

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 19 AUGUST 1919

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

TUESDAY, 19 AUGUST, 1919.

The SPEAKER (Hon. W. McCormack, *Cairns*) took the chair at half-past 3 o'clock p.m.

QUESTIONS.

LOCAL SALES BY STATE PRODUCE AGENCY.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*) asked the Hon. J. M. Hunter—

"What has been the value of the produce sold in Queensland for local requirements by the State Produce Agency during the year 1918-19?"

Hon. J. M. HUNTER (*Maranou*) replied—

"£112,000 7s. 5d."

TRUSTEES OF HERBERTON SHOWGROUND.

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*) asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

"1. Is it the intention of the Government to retain in office the trustees of the Herberton Showground, recently appointed, in the face of the continued protests of the people of Herberton, and of the fact that one of those trustees has twice been convicted of indecent exposure in a public street since his gazettal?"

"2. If the matter is to be considered, how long may the consideration be expected to occupy?"

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. J. H. Coyne, *Warrego*) replied—

"The hon. member has evidently been misinformed, as the department has not received any protest from the people of Herberton against the appointment of the trustees referred to."

"2. See answer to No. 1."

FREE RAILWAY PASSES.

Mr. VOWLES asked the Acting Premier—

"How many free six or twelve monthly station-to-station passes over the Queensland railways have been issued to—(a) Government servants; (b) private persons, through the agency of the Chief Secretary's office during the twelve months ended 30th June, 1919?"

The ACTING PREMIER (Hon. E. G. Theodore, *Chillagoe*) replied—

"(a) 3; (b) 2."

CONSERVATION OF HIDES FOR QUEENSLAND.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN (*Kennedy*) asked the Acting Premier—

"Considering that Queensland is the principal producer of hides, will the Government take action to conserve sufficient hides in the State to enable the people of this State to have cheap leather, thus providing the people with cheap boots?"

The ACTING PREMIER replied—

"The matter will be considered."

1919—Q

"MARORO'S" CARGO FOR BABINDA STATE HOTEL.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*) asked the Hon. J. M. Hunter—

"1. What quantity of beer and [or] spirituous liquors was forwarded in bulk and case to the State hotel at Babinda by the steamer 'Maroro' on her last voyage northward?"

"2. What quantities of flour and other foodstuffs were forwarded to the Babinda State hotel by the same vessel on that voyage?"

The Hon. J. M. HUNTER replied—

"1 and 2. No goods of any kind were ordered by the State Trade Office to be forwarded to the State hotel, Babinda, by the steamer 'Maroro,' nor has this office any record of any having been sent."

STOPPAGE OF FREE RAILWAY PASSES AND OTHER PRIVILEGES TO DELEGATES TO LOCAL AUTHORITIES' ASSOCIATION'S CONFERENCE.

Mr. CORSER asked the Home Secretary—

"1. Is it a fact that the Government has taken away from delegates to the Local Authorities' Association's conference the free railway passes and other privileges which they were formerly granted?"

"2. If so, what is the reason for the deprivation?"

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. Huxham, *Buranda*) replied—

"1. Yes."

"2. The Government did not consider the continuance of the privilege was justified."

FREE RAILWAY PASSES FOR MEMBERS OF COUNCIL OF QUEENSLAND RAILWAY UNION.

Mr. CORSER asked the Secretary for Railways—

"Is it true that members of the council of the Queensland Railway Union are granted free passes and free sleeping-car accommodation on the railways for the purpose of attending the meetings of the council in Brisbane or elsewhere?"

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. J. A. Fihelly, *Paddington*) replied—

"Free passes and leave without pay are allowed to members of the railway staff who, as officers of unions connected with the railway, are required to attend council meetings. Free sleeping berths are not granted."

ANNUAL REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND STOCK.

Mr. CORSER asked the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock—

"When will the report of the Department of Agriculture and Stock be available to the House?"

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. W. Lennon, *Herbert*) replied—

"As soon as possible; but the issue of it is dependent upon the completion of statistics; therefore, no date can be stated."

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORTS.

Mr. PETRIE (*Toombul*) asked the Treasurer—

"When is it expected that the Auditor-General's reports will be available for the information of the House?"

The TREASURER (Hon. E. G. Theodore, *Chillagoe*) replied—

"The Auditor-General advises me that he expects to have his reports completed about the end of next month."

FAT CATTLE FROM STATE STATIONS.

Mr. MORGAN asked the Hon. J. M. Hunter—

"1. What number of fat cattle from the State stations have been—(a) sold to meatworks; (b) sold to other private buyers; (c) sold to the State Butcheries Department; (d) treated by meatworks for the Government during the year ended 30th June, 1919?"

"2. What was the average price per head realised from the sales, respectively, under the headings (a), (b), and (c)?"

HON. J. M. HUNTER replied—

"1 and 2. All necessary information relating to sales of cattle by State stations, or supplies of meat to State butcheries, will be furnished in the report of the Trade Commissioner to be submitted to Parliament shortly."

ALLOWANCE TO MEMBERS OF LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Mr. MORGAN asked the Acting Premier—

"1. Has his attention been drawn to a statement appearing on page 919 of Knibbs's Official Year Book of Australia, 1916-1917, that 'allowances to members' of the Legislative Council in Queensland totalled £1,422 for the year 1916-1917?"

"2. Is it a fact that such an allowance is made to members of the Legislative Council; if so, how is it voted and allotted?"

The ACTING PREMIER replied—

"1. Only by the hon. member.

"2. Yes; to the President and Chairman of Committees of the Legislative Council."

EMPLOYEES ON ORALLO-INTJUNE CREEK RAILWAY.

Mr. MORGAN asked the Secretary for Railways—

"How many men were employed on the construction work of the Orallo-Intjune Creek Railway on—(a) 1st August, 1918; (b) 1st January, 1919; (c) 1st August, 1919?"

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS replied—

"(a) 102.

"(b) Works closed down for Christmas vacation.

"(c) 153."

SALES AT ENOGGERA OF FAT CATTLE FROM STATE STATIONS.

Mr. MORGAN asked the Hon. J. M. Hunter—

"1. What number of—(a) fat cattle; (b) store cattle, were sold from the State stations through the Enoggera saleyards during the year ended 30th June last?"

"2. What was the average price per beast realised for each class of cattle?"

"3. What was the average price per 100 lb. deadweight (exclusive of hides and sundries) realised for the fat cattle, on an estimate?"

HON. J. M. HUNTER replied—

"1, 2, and 3. All necessary information relating to sales of cattle by State stations, or supplies of meat to State butcheries, will be furnished in the report of the Trade Commissioner to be submitted to Parliament shortly."

CATTLE FROM STATE STATIONS FOR CHARLEVILLE STATE MEATWORKS.

Mr. MORGAN asked the Hon. J. M. Hunter—

"1. Have any fat cattle been provided by State stations for killing at the Charleville State meatworks to 31st July, 1919?"

"2. At what price did the State stations sell such cattle to the meatworks or other Government Department?"

"3. What purchase price per 100 lb. is debited on the books of the State Butcheries Department in respect of the meat product of the cattle mentioned in 1?"

HON. J. M. HUNTER replied—

"1, 2, and 3. All necessary information relating to sales of cattle by State stations, or supplies of meat to State butcheries, will be furnished in the report of the Trade Commissioner to be submitted to Parliament shortly."

EXPORT OF LOCALLY PRODUCED FERTILISERS.

Mr. JAMES (*Logan*) asked the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock—

"1. The amount of locally produced fertilisers exported from Queensland during the year 1918-1919?"

"2. The amounts of such exports destined for the respective importing countries concerned?"

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE replied—

"1. I learn from the Customs Department that 1,250 cwt. were exported during the year to 30th June last.

"2. The whole quantity was exported to Japan."

DUMMYING GRAZING FARMS.

Mr. HODGE (*Nanango*) asked the Hon. J. M. Hunter—

"1. Did he state at a recent conference that the special preference provisions of the State soldiers' settlement legislation could not be applied to grazing farmers for fear of dummying?"

"2. Is there anything in the Land Act to prevent dummying by ordinary selectors of grazing farms?"

"3. If not, what is the reason for differentiation against the soldier settler in the matter?"

HON. J. M. HUNTER replied—

"1. The hon. gentleman misconstrues the statement. The innuendo he wished to cast on returned soldiers would apply with equal force to himself or any exclusive body with whom he might be associated if special preference were granted.

"2 and 3. See answer to No. 1."

STATE FISHERY DEPARTMENT.

Mr. SIZER (*Yundah*), in the absence of Mr. Fry, asked the Hon. J. M. Hunter—

"1. The persons employed in the State Fishery Department under the following headings:—(a) management and head office; (b) market at South Brisbane; (c) respective State retail shops; (d) Wynnum; and the respective salaries or remuneration paid to each?

"2. Where have agencies been established, and what are the terms of the appointment of those agents?

"3. What quantities of fish have been supplied to the State fish market or State shops from sources other than the State trawler since 8th May last?

"4. What was the cost of such fish to the State Fishery Department?"

HON. J. M. HUNTER replied—

"I suggest the hon. gentleman move for a return. I have it here, but it is such an immense thing that it will delay the House to read it."

Mr. SIZER: I beg to move accordingly.

HON. J. M. HUNTER: I table the return.

REPORT ON IGUANA CONSOLS MINE.

Mr. GUNN (*Carnarvon*) asked the Acting Premier—

"1. Is it a fact that the Government some time ago took steps to secure a report on the working of the Iguana Consols Mine?

"2. If so, is the report yet available, and will he have it laid on the table for the information of the House?"

THE ACTING PREMIER replied—

"1. Yes.

"2. The report will be tabled when available."

ANNUAL REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

Mr. GUNN asked the Secretary for Public Instruction—

"When will the annual report of the Department of Public Instruction be available?"

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. H. F. Hardacre, *Leichhardt*) replied—

"The preparation of the report is approaching completion and it will be tabled with the least possible delay."

SHIPS FOR RELIEF OF NORTH QUEENSLAND.

