rosewood would be £955,875 as against £529,625 by the other route, or £426,250 in favour of the old route.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Those are very old estimates.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: The Warwick to Maryvale section comes out of that.

Mr. ALLEN: That will have to be rebuilt.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: No, it will not have to be rebuilt. Mr. Thallon was asked that question long ago, and he satisfied the Warwick community on that. The line is identical with all other lines with the exception that the rails are lighter, and they can easily be altered. I do not intend to delay the House any further at this late hour. I have pleasure in congratulating the Government on the policy they have enunciated. I trust that the policy as laid down will be carried out and that it will be in the interests of Queensland. (Hear, hear!)

Question—That the Address in Reply be presented to His Excellency the Governor—put and passed.

#### OPENING OF SUPPLY.

The PREMIER: I beg to move that the Speech of His Excellency the Governor be taken into consideration at the next sitting of the House.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at twenty-five minutes to 12 o'clock.

Hon. D. F. Denham.]