Mr. LARCOMBE (*Keppel*) asked the Acting Premier—

"1. Is it a fact that the Queensland

State Government requested the Federal Government to release certain ships so as to enable the State Government to provide adequate supplies for the people of Northern Queensland?

"2. If so, is it a fact that the Federal Government refused to release ships required to provision Northern Queensland?"

THE ACTING PREMIER replied—

"1. Yes.

"2. Yes."

SEAFORTH REPURCHASED ESTATE BILL.

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

(Mr. Bertram, *Murce*, in the chair.)

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS, in moving—

"That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to enable the Seaforth Estate, acquired under the Agricultural Lands Purchase Act of 1894, to be dealt with as Crown lands under and subject to the Land Acts, 1910 to 1918."

said: Under the Agricultural Lands Purchase Act it is necessary that an estate shall return 10 per cent. on the purchasing price of the land. In accordance with that provision, the land was thrown open for selection, but, unfortunately, none of it has been taken up since. The total amount paid for the land was £22,622 14s., or equal to £3 13s. per acre. The money, of course, was obtained from the Trust Fund, and has been lying practically idle ever since. No revenue has been obtained from the land. It is now thought desirable to offer the land for settlement under some other form of tenure in order that we may be able to recoup the Treasury for the money expended. That is the object of this Bill.

Mr. MACARTNEY (*Toowong*): I hope the hon. gentleman will give the Committee information as to what is to be done in regard to the adjustment of the debit to the Trust Fund as a result of the money which was paid out of the fund for the Seaforth Estate. Is it proposed to recoup that fund?

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: We cannot recoup the fund at once.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Is it proposed to recoup the fund when the land is subsequently sold as Crown lands? Will the Bill deal with that question?

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The Bill deals with that question.

Question put and passed.

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

FIRST READING.

On the motion of the SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS, the Bill was read a first time.

The second reading was made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

Hon. J. H. Coyne.]

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. MULLAN (*Flinders*): In the time at my disposal I propose to expose what I regard as one of the most scandalous plots ever launched in this country. It is nothing less than a capitalistic conspiracy to fight organised labour.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MULLAN: In fact, it might be regarded as a capitalistic Soviet. Extraordinary precautions have been taken by the gentlemen connected with this scheme to maintain the utmost secrecy, but, in spite of all their precautions, these profiteering political pickpockets have been caught red-handed, and I propose to give the public of Queensland information in regard to some of their transactions in order to show the people what these gentlemen are prepared to do in order to try and smash Labour if they can. This scheme has been launched under the auspices of the Queensland Employers' Federation.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Mr. MULLAN: Already they have made arrangements for the purchase of a building site to cost £2,600, on which they propose immediately to erect their own building at a cost of £10,000.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: More work for the unemployed.

Mr. MULLAN: Then they propose to collect an annual levy up to one-half per cent. on all the wages paid by the members of the Employers' Federation. Under this scheme, as I will show later on, the employers who do not join the undertaking are to be blacklisted and boycotted.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Oh!

Mr. COLLINS: Why, they will be Simm Feiners later on.

Mr. MULLAN: It is specifically provided also that Labour publications are to be boycotted and all advertisements immediately withdrawn if they dare to oppose these people. Of course, that is nothing new, because they have already attempted to boycott Labour publications, and have ignominiously failed. At all events, they are making one more desperate effort in that direction, and we must be prepared to meet it.

Mr. H. J. RYAN: They might find it a boomerang.

Mr. MULLAN: Another proposal is to fight all Labour legislation in the courts.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: They have been doing that.

Mr. MULLAN: They are going to continue doing it on a more up-to-date plan and in a much more extensive way, as they will have much more money to back them. Then they are going to institute an indemnity fund, and the levy on the wages paid by the employers is to go towards supporting candidates for Parliament, for municipal councils, and for other positions in the State. Then they propose to fight unionists who dare to strike for higher wages. It is

[*Mr. Mullan.*

also proposed to guarantee all employers of labour against any loss incurred by them in fighting unionists who dare to ask for better conditions, such as shorter hours or higher wages. But perhaps it might be better to go a little more into details in regard to this audacious attempt on the part of the Employers' Federation. I have here a copy of a recommendation made by a committee appointed by the Employers' Federation, which reads—

“ QUEENSLAND EMPLOYERS' FEDERATION.

“ Union Bank Chambers,

“ Queen and Creek streets,

“ Brisbane, 20th July, 1919.

“ REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMITTEE APPOINTED AT MEETING OF ALL EMPLOYERS' ORGANISATIONS HELD ON 4TH MARCH, 1919.

“ *Preamble.*

“ Gentlemen,—As you are aware, on the afternoon of 4th March last one of the largest and most widely representative gatherings of employers known to Brisbane was held in these chambers, for the purpose of conceiving means of combating the incessant attacks of militant unionism, and to broadly devise methods of preserving and promoting the well-being of all employers. A record of those present, and of the proceedings, was furnished each organisation.

“ By that meeting a committee comprising—

Ald. J. F. Maxwell (chairman),

G. W. Shipley,

Ald. C. W. Campbell,

H. A. Manahan,

Hon. A. H. Whittingham, M.L.C.,

J. P. Wilson,

Hon. T. C. Beirne, M.L.C.,

H. A. Feather,

Ald. R. H. Julius,

H. S. Cribb,

C. E. Lever,

A. Watson,

J. Dowrie,

D. Traill,

J. D. Bell,

F. O. Nixon,

S. Earle,

S. Benjamin, and

R. Bowen,

was elected, to plan the manner of procedure to give effect to the above purposes, and bring down for another general meeting (that of to-day) a scheme to be discussed and referred to every organisation interested, for final adoption, rejection, or further recommendations.

“ The committee has gone thoroughly into all aspects of what is undoubtedly a far-reaching project, and one that must fail unless employers be prepared to subscribe liberally towards it. No matter what expenditure may be incurred, the benefits that must necessarily accrue will more than recompense.

“ *The Scheme.* ”

“(a) Purchase of site and erection of a building to accommodate employers' organisations.

“(b) Establishment of indemnity fund.

“(c) Appointment of organiser or organisers.

“(d) Creation of a committee of promulgation.

“(e) Preferential treatment for members.

“(f) Non-patronage of hostile publications.

“ 1. PROPOSED BUILDING. ”

“ On all sides it is admitted that a building for the accommodation of employers is a long-felt want. The need for it is demonstrated by the inconvenience in securing suitable premises for the holding of meetings, for employers do not desire their business made broadcast. Take as an example the forerunner of this meeting. The accommodation was taxed to the utmost, yet the privacy of the deliberations were possibly not as well safeguarded as they would have been had the meeting been held in a building of the employers' own. Again, this room was asked for by one association for their annual meeting on 14th proximo, but another having bespoken it for theirs, one was obliged to procure premises elsewhere. These are two illustrations, and innumerable similar instances could be quoted. Further, the policy of rent-paying is, on principle, unsound. Roughly estimated, the rent paid by kindred associations who have practically expressed their intention of taking up quarters in the proposed edifice, namely, Queensland Employers' Federation, United Pastoralists' Association, Queensland Chamber of Commerce, Brisbane Timber Merchants' Association, Queensland Chamber of Manufacturers, Master Carriers' Association, Master Bakers' Association, Brisbane Traders' Association, and the Brick Manufacturers' Association, between them paying close on £1,000. Furthermore, the concentration of associations will enable closer co-operation, so essential now-a-days. Moreover, it will obviate much loss of time and inconvenience to members who are often obliged to attend meetings of employers held in different places, and, among other things not enumerated, provide headquarters for the indemnity fund it is contemplated launching.

“(a) Site. ”

“ To investigate this important matter, the committee delegated power to a sub-committee consisting of Mr. J. F. Maxwell (president of the Queensland Employers' Federation), Mr. J. P. Wilson (president of the Brisbane Chamber of Commerce), and Mr. James Dowrie (vice-president of the Queensland Ironmasters' Association). After exhaustive inquiries and mature deliberation these gentlemen preferred a site in Charlotte street, adjoining St. Luke's Church, with a frontage of 100 links (including lane) and depth 225 links. The committee as a whole deems the land eminently suitable, being as it is central and conveniently situated, yet removed from the

noises of the city. The price asked for it is £2,600, and in the event of the scheme now placed before you meeting with sufficient support the purchase is recommended.

“(b) Means to Acquire. ”

“ To procure the necessary amount to acquire this land, associations as bodies, and their members individually, are asked to take up £10 debentures; the property after purchase to be vested in trustees elected by the shareholders on the per capita basis. When it is come to be considered that affiliated with the Queensland Employers' Federation there are bodies representing 4,927 employers; with the Brisbane Traders' Association 500 to 600, without taking into consideration the membership of the Brisbane Chamber of Commerce, Queensland Chamber of Manufacturers and unaffiliated organisations, there should not be any difficulty in issue of the requisite 260 debentures.

[4 p.m.]

“(c) Erection of Buildings. ”

“ Upon securing possession of the land it is proposed to erect a modern building (to be so constructed as to enable subsequent additions) at an estimated cost of £10,000. This sum to be secured privately, if possible, from any gentleman who may appreciate the motive that prompts the movement, or, failing that, by the flotation of a loan with some financial institution. The revenue that will be derived in the form of rent from the various organisations that have already definitely and partly expressed favourable intentions will suffice to pay taxes, maintenance, interest on the £12,600.

“ Will your body locate itself in the proposed building, and if so, what accommodation will be required? ”

Then appears the reference to the indemnity fund—

“ 2. INDEMNITY FUND. ”

“ What may be designated the second plank of the scheme is the Queensland Employers' Federation, Limited, or, in other words, an indemnity fund. Its objects and necessity for its establishment are clearly defined in the printed document appended hereto. A similar fund is in operation in South Australia, Western Australia, and Victoria. The whole project had been finalised, including the appointment of an organising secretary, and would have been launched in Queensland four years ago had the great war not intervened.

“ Is your body in favour of it, and what number of shares would your members be prepared to take up? ”

Then it goes on to point out the necessity of appointing organisers, which becomes a matter of course.

“ 3. ORGANISERS. ”

“ It is recognised that there are many employers who are not, but who should be, members of the various organisations. A small percentage, it is known, are inconsiderate enough to receive the rewards of the efforts of associations

Mr. Mullan.]

and not bring 'grist to the mill,' whilst there are very many not linked up for want of urging. Attention to the internal workings of associations will not permit of secretaries going in search of delinquents, therefore, the appointment of at least one organiser is essential to enrol members for the respective bodies, impart knowledge to those belonging to organisations, and generally discharge the multifarious duties pertaining to the office of organiser. He (or they) should be placed under one control, but work for the welfare of the whole.

"Cost of his (or their) maintenance to be borne by all associations.

"Does your association approve of the idea, and what financial support is it prepared to offer?"

4. COMMITTEE OF PROMULGATION.

"Publications, to employers' knowledge often false, pass unchallenged, and whilst the propagandism of others has almost reached a state of perfection, little work of this nature is done for employers. From writings and cartoons through the Press, and by means of pamphlets, much good would come, hence it is suggested that the secretary of each organisation contribute weekly at least three paragraphs in the interests of the members of his particular association, the publication of such contributions to be superintended by a committee to be elected, or a specialist to be appointed.

"Does your body approve of the idea, and does it consider a committee or a specialist should do the editing, and what sum is it prepared to subscribe towards defraying cost of such work?"

Here is a very important and interesting part relating to preferential treatment to members of the federation—

" 5. PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT.

"The adoption of a system of preferential treatment amongst members of all organisations is one of the best means for attaining that harmony so essential for success and so highly desirable, hence its adoption is recommended, and to facilitate the carrying out of same, it is proposed to issue an employers' directory to enable it to be readily seen who's who.

"Does your body approve of the proposal?"

Mr. KIRWAN: It is the old black list.

Mr. STOPFORD: We will give them a little of that back again.

Mr. MULLAN:

" 6. NON-PATRONAGE OF HOSTILE PUBLICATIONS.

"It is astonishing to notice some firms who, by supporting publications with advertisements encourage attempts to destroy loyalty to all that is good and sound, and, metaphorically speaking, by so doing are making rods for their (the employers) own back. When the nation's interests or your own are assailed, for self-preservation patronage of such publications should be instantly withdrawn.

"Will your members give serious consideration and effect to this imperative movement?"

[Mr. Mullan.

That is a game that two can play. In conclusion, it says—

" CONCLUSION.

"The committee, having to the best of their ability formulated a scheme (the adoption of which, in their opinion, will enable the consummation of the idea indicated at the meeting of 4th March), now pass it on to organisations for consideration with a request that each forthwith convene a special meeting for the sole purpose of discussing and coming to decisions on the various proposals submitted, and eventually intimate to the general secretary, Queensland Employers' Federation, the result of deliberations, so that the necessary further action may be taken.

"The committee wish to emphasise that only when resolutions passed are put into practice that schemes take definite forms.

" EMPLOYMENT FOR RETURNED SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

"So far as the resolution amenable securing employment for all returned sailors and soldiers is concerned, representatives of the employers have met representatives of the Returned Sailors and Soldiers' Imperial League, and it is gratifying to be able to announce that in addition to returned sailors and soldiers being restored to situations occupied prior to going to war, through the influence of the Employers' Association, innumerable positions have been found others. Nevertheless, much yet remains to be accomplished, and to enable the display of further practical sympathy, subjoined will be found documents for circulation and consideration."

The ACTING PREMIER: It is a pity you have not got those documents.

Mr. MULLAN: I have got some interesting documents yet. There is no reference here to any meeting between the Employers' Federation representatives and representatives of the Returned Sailors and Soldiers' Labour League. You see they are only concerned with the Returned Sailors and Soldiers' Imperial League.

Mr. STOPFORD: The Tory league.

Mr. SIZER: It shows that the Labour League are not active enough.

Mr. MULLAN: It is very significant, in view of the fact that the Returned Sailors and Soldiers' Imperial League have stated that they are not a political body. If they are not a political body, why are they co-operating with this body to smash the Labour movement?

Mr. SIZER: All the Returned Sailors and Soldiers' Imperial League are concerned about is to get employment for their own people.

Mr. MULLAN: Then, why did not this federation approach the Labour returned soldiers just in the same way as they approached the Tory returned soldiers? I am amazed to think that a returned soldier should, by interjection in this House, indicate that he is prepared to give preference to

Tory returned soldiers. Here is a very important document headed (this is very interesting reading)—

“ IN DEFENCE OF EMPLOYERS.

“ *Its objects and the necessity for its establishment.*

“ For some time past the fact has forced itself upon the minds of business men in this State that a definite stand must be made against the aggressive, and in many cases unlawful, acts of ‘organised Labour.’ With that object in view a committee was recently appointed to devise means to raise money with which to establish an employers’ defence fund. The work of that committee has resulted in the establishment of the above company as a business-like method of meeting the industrial position as it exists to-day.

“ In the past the weakness of the association of employers has been the smallness of the funds and the reliance which necessarily had to be placed upon the generosity of members for special donations when trouble arose. This system had at least three grave objections—

1. It was unreliable.
2. It allowed the patriotism of certain firms to be unduly imposed upon.
3. It practically debarred any effective action being taken until after the trouble had arrived.

“ The new scheme provides for an assurance fund which will be available in case of need. Employers are asked to make advances on a pro rata basis according to the amount of wages paid, and they thus know exactly what is expected of them, and can provide accordingly.

“ It is not proposed to interfere with the Employers’ Federation, which is doing excellent work, but to act in concert with existing arrangements, as will appear in the details.”

Here is the scheme. If you watch it, you will find that it closely resembles a scheme encouraged by the American beef trust and the “Big Five”—who are out to fight the people of America in connection with their profiteering scheme—

“ THE SCHEME.

“ The company has been registered with a nominal capital of £100,000, in 100,000 shares of £1 each, to be issued fully paid.

“ Employers wishing to join the fund are required to take up at least one share, and pay the annual subscription as provided.

“ Only those employers who are shareholders, and pay the subscription, will be entitled to participate in the benefits of the fund.

“ The subscription is based on the annual turnover in wages, and members will pay on the following scale for a period of four years:—”

I do not know how the Treasurer is going to extract his income tax this year from these people—

“ $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. up to £20,000 in wages.

“ $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. on the next £30,000 in wages; and

“ $\frac{1}{8}$ per cent. on the amount paid in wages in excess of £50,000.

“ After the first four years the subscription will be reduced to a nominal sum unless otherwise decided by the members in general meeting.

“ There will be a minimum subscription of £1 1s. per annum. Employers becoming members at any time will be required to contribute on the same basis as original members for the corresponding years of their membership, in order that all may be placed on the same footing. Every member will be required to furnish a statement of wages paid in the previous year at the beginning of each financial year of the company, and on that return their contributions for the then current year will be based.

“ ‘Wages’ shall mean the total amount paid for all classes of labour, excluding salaries of working partners, directors, general and departmental managers, managing clerks, secretaries, and commercial travellers.

“ The ‘objects’ have been made as wide as possible in order that the company may take up any work thought desirable in the interests of the employers, at any time. For the present it is provided under the articles that the funds of the company will be used for—

“ (1) Testing the legality of any Act, proclamation, regulation, or order of the Federal or Queensland Parliament, or of any rule or by-law of any corporation, in either case of common application.”

Boiled down, this means that they are out to test the legality of all Labour legislation and all Labour administration. When the Labour Government pass an Act of Parliament or a regulation it is going to be challenged in the law courts so far as the huge funds at the disposal of this body will allow.

“ (2) Supporting, assisting or rendering aid to candidates or intending candidates, in parliamentary, municipal, and other elections.”

There is no doubt that this political venture is being designed to fight the Labour party in this House and in every other Parliament in Australia.

“ (3) Protection of employers against the attacks of ‘organised labour.’”

That embraces the whole Labour movement. They know that the Labour movement, and the Labour Government particularly, is founded upon the basis of industrial unionism.

Mr. SIZER: I thought it was founded on the brotherhood of man?

Mr. MULLAN: I will read some more—

“ (4) Compensating and indemnifying members wholly or in part against loss arising from strikes, cessation of work or organised interference with their business, in so far as such may be deemed by the directors to be in the common interest of employers.”

That means that at any time when men assert themselves, as they have done in the past, to better their conditions, this huge fund will be placed at the disposal of the particular

Mr. Mullan.]

employer who wishes to defy the reasonable demands of labour.

"(5) Any work in the common interest of employers directly or indirectly connected with the above.

"The company is managed by seven directors, elected by the subscribers. The directors hold office for two years, but at the end of the first year three directors will retire, and thereafter three will retire annually.

"Voting by members is on a sliding scale, based upon the amount paid annually in wages, with a maximum of seven votes.

"The funds will be brought into operation in the following manner:—A request from the Queensland Employers' Federation or any other approved body of employers for financial aid in any matter authorised by the 'objects' will be considered by the directors, and if approved the request will be granted. If the directors do not approve they shall refer the matter back to the applicant body, stating the reason for the refusal.

"In the event of the request being renewed, and the directors still disapproving, an extraordinary general meeting of members shall be called forthwith, and the majority vote of such meeting shall be taken as an instruction by the directors. The directors shall not take direct action in any matter unless specially authorised by the members in general meeting.

"THE NECESSITY FOR A FUND.

"The necessity for a strong employers' fund for defensive purposes will, perhaps, be more readily appreciated after reading the following regarding the 'Capitalistic Labour Combine' of Australia to-day:—

"In 1891 there were in the Commonwealth 124 trade unions, with an estimated membership of 54,888. Since then there has been uninterrupted progress until in 1912 they had reached a total of 621 trade unions, with an estimated membership of 433,224, an increase of over five times in number of unions, and nearly eight times in members. Their annual income now approaches £750,000, the result of a comparatively small levy.

"Through their command of this large sum of money the Labour organisations are enabled to finance newspapers, to dictate legislation to suit their class, to control the labour market, and to bring pressure to bear on the Government themselves.

"No doubt, the objects of the employers in creating a large assurance fund will receive adverse criticism and sinister motives will be imputed, but the contrary is the case. No fair-minded employer is opposed to legitimate unionism; on the other hand, they freely accord to wage-earners the same right which they claim for themselves, viz.:—'The right to confederate for the protection and furtherance of their mutual interests.'

"It behoves every employer to become associated for mutual protection.

[Mr. Mullan.

"It is not sufficient for anyone to reason that, because he has had no trouble with organised Labour, or because it is quiet to-day in the particular industry in which he happens to be engaged, he need take no interest in what is happening elsewhere. For just so long as those who follow as a business the occupation of promoting labour unrest continue their efforts, somebody will have to wrestle with it, and no man can tell how soon he may be picked upon as the weak spot industrially in the employers' armour.

"Those who hold aloof will undoubtedly be the weak spots.

"The vital issue is 'law and liberty' versus 'lawlessness,' and it is the plain duty of every employer of labour to do his full share in support of any organisation whose purpose is the preservation of industrial liberty, the maintenance of the law of the land, and the promotion of goodwill between master and man.

"In the event of your deciding to become a member of the company it will be necessary to apply for at least one share.

"Any further information you may desire I shall be pleased to supply on hearing from you.

"Yours faithfully,

"Sgd. F. RANSON, Secretary.

"'Courier' Building, Queen street, Brisbane."

Mr. KIRWAN: That is the One Big Union in earnest.

Mr. MULLAN: This document is marked "Private and Confidential."

Mr. MACARTNEY: How do you come to have it?

Mr. MULLAN: Nobody should be in a better position in this House to tell me how I come to be in possession of this than the gentleman who lost the other famous document. (Government laughter.) However, the first document which I read says, "Strictly for the information of the Employers' Association only." In spite of all the secrecies surrounding this federation, their little plot has been exposed.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Are you not ashamed of using stolen goods? (Laughter.)

Mr. MULLAN: All I am doing is exposing it, and that is what the hon. member does not like.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I am not objecting to it.

Mr. MULLAN: It is well that the public of Queensland should be prepared for this audacious onslaught on the Labour movement. It is a deliberate attempt to boycott Labour publications. It is stated and explained in the scheme that, when a Labour publication dares to do anything inimical to the interests of the Employers' Federation—of the employing class—it is to be immediately set upon; it is to be immediately squeezed, boycotted, and blacklisted. If the workers of Queensland will submit to this tyranny, and will permit their Labour publications to be annihilated in this way, I am very much surprised. What will happen to the Employers' Federation scheme if the

workers, now knowing what the proposals are, do with the Tory publications what they propose to do with the Labour publications? It is a game that two can play. In my opinion, we shall have to meet them on their own ground. So far as I am concerned, at all events, I do not hesitate to say that I am prepared to urge every unionist and every Labour organisation to stand by their papers, because, after all, the Labour movement—strong as it is to-day—is so strong because of the grand assistance it has received from Labour publications. And there is another thing to be pointed out. The gentlemen who proposed this scheme are the men who are depending upon the workers of this State for their existence, and I am sure that the workers of this State will not submit to a scheme practically to enslave them, because, if the Labour movement be smashed, these gentlemen will be able to embark on such an orgy of profiteering as was never seen before.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Like they are doing in Britain to-day.

Mr. MULLAN: I think that the sooner Labourites realise the seriousness of the plan I have exposed the better. There is no doubt that it is a big conspiracy to defeat Labour legislation. In effect, it is a plot to defeat the will of the people, because when this Parliament speaks it should be able to speak finally and effectively; but they are going into the courts and by every subterfuge in their power are going to try to defeat the objects and legislation of the Labour party. As I stated earlier, there is no doubt that this scheme shows a striking similarity to a scheme which was recently exposed in America by a Royal Commission appointed by President Wilson in connection with the meat trust. If hon. members will only listen to the few lines which I shall quote, showing some of the objects of the meat trust and the "Big Five," they will see the great similarity, and realise the truth of what I said at the outset, that the man who drew up this Employers' Federation scheme had before him the scheme of the American meat trust for smashing Labour there. The Commission, which was reporting on the American meat trust, said—

"The Commissioners discovered, in the course of the investigations, that the packers had a joint fund subscribed in proportion to the business done."

Hon. members will see that this fund is subscribed in proportion to the wages paid, which means the same thing. And mark the similarity in the purposes—

"To employ lobbyists and pay their unaudited expenses.

"To influence legislative bodies."

Mr. STOPFORD: That is done in Queensland, in the case of the Workers' Compensation and Insurance Bills.

Mr. MULLAN:

"To elect candidates who would wink at violation of law, and defeat those pledged to fair enforcement.

"To control tax officials, and thereby evade just taxation.

"To secure modifications of Government rules and regulations by devious and improper methods.

"To bias public opinion by the control of editorial policy through advertising.

loans, and subsidies, and by the publication and distribution at large expense of false and misleading statements."

There you have practically the same proposals as they have in their scheme here. There is no doubt that this is the first step of the Employers' Federation to weaken the unions, and they would then continue in their wild career of profiteering on a scale never hitherto attempted. But the mask has been torn from their face, and this House and the country can now see this scheme in all its hideousness. There is no doubt that it is a deliberate scheme by the members of the Employers' Federation to smash Labour unions, to smash Labour papers, and ultimately, of course, destroy the Labour Government, secure power, and then embark on an orgy of profiteering. But I misunderstand the workers of Queensland if they permit this dastardly plot to succeed.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. STOPFORD: Members of this House can easily teach the workers outside.

Mr. MULLAN: In the remainder of the time at my disposal I propose to deal with a matter which is of vital interest to Queensland and to Australia at the present time, that is, the solution of the unemployment problem. Queensland is in a very difficult position in connection with this problem, more so than any other State, because of the fact that, having a Labour Government and better conditions in many respects than other States, people flock here from other States, and, when work is scarce, we consequently have, not only the strain of providing for our own unemployed, but also the additional strain of providing for the unemployed of other States as well. At the termination of the war the price of copper rapidly slumped, and a collapse in the copper-mining industry took place. The big companies in the copper-mining areas were taking no risks. They immediately dismissed their workers by the thousand, with the result that great hardship was inflicted upon thousands of workers and their families. In fact, I may say in connection with this matter that the great copper-mining companies showed very little concern for the welfare of their men. As soon as the slump set in they practically dismissed [4.30 p.m.] the lot of them, without any regard for their welfare or the welfare of their families, and that certainly steeled my resolve that, when the opportunity again presents itself—as it will when these men resume operations—to advocate that the workers in all those mines should secure every penny that they can from those men who, at a critical period in their existence, did not give them much consideration. Unemployment consequent upon the termination of the war, of course, has been broadcast, and every Government the world over has to meet the difficulty, and to try to solve the difficulty if it can. There is no doubt that unless the Government of every country is prepared to solve or settle the unemployed problem, sooner or later the unemployed problem will settle the Government. We find that the British Government is alive to this situation, and it should open the eyes of other Governments to the position as it exists to-day. We find that the British Government have evolved a scheme to meet

Mr. Mullan.]

the immediate difficulties of the unemployment which succeeded the termination of the war. They have provided a scheme for civilians and soldiers—a colossal scheme—involving the expenditure of millions of money. If this action of the British Government to provide payment for unemployment had been advocated by any Government such as the Labour Government before the war, it would have been described as the “wild-cat” scheme of a dreaming socialist. Now, however, all that has changed. Five years of war, five years of horror and hell in England, have awakened the worker to some extent from his century-long nightmare, and the statesmen of England realise that to-day. The aristocrats of Great Britain to-day have come down with a scheme to provide for unemployment—a temporary scheme, certainly, but, nevertheless, a scheme more liberal than was ever promulgated by any Government yet established, showing that they are judging the times and realising the necessity of keeping pace with the times. To give you an example of the scheme, it provides 24s. per week for males over eighteen years of age, 24s. per week for males over eighteen! Females over eighteen years receive 20s. per week; there is provision of allowances for each child at the rate of 6s. for the first and 3s. for each additional child; and male juveniles between fifteen and eighteen who are unemployed will receive 12s. per week, and girls between fifteen and eighteen will receive 10s. per week during the currency of this scheme when unemployed. That shows that the British Government realise their responsibility, and the urgency and necessity of doing something towards meeting the unemployed difficulty. The Swiss Government have made extraordinary provision also. In fact, under the Swiss scheme, they provide that each industry shall support its own unemployed.

Mr. COLLINS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MULLAN: Without committing myself to that scheme, or to any particular scheme just now, I will say that, if the Swiss scheme had been in operation during the last six months, the great copper companies, such as Hampden, Mount Elliott, and Mount Morgan, would not have been able to cast their workmen adrift without any responsibility for their happiness or welfare during this critical period. But so long as we have capitalistic production for profit, instead of socialistic production for use, so long will you have unemployed. In fact, unemployment will follow in a cycle just like droughts so long as you have a capitalistic system of production for profit. In most cases, it is the community and not the individual that is responsible for unemployment. We must realise this or we can never approach the solution of the problem. Some people who look upon this question of unemployment superficially tell you that most unemployment is the fault of the workers themselves, and they will point and say, “Look at Smith; Smith has been dismissed for being drunk.” “Look at Brown; Brown has been dismissed for being lazy.” “Look at Robinson; he has been dismissed for being dishonest.” But these gentlemen have not realised that even if Smith, Brown, and Robinson are dismissed for those causes, three other men are immediately put into their places, and unemployment in the community is neither increased nor decreased

[Mr. Mullan.

by the process, so that, if Smith had never been drunk, if Brown had never been lazy, or if Robinson had never been dishonest, it would not have affected the unemployed market one iota. So you can see that it is not the individual but the community more than anything else that is responsible. As I said before, unemployment is more than anything else the inevitable outcome of our capitalistic system to-day. For instance, if the product of any industry is selling at a high price, immediately those engaged in that industry proceed to produce as rapidly as possible, and as many workmen as can be found are employed in the occupation of producing that high-priced article for profit. As sure as the sun rises, the time will come when you will have over-production. You will have a glut in the market, and with a glut in the market the output must be immediately diminished, and, of course, you have workers unemployed again. This thing goes on in a cycle just like the weather, and will continue so long as you have production for profit. And, of course, what is true of one industry is true of other industries. When that sort of thing happens in a number of industries, instead of in one industry, you get what is known as an industrial crisis, with wholesale unemployment; and you get the great economic waste which follows in the wake of unemployment. In Queensland, one of the additional difficulties in solving the unemployed problem is the seasonal occupations. You have your sugar, your meat, and your shearing all coming on at various times of the year, and it makes it more difficult to solve the unemployed question. I say that we have to face this position, and do something to minimise it, because, so long as you have a capitalistic system, you cannot remove unemployment as a whole; but you can devise a scheme to remedy or minimise unemployment during the transitional period from capitalistic to socialistic production. Nobody can submit any concrete scheme for dealing with this matter, but I am quite sure that any well organised State can embark upon certain national work in such a way as to make for the advancement of the individual and of the State itself. We might embark upon public estates improvement, such as the preparation of farms, the construction of main roads, and the construction of developmental railways. There should not, in my opinion, be one unemployed man in this country if we embarked upon proper developmental schemes, preparatory to opening up this country as it should be opened up. Then there is another direction in which we might strike out. We might consider whether it would not be possible to compel large pastoral companies to employ more white men instead of blackfellows, as they do at present; and not only the private landowners, but the State itself should adopt this policy.

Mr. FRY: Do you include the State in that?

Mr. MULLAN: I include everybody.

Mr. FRY: The State is one of the employers of black labour on the stations to-day.

Mr. MULLAN: We may well consider how far we may go towards making the pastoralists do what the mining magnate, to some extent, does to-day—employ more white men in proportion to the area and the value of his holding. The same thing might apply to big sugar plantations. At certain seasons

valuable plantations should not be permitted to lie idle as many do—or rather, they should not be worked by brown, black, and brindle labour as they are at present. The sugar industry is maintained mostly by the people in the Southern States, because it is supposed to be worked as a white-labour industry. It is a deplorable fact that at the present time there are too many blacks, browns, and brindles engaged in it. Under this scheme I believe we would be able to do something in the direction of having more white men employed in the cultivation of sugar in the North than has hitherto been the case. Then we might consider the case of mining companies. At present, mining companies, according to their area, are supposed to employ a certain number of men. Unfortunately, there are big freehold copper ventures and coal ventures which are not under that responsibility, and it might well be considered whether we cannot do anything in the direction of making those people man their mines instead of holding them like “dogs in the manger” as they do at present. Then, it might well be considered whether the Government, in advancing money to municipalities and shires, should not do so on condition that their developmental and improvement work should coincide with that period of the year when there is a surplus of workers in various occupations. These things are well worth considering, I believe, as a result of them, we could evolve a scheme which would, temporarily, at least, solve the unemployed question. In addition to all that, something might be done towards providing a scheme—either National or State—of unemployed insurance. I believe this is a matter more within the province of the Commonwealth Government than of the State Government; but until you get a Labour Government in power in the Federal Parliament, there is not much hope of getting a scheme of that kind.

Mr. MORGAN: Why did you not do it when you were in power in the Commonwealth?

Mr. MULLAN: We cannot wait for it, so that the State must do something in the interval. In reply to my friend, I might state that, had the Labour party remained in power long enough, they would have done something. They could not do everything in a day.

Mr. MORGAN: The same old cry.

Mr. MULLAN: I have a distinct objection, of course, to any scheme of unemployed insurance which would be of a contributory nature so far as the worker is concerned. Whoever contributes, I claim that the worker should be absolutely exempt from any contribution to an unemployment insurance fund.

Mr. CORSER: Or to anything else.

Mr. MULLAN: Most writers to-day contend that each industry should be responsible for its own unemployed. The Swiss system practically provides for that; but that scheme could be carried out in Queensland only in a modified form, because many of our industries are in their infancy, and they might be called upon to meet the expenses of the unemployment at a period of their existence when they might be least able to bear it.

The collective scheme is the best. Instead of each being responsible for its own, all industry might be called upon to bear the brunt of the expense of all unemployment.

Mr. MORGAN: What would you do with the unemployed?

Mr. MULLAN: I will deal with that at a later stage. Dr. Zacker, an authority on the matter, who was an insurance officer in Germany—which has done more in the matter of unemployed insurance than any other country—says—

“Unemployment of a purely industrial origin, which is an inevitable consequence of capitalistic production, can only be mitigated—perhaps can be suppressed—by an insurance of which the contributions are paid by the masters of industry. Any different system which tends to burden other shoulders with the cost of insurance against unemployment is illogical.”

In my opinion, then, our unemployed should be provided for, in the main, by the industries of Queensland, and if there be any deficiency, that deficiency should be made up from the consolidated revenue. The reason for making the consolidated revenue responsible for whatever shortage there might be is that the nation should be responsible—the State should be responsible—and interested in eliminating rather than relieving unemployment. What we want is to have no unemployed, rather than to be constantly relieving unemployment. Mr. Knibbs, in a treatise of his on the matter, hit the nail on the head when he said—

“Unemployment is evidence of defective social organisation, and should be corrected by improving organisation rather than by remedying it.”

That is the position I take up. What we want to do is to create such a condition of affairs as will remove the cause of unemployment so that we shall have none, rather than to create a scheme for remedying it. In further support of that, I will give an opinion of a very prominent actuary, the president of the London Institute of Actuaries, who, before that body early this year, said—

“Unemployment insurance is naturally still in its infancy, but it is part of the national scheme of insurance. The correct calculation of its rates of premium is certainly an actuarial matter, and therefore it must sooner or later come within the purview of the institute if it can be contrived at all. It seems to me that human and extrahuman agencies—politics, strikes, etc., on the one hand, and trade cycles on the other—are disturbing agencies too uncertain for science to measure their effect and too powerful to be neglected. The aim of society should be to lessen unemployment or to abolish it, if possible, by social and industrial reform, rather than to pay for it by insurance.”

Unemployment, no doubt, is a great misfortune, not only to the individual, but to the community. As a result of unemployment you have physical, mental, and moral deterioration. They are undoubtedly the offsprings of unemployment; and, in addition, you have disease, destitution, despair,

Mr. Mullan.]

and death. They all follow in the wake of unemployment, and the cost of any scheme, no matter how great, by which we can avert this social calamity, would be repaid a thousandfold. In fact, if we could only remove the cause of unemployment, and, naturally, the consequences of unemployment, we would really transform society.

At nine minutes to 5 o'clock p.m.,

The SPEAKER said: Order! The hon. member has exhausted the time allowed him by the Standing Orders.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I beg to move—

“That the hon. member for Flinders be granted an extension of time.”

Question put, and the House divided—

AYES. 34.

Mr. Armfield	Mr. Larcombe
.. Bertram	.. Lennon
.. Carter	.. Lloyd
.. Collins	.. McLachlan
.. Cooper, F. A.	.. Mullan
.. Cooper, W.	.. O'Sullivan
.. Coyne	.. Payne
.. Fihelly	.. Peterson
.. Foley	.. Riordan
.. Forde	.. Ryan, D.
.. Gilday	.. Ryan, H. J.
.. Gillies	.. Smith
.. Harbacre	.. Thompson
.. Huxham	.. Weir
.. James	.. Wellington
.. Kirwan	.. Whitford
.. Land	.. Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Carter and Mr. Gilday.

NOES. 15.

Mr. Appel	Mr. Morgan
.. Barnes, W. H.	.. Petrie
.. Corser	.. Roberts
.. Elphinstone	.. Sizer
.. Fry	.. Taylor
.. Gunn	.. Vowles
.. Hodge	.. Warren
.. Macartney	

Tellers: Mr. Fry and Mr. Sizer.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. MULLAN: To continue my remarks about unemployment. I would say that, in a properly organised society in which every man who wanted work could get work, and every man who would not work, such as the capitalistic parasites, were made to work, comfort, intelligence, and production would be increased enormously. Confidence in his ability to secure employment would make a man willing to accept duties which to-day he is compelled to evade. To-day it is a common thing to hear biased judges and ill-informed legislators say that an industry cannot bear the strain of shorter hours and higher wages; but, if society were properly organised, so that everybody who wanted work could get it, and all the capitalistic parasites were compelled to do their share, there would be no difficulty in reducing the hours of employment, as well as increasing wages in such a way as would enable the worker to live decently, and in comfort. “Knibbs” shows that in the unions of Australia, at the end of each quarter for 1917, there was 7 per cent. of unemployed. If you take each quarter for the years 1915, 1916, 1917, and 1918, you will find that the unemployed in Australia during that period was equal to 6.9

[Mr. Mullan.]

per cent.—practically 7 per cent. was continually unemployed. Therefore productivity could be increased by 6.9 per cent. if those unemployed were given employ-

[5 p.m.] ment. I hope, at all events, that something will be done to remove the unemployment evil. I hope that Parliament, as indicated in the Governor's Speech, before it rises, will do something to prevent a repetition of the unemployed that I have seen during the last recess. The “Worker” newspaper recently, writing on the unemployed question, made use of these words— I quite agree with them—

“One unemployed man is a reflection on a country, two are a disgrace, and any more a national danger.”

That sums up the situation very tersely. We must never again allow the workers to be the playthings of the Mount Morgan, Hampden, or Mount Elliott companies and other capitalistic profit-mongering machines in this State. Provision must be made for them, regardless of whether those companies are working or not. Why should the unemployed workers of the State be compelled to sit down on a “ten bob a week ration” while the directors of those great companies are marking time in Sydney while the mines are shut down? That sort of thing is not fair and square. A Government that is worthy of the confidence of the electors and a Government that wants to retain that confidence, as I believe this Government wants to do, must do something to remove the unemployed evil. The Government have promised to do something during this session to solve the question, and to preclude the possibility of any few men in any industry taking the profits from the workers and their families, while at the same time they serve out to the workers just whatever they like. This Government have over and over again attempted to prove that a worker has a right to live. So far it is a mere theoretical right that the worker has, but we want to make it practical. Every worker should have the right to work and the right to live, and the duty devolves on this Government and on every Government to make adequate provision to give work to every worker. I know of nothing which inflicts greater hardship upon a worker, and also indirectly upon society than the curse of unemployment. There has been a dislocation of industry for the past five years as the result of the war, and it make it more imperative than ever that we should do something to solve the unemployed question at the present time. Our soldiers are being rapidly demobilised, and as a result they are being thrown upon the labour market, and they will be displacing other men who will then be thrown on the labour market. Men's passions are inflamed as the result of the past five years' horror, and they will not submit themselves to a system of slow starvation, and I do not blame them. I trust that the Government will do something to solve the question this session, and, to repeat what I said earlier in my speech, any Government that neglects to deal with or solve the unemployed problem will find that it is only a matter of time when the unemployed of a country, especially at this critical period in our history, will deal with the Government itself.

I would now like to make a few remarks on the question of the Arbitration Court

and the cost of living. Although arbitration is the policy of this party, no man can deny the fact that arbitration, as we have it to-day, has been the cause of great dissatisfaction. The ballots taken by the Australian Workers' Union, the Seamen's Union, and by the members of the Australian Meat Industry Employees' Union, have disclosed the fact that there is a strong difference of opinion among the workers of this State, and the workers of Australia, in regard to the continuance of arbitration; and I am satisfied that, unless arbitration is placed on a different footing, then arbitration is not going to succeed.

Mr. FRY: What footing would you suggest?

Mr. MULLAN: My friend asks me what footing I would suggest. Some people say that we should have a living wage scale. Why, the slaves were entitled to a living in the long, dim, distant past. The slaves always had to be fed, so a man is not asking for too much when he asks for a living wage. In fact, when you ask for a living wage, you are not getting very far ahead of the slave on this question. You are not very much ahead of the old days of slavery. Mr. Ryan, in his book on the "Living Wage," says—

"To compel a man to work for less than a living wage is as truly an injustice as to pick his pocket."

Trying to force men to work for less than a living wage while at the same time picking their pockets by profiteering is nothing but an injustice. Then, again, Philip Snowden, the English Labour man, says—

"The demand for a living wage is not a demand for full justice."

The hon. member a while ago asked what footing I suggested. I can tell the hon. member that the Labour platform provides for securing to the worker the full product of his industry. When the Arbitration Court judge bases his awards on the mere living wage, he is not carrying out the policy of the Labour movement, which says that the labourer must secure the full product of his industry. That is the irreducible minimum to which each worker is entitled. The system of arbitration cannot last if it does not come up to that standard.

Mr. FRY: How will you bring it about?

Mr. MULLAN: I have just told you what the Labour movement provides.

Mr. FRY: You are just making a statement. You are not saying how you will bring it about.

Mr. MULLAN: The object of the Labour movement is to secure to the worker the full results of his industry. If arbitration does not give that to the wealth producer, then arbitration fails to fulfil the conditions asked for in the Labour platform.

Mr. FRY: How are you going to do it?

Mr. MULLAN: If my friend will be quiet and patient, he will perhaps hear something to his advantage. The present method of arbitration does not attempt to give the worker the full results of his industry. We know that again and again the worker is compelled to go into the witness-box, and to go into disgraceful details as to what it costs to keep his wife and family.

He has to give a lot of humiliating details in support of his case for a living wage.

Mr. PETRIE: Who passed the Arbitration Act?

Mr. MULLAN: I am just pointing out that the Arbitration Act has had a trial, but it wants amending now. The weakness of the Arbitration Court to-day is that one body awards a wage, and another body, outside the control of the court, has the right to vary or wipe out that wage. A worker may get an increase of 5s. a week, and bodies beyond the jurisdiction of the court are able to nullify those wages. I have evidence of that here. Mr. Justice McCawley in one of his recent judgments dealing with the bakers, said—

"The efforts of the court to maintain or improve the standard of living of employees is constantly being frustrated by arbitrary increases in the selling price of commodities. Some means may conceivably be adopted to standardise the prices of most of, if not all, the necessities of life, so that increases in wages, if given, should be real, not nominal."

Mr. Justice McCawley sees the flaw, and realises the way in which that flaw may be met, and we must do something to meet it. Here is a glaring case of how the efforts of the Arbitration Court are thwarted by the employers of labour. In giving his judgment in the bakers' case, Mr. Justice McCawley said—

"To the master baker the increase means a great deal. In the proceedings leading up to the last award, I had before me the figures of a profitable business in which the baker sold well over 30,000 loaves per week, and employed not more than ten bakers. To that baker the increases in wages and the granting of the weekly holiday the award prescribed entail an added expense of about £2 per week; the increase of $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per loaf would add £62 per week to his receipts. Should the employees' claim now put forward be granted in full, it would involve an outlay of £5 per week extra. The wages now received by the bakers employed could be doubled without depriving him of the full benefit of the contribution of $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per loaf, which he exacts from the consumer."

That is a glaring case. Mr. Justice McCawley, in his award of 3rd March, granted the men employed by this particular firm an increase of £2. This firm turned out 30,000 loaves per week, and they immediately increased the price of bread $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per loaf, which brought them in £62 10s. per week with which to meet the additional award of £2 per week.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: A little over!

Mr. MULLAN: A little over! Even allowing for a late additional award of £5 per week, that particular firm in Brisbane, which is turning out 30,000 loaves per week, is making an additional sum weekly of £55 10s. or £2,863 yearly, over and above the profits they were making before this award was made at all. Imagine the extraordinary profits that are being made by the whole of the bakers of Brisbane in providing the people of Brisbane with bread! This is one example of the profiteering going on. Here we have a case of one employer increasing

Mr. Mullan.]

his income £60 per week, whilst his employees only increase theirs by 10s. per week. So long as we permit of profiteering on that extensive scale, so long will we find it very difficult to deal with the question of arbitration. As evidence of the failure of arbitration owing to the profiteering proclivities of certain classes in the community—Mr. W. M. Murphy, the Under Secretary for Labour in Victoria, in dealing with wages and prices in Australia, has shown that, whilst wages and prices in Australia have increased 39 per cent., the cost of living has increased 50.7 per cent., showing that the worker was 11.3 per cent. worse off in 1916 than he was in 1901. We know from figures submitted by "Knibbs" that the cost of living is almost unbearable to the average family. The average for Australia has increased during the period of the war alone 42.2 per cent., and in this State of ours—it is no use disguising the fact—it increased by as much as 60 per cent. during the years of war; so that the worker is being exploited, and is receiving practically nothing in comparison with the increase of wages, and, unless the Arbitration Court is clothed with additional power to enable it to give an award which will be an effective award, and not a nominal award as it is to-day, we are bound to fail. Any system of arbitration will fail if we permit of the passing on of the award. To permit of the passing of the award made on to the workers themselves is the weak spot in our arbitration system. Let me give another glaring example of it. In the coal-mining dispute of 1916, Judge Edmonds gave an increase in miners' wages of 15 per cent., which represented about £390,000; but he immediately allowed the coalowners to increase the price of coal 5s. per ton, which, on the basis of the consumption of coal, represented an increase in the price of that product of £1,350,000. So that, after meeting the award of Judge Edmonds, equal to £390,000, the mineowners were still able to make an excess profit of £960,000. Now this sort of thing cannot go on; it cannot be allowed. It has been urged by the other side that many industries will not be able to pay if the worker receives the full product of his industry. I say that the industry which is not able to pay the worker the full product of his labour is hardly worth bothering with in this country. Mr. Justice Higgins laid it down long ago in his famous award in connection with the Broken Hill Company that if it was a calamity that that historical mine should close down, it would be a greater calamity that men should be underfed and degraded. That is the position I take; and I say that, if it is necessary to conduct a certain industry in the interests of society, and that industry will not pay, it is not the workers who should suffer, but the community. It is obvious that a radical change must be made in the whole conduct of arbitration as it stands to-day. This party stands for arbitration. It is just as well that we should understand that the mere passing of an Arbitration Act—the mere registration of a particular brand of arbitration—does not fulfil the platform of the party. I say that any Arbitration Act which falls short in its object of securing to the worker the full product of his industry fails to meet the conditions of the pledge to which I have subscribed. I know that you cannot do everything in a day: I know political advancement is evolutionary; but it is no use this party disguising the fact that we must face this acute

[Mr. Mullan.

problem. The workers all over Queensland and Australia to-day are divided upon the question as to whether arbitration has given them what they expected from it. And if it fails to give them what they expect and what clearly we understand they expect—the full product of their industry—then they are going to turn arbitration down. There is a constitutional way in which it can be turned down no doubt; that is by Labour in convention; but, before they resort to that course, I hope that now we have the opportunity we shall take it, and, if possible, devise an Arbitration Act that will secure to the worker the full product of his labour. There is no good in talking about a living wage. The day is past when the worker is going to be content with a living wage. It might have been good enough for his forefathers, but it is not good enough to-day. The worker wants a little more. I know that some of the judges are even saying that the worker should be permitted to live in moderate decency and comfort. I go further than saying that there should be moderate decency and comfort for the worker. He is the creator and the source of all wealth and he should be entitled to at least as much as the man for whom he works. The stand I am going to take in this House—the stand I have taken all along—is that when any Act comes along dealing with this question I shall do all in my power to have it framed in such a way that it will carry out in its entirety the principles of the Labour movement, that is, to secure to the worker the full product of his industry.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. PETRIE (*Toombul*): It is now the third week of the debate on the Address in Reply, and I was expecting some of the Ministers to reply to the criticism of the leader of the Opposition.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: What do you call it? (Government laughter.)

Mr. PETRIE: Evidently they cannot defend their own administration and they put up their rank and file to do it for them. The hon. member for Flinders, who has made a very good speech from his point of view, has made an attack on the Employers' Federation and used some private and confidential documents he has got possession of. The employer, we are told, is all that is bad, and he is going to do all things that are bad to the worker. I should like to read a document that Mr. Ryan, when in England, or some of his friends on the other side, were good enough to circulate, or, at all events, on the strength of what is said in this document, a leaflet was printed in the interests of a Mr. Cape, who was put up in the Labour interests. It reads—

"THREE YEARS OF LABOUR GOVERNMENT.

"SOME FACTS FROM AUSTRALIAN EXPERIENCE.

"*Queensland Before the Labour Victory.*

"Queensland had been ruled for years up to the war by capitalists called Liberals.

"Before the war had lasted a week, these Liberal cabinet ministers, while promoting recruiting, were privately touring the country, buying up all the foodstuffs and putting up the prices 50 to 100 per cent."

Mr. KIRWAN: What about the round robin?

Mr. PETRIE: The hon. member, when speaking the other night, said that, when the history of this war came to be written, those who supported conscription would be handed over to perdition, and I suppose that those who were anti-conscriptionists will get the V.C. and every other good thing it is possible for them to have.

Mr. MORGAN: The iron cross. (Laughter.)

Mr. PETRIE: This leaflet goes on—

“So Ryan, the Labour leader, began touring the country, collecting evidence of their deals, which he proclaimed everywhere. In ten months they had made £20,000,000.

“Ten months after the beginning of the war there was a general election, with the result that Ryan was returned to power and was called upon to form a ministry, with a majority of 17.

Queensland After the Labour Victory.

“By a Sugar Acquisition Act he reduced sugar to pro-war prices. He took the duty off tea (and Australia is alleged to be unanimously and incurably protectionist), and so supplied the people with a good quality at 1s. per lb., instead of 3s. 6d. or 4s.

“He took 2,000,000 acres of unused land without compensation, and intends to take 200,000,000 more at the same price.

“He reduced meat from 1s. 3d. to 6½d., and pig-iron from £11 10s. per ton to £4.

“He has provided 872 houses for discharged soldiers, and a farm each for over 5,000; if they don't know how to farm they are supplied with competent teachers, and paid £2 a week, board and lodging while learning.

“He socialised the hospitals and asylums, so as to remove the stigma of pauperism from those who were unable to pay. Every widow had 15s. a week; orphans were provided for; baby clinics were provided; and a legal working week of forty-four hours was enacted.

“They have State trawlers, and their hauls of fish being greater than local consumption, the surplus was frozen and exported—waste and overlapping of private enterprise being avoided.

“The Coalition Government has just been selling State-built and State-owned vessels back to private enterprise.

“Then, note these other food products, and how their prices were steadied by State production—

Butter was 1s. a lb.; cheese, 8d. and 9d.; honey, 5d.; oranges and other fruit, 4d. a dozen: all these were supplied from a State-socialist colony on the Murrumbidgee, with a population of 100,000 and established at a cost of £3,500,000.

“Ryan's Second Victory.

“Of course, all these things were fiercely opposed, secretly, if not openly, by the capitalists, who alleged that he had no mandate for doing all these things, so Ryan decided to appeal to the people before his time was up. To meet this, the Liberals and Tories united against him, calling themselves the National and Patriotic Party.

“A number of most popular officers were released from the front to stand as candidates against him. The Press was deluged with ‘atheism,’ ‘free love,’ ‘German gold,’ etc. Not one was returned.

“The result was that Ryan came back with an increased majority—51 to 21.

“Some New Proposals and Comparisons.

“He is now proposing to pension off everybody at fifty-five (as was done in ancient Peru, under the Incas) at the rate of £5 a week; whereas in Britain, against the old age pension of 5s. a week (recently increased to 7s. 6d.); generals retire on £3,000 a year, judges on £3,500; and while soldiers' widows get 12s. 6d. a week, Lady Maude got £25,000, which, invested in war loan, will give her and her heirs £15 a week. And while the patriotic British Government gives the soldiers 10s. 6d. a week, this Labour Government gives them £2 2s. a week, and 35s. a week for their wives and widows.

“Vote for Cape, the Labour candidate, and similar legislation for England.”

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: What Tory wrote that?

Mr. PETRIE: No Tory. I have here the particulars as to whom it was printed by, and so on. I think it is a little bit—

Mr. McLACHLAN: Over the odds. (Laughter.)

Mr. PETRIE: It shows what reliance is sometimes placed on statements made by the other side of the House.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Written by a lunatic in England.

Mr. PETRIE: Yes, but where did they get those statements?

Mr. F. A. COOPER: Probably from the Opposition.

Mr. PETRIE: Was it from “Socialism at work,” or something of that kind, published by the present Government? To get back to the Address in Reply—

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. PETRIE: They say “Hear, hear!” from the other side, but I think, in justice to the Opposition, it is quite right that we should ventilate rubbish of that sort and expose lies of that sort that are put before, not only the people of Australia, but the people of Great Britain. The Governor's Speech says—

“It must be a source of intense gratification to you that the dreadful war which for more than four years had devastated the fairest portion of Europe and had caused appalling loss in life and treasure has come to an end with victory for the side that stood for freedom, justice, and civilisation against a formidable enemy.”

We are all pleased that the great, world-wide war has at last come to an end, and we hope that we are going to enjoy that freedom, that justice, and that civilisation which are mentioned in the Speech. But, while we are all glad that this great war has ended in victory for Great Britain and the allies, it is deplorable to think that, after all that our sailors and soldiers have done for us in fighting for freedom, liberty,

Mr. Petrie.]

and civilisation, they should find industrial unrest and turmoil when they come back to Australia and Queensland.

Mr. COLLINS: Do you call war civilisation?

Mr. PETRIE: Hon. members do not like my putting it in that way, but I have come here to say something on the war and this industrial unrest. We find that the Government in power in this State are powerless to administer or to govern the State.

Mr. KIRWAN: They are doing just as well as Lloyd George or "Billy" Watt is doing.

Mr. PETRIE: While we have Bolsheviks, I.W.W.-ites, and other men of that sort—

Mr. KIRWAN: Imported by Denham.

Mr. PETRIE: We will always have trouble; and I say that it is the duty of every conscientious and honest worker of Queensland and Australia to assist the unionists of Australia to burn out this cancerous growth of disloyalty that is eating the heart out of their organisation. There is no room in Australia for disloyalists. The sooner our social and industrial system is purged of them the better it will be for Australia and Australians.

Mr. KIRWAN: Are they the chaps who were trading with Germany?

Mr. PETRIE: The only way, to my mind, to do this is at the ballot-box. If the workers of Queensland and Australia exert their influence in this direction, they will find that fair play and fair dealing will be their lot. We have heard a lot this afternoon from the hon. member for Flinders regarding the unemployed question. It is a great question and a big problem. He was trying to prove that he saw a way out of the difficulty, and I think probably from his standpoint he may have made out what some hon. members may consider a good case. The unemployed question certainly is a big one. Unfortunately, there are some men who, no matter what is done for them, or however good conditions are made for them, will never work. The State should make men of this class work, and, if they have wives and families to support, the State should pay the money over to them so that they shall be supported, and that this should continue until the men came to their senses and went to the support of those whom they have every reason to support. We have heard a good deal about the worker. We know that outside of this House the worker is a power in the land, but hon. gentlemen must not forget that so is the man with brains.

Mr. COLLINS: Has not the worker brains?

Mr. PETRIE: Regard must be had to the man with brains, to the scientist, the expert, and the capitalist. I am one of those who believe in making the conditions of the workers better in every respect. Arbitration has not solved the problem. To-day we find that the other side of the House, which introduced the Arbitration Act—the Arbitration Act which the Denham Government brought in was not considered good enough—are ignoring that Act altogether; they will not abide by it. I say that, if the Government can amend the Arbitration Act in any shape or form that will stop strikes and other industrial disputes, then I am with them all the time.

Mr. WEIR: Why don't you help them in Liverpool? They need your assistance there.

[Mr. Petrie.

Mr. PETRIE: We know that brute force has never achieved anything in that particular direction. It has been the means of forcing misery and starvation upon thousands of innocent victims. I wish to refer to the present strike. I do not say that the seamen are not justified in making demands, but I believe that they must go about it in a constitutional way. They can have their grievances righted without doing what they have done. They have been misled by the extremists and those I have mentioned, whom the unionists should cut out. The sooner they are bounded back to the country they came from the better it will be not only for the unions but also for the people of Australia.

Mr. WEIR: Too thin.

Mr. PETRIE: The hon. member says "too thin," but I say it is to be regretted that, while these strikers are doing what they are doing, people are starving in the North and other parts, and the Government stand idly by and do nothing to relieve the position.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Are you speaking of the Commonwealth Government?

Mr. PETRIE: This Government is to blame.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: This Government have nothing to do with it.

Mr. PETRIE: This Government should have taken a stand, but they are too afraid of the votes they are after; they are too weak-kneed. I say it is time they should stand down and let someone else get on the Treasury benches who would do the proper thing.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The Seamen's Union is a Federal union.

Mr. PETRIE: This Government want to throw everything on to the Federal Government. They say the Federal Government will not supply them with the ships; but they had ships lying here that they could have acquired.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: The "Allinga."

Mr. PETRIE: The "Allinga." Why didn't you get her?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You try to man her, and see if you can get her.

Mr. PETRIE: I now wish to refer to the ill-fated steamer "Llewellyn."

Mr. WEIR: Are you going to blame the Government for that?

Mr. PETRIE: I am not going to blame the Government, but I say that that vessel should not have been sent to sea at all. She was condemned before as unfit to go outside Cape Moreton. I know that the Government probably thought they were doing the best they could, but they had other steamers which they could have sent.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Do you think the Marine Department is totally incapable?

Mr. PETRIE: I do not say that the Marine Department is totally incapable.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Don't they manage these things? Don't they certify to the fitness of ships?

Hon. W. H. BARNES: The Minister is getting angry. Why should he get angry?

Mr. PETRIE: The hon. gentleman will have time to make his own speech later on. I do not think he will, however, because he moved an extension of time for the hon. member for Flinders.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I am not so fond of talking as the hon. member.

Mr. PETRIE: I noticed that the annual report of the Labour and Industrial Branch of the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics, which is issued by the Commonwealth Statistician, Mr. G. H. Knibbs, shows that, since the advent of the Ryan Government in Queensland, strikes have increased enormously. These are the figures from 1913 to 1918, inclusive. The Ryan Government assumed office in June, 1915.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Does "Knibbs" say that?

Mr. PETRIE: I say that. I am going to quote "Knibbs" now. The Minister need not think he will trip me up, because I know as well as he does what I am saying. I thought he was going to say that "Knibbs" was telling an untruth. These are the figures—

	Disputes.	Establishments Involved.	Work-people Involved.	Loss of Wages.
				£
1913 ...	17	20	2,006	23,374
1914	18	42	1,686	11,747
1915	17	39	2,066	3,505
1916	64	252	20,318	95,973
1917	39	202	13,045	178,125
1918	84	696	10,678	131,142

The Commonwealth figures for the year 1918 are—New South Wales 138 disputes, Queensland 84, Victoria 33, Western Australia 22, South Australia 17, Northern Territory 3, Tasmania 1. New South Wales loss of wages, £112,894; Queensland, £151,142; Victoria £99,346; Western Australia, £17,792; South Australia, £10,515; Northern Territory, £395; Tasmania, £250. The reason I am quoting these figures is to show that, while the Labour Government have been in power, they have had far more strikes than any other Government. I think some of those extremists, when they have a Labour Government in power, are not satisfied with a fair thing. They want the Government to do things which are not constitutional, and which they have not the power to do. They try to force the hands of the Government in every respect. In dealing with these men the Government have far more trouble than they would have if they were allowed to act as their consciences dictated. I do not wish to say anything disrespectful of the Labour party, because I believe that in that party there are true and good men. At the same time, when they get in power, this House and this country are ruled by outsiders. There is the Industrial Council, which will never have any industrial peace as long as they can prevent it. Should such a thing happen the occupation of organisers and men of that stamp would be gone.

I notice in the Speech the following paragraph:—

"But no scheme that could be devised for the benefit of the returned soldiers, or of the community generally, can be fully effective while the law permits the remorseless profiteer to make grossly

excessive gains by the sale of the common necessities of life. As the rescission of the Commonwealth price-fixing regulations has given this species of exploiter larger opportunities, a measure dealing with the whole matter thoroughly and equitably will be submitted for your approval."

Mr. KIRWAN: Hear, hear!

Mr. PETRIE: I am not in sympathy with the profiteer, because I believe that any man who tries to take down the worker or anybody else by excessive profits should be punished. At the same time, supply and demand is the thing that controls this matter. At the last election the cry was "Cheap food." What do we find in Queensland to-day? According to Knibbs's statistics, we find that Queensland is the dearest State in the Commonwealth in which to live. It is not fair that immediately a man gets a rise in wages the price of commodities should go up. Something should be done to prevent that. We must not forget, however, that, when there is an increase in wages, the price of the article which has to be produced must also go up. The Government are taking credit for what they have done for our returned soldiers; but they have been doing it with money which has been advanced from the Commonwealth. This week, in Brisbane, and throughout Queensland, we are having what is called an "Australian manufacturers' week." Unfortunately, on account of the influenza epidemic, we have been prevented from holding our big exhibition this year. This manufacturers' week is taking the place of the exhibition. I think there is a display in Market Square, and in most of the shop windows. It does one good to go round and see what can be produced in Australia. If we wish to promote the return to civil life of our sailors and soldiers who fought in the great war, we must institute throughout Australia an active campaign with the object of fostering a sentiment in favour of Australian-made articles and the building up of Australian industries. Unfortunately for those industries, while conditions in the industrial world remain as they are, no man will lay out money to a large extent. This state of affairs will continue until the workers are prepared to work in with the much-abused capitalist, about whom we have heard so much. I see no reason why capital and labour should not be friends, helping one another, making the State progress, and bringing happiness and contentment to everybody. I have been an employer of labour for many years, and I can honestly say that I have always been able to settle without bother any little trouble I may have had with the men, so that, notwithstanding what may be said by the hon. member for Flinders, while some employers may be bad, all employers are not.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: You are the bright, shining example.

Mr. PETRIE: I do not want any compliments from the hon. member, neither do I want a halo round my head, because I was told by another hon. member on the other side that on account of my speaking in favour of conscription I would be sent to perdition. I would remind the hon. member for Brisbane, who made that statement, that, although he said he was in favour of the voluntary system, when conscription was not carried, very few members on the other side

Mr. Petrie.]

went into the country and asked people to enlist and help their comrades in the trenches. Why did hon. members opposite not go out in the country and try to do something in the direction of asking men to cross the seas to help their comrades?

During the war a multitude of young industries came into being. They were picturesquely and accurately described as "War Babies," as they were born during the war. Other industries were extended and the avenues of employment were widened; and, consequently, there was a greater circulation of money locally. Australia's progress and status as a nation is dependent on proper encouragement by Australians of their own industries. We have any amount of raw materials here, and, instead of exporting our raw products, we should, if possible, manufacture them within our own shores. This campaign should be a national one, and the chief note to be sounded should be the urgent need of establishing industries in order to permit the return to civil life of our soldiers who have helped to make Australia a nation. We have a huge national debt as a result of the war, and we must prevent, if possible, money going out of the country for the purchase of goods abroad when similar goods can be obtained in Australia. I have mentioned that this is Australia week, and I have an extract from one of the papers, which says—

"In a recent address to his fellow-manufacturers, the president of the Chamber of Manufactures (Mr. A. D. Walker) declared dramatically: 'Militarily the war is over. For us it has just commenced.' He pointed out that nations abroad, facing after-the-war reconstruction, were organising huge trade combines, backed by enormous capital, and, with veritable advance armies of consuls, selling agents, and secret trade commissioners, they were preparing for the 'peaceful invasion' of countries open to exploitation. Their aim was a natural one. They wanted to promote the reparation of their own soldiers, to lessen their own unemployment problems, and to lighten, by increased production, their own grievous burdens of taxation. The question was whether Australians were going to solve these problems for other countries and to neglect the equally serious problems of their own country."

I think that sums up the situation very nicely indeed.

Mr. COLLINS: Did that manufacturer sign the circular that was read in the House this afternoon?

Mr. PETRIE: I know nothing at all about the circulars that were read by the hon. member for Flinders. I am not connected with them, and I do not know who signed them. I do not know that it would make very much difference if I did.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: If you do not join, you will be blacklisted.

Mr. PETRIE: I know all about that. There are thirty-six measures mentioned in the Governor's Speech, and six or seven of them are already very well known to us. I might say that they have been resurrected.

Mr. MULLAN: Which one do you object to?

Mr. PETRIE: When those measures come before us, I will let the hon. member know

[*Mr. Petrie.*

what I have to say in regard to them. I wish to point out the alarming position into which this State has got since the socialistic Government took control.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Since the Tories left office.

Mr. PETRIE: Our party is the party which believes in justice to every man and woman in the State; we do not believe in class legislation. (Government laughter.) I am only sorry that we have party politics. If I had my way, I would do away with party politics altogether, but what to substitute is the problem. Faithful as the Government's own followers may be, still there are plenty of things done by the Government in which they do not believe. I do not forget the remarks of the hon. member for Logan, nor those of the hon. member for Normanby, and I must congratulate those hon. members on their very moderate speeches. The hon. member for Logan admitted that the greatest educator is travel. I am glad that that hon. member enlisted and went to fight for his King and country. His intentions were good, and it is no fault of his that he did not get right to the field of battle, and I am sure every member of this House will appreciate what he did. The hon. member said that, owing to his travels, his views have been broadened.

Mr. COLLINS: Made more democratic.

Mr. PETRIE: We are all more democratic than we were. When I first came into this House in 1893, under the late Sir Thomas McIlwraith, I was called a Tory, and I have been called a Tory ever since, although I venture to say—not that I wish to blow my own trumpet—that I have been as good a Labour man as any member of this House, not excluding hon. members on the other side.

(*Sitting suspended from 6 p.m. to 7 p.m.*)

Mr. PETRIE: We all know the alarming position that this State has got into since the socialist Government took control. There is no doubt that the State has got into such a position that, if things are not adjusted soon, I do not know how we are going to carry on. I might remind hon. members that, prior to the advent of the present Government, there were a series of credit balances shown by the State; but, notwithstanding the increased taxation, there are distinct losses shown upon each year's return. The total revenue for the year 1914-1915, the last year of the Denham Government, was £7,202,658. In 1918-1919 the revenue for the year amounted to £9,415,543. It will be seen that in that period of years, as a result of added taxation imposed on the community by the present Government, there was an extra amount of revenue amounting to £2,212,885. The total taxation received in 1914-1915 was £915,457. In 1917-1918 the receipts from taxation amounted to £1,761,232, and in 1918-1919 to £2,772,268. The taxation receipts for the last financial year, as compared with 1914-1915, showed an increase of £1,856,811. That amount all came from increased direct taxation, and not from the general progress of the community.

Mr. COLLINS: Taxation of a few persons and of a few estates.

Mr. PETRIE: There are a few people who do not pay taxation who should be made to pay.

Mr. KIRWAN: You favour the poll-tax.

Mr. PETRIE: No, I do not. That is an old worn-out saying. It is like the cry, "Give us your policy," which used to be indulged in by hon. members opposite. It is time they dropped all that sort of rubbish. The taxation per head of the population in 1914-1915 in Queensland was £1 8s. 2d. In 1916-1917 it was £2 6s. 9d. I do not know what the figures were for 1918-1919, but no doubt they will show a further increase per head.

Mr. KIRWAN: Give us the profiteers' taxation, and let us have the whole thing.

Mr. PETRIE: Queensland is the heaviest taxed State of all; and, not only are we taxed more heavily than any other State, but the cost of living has gone up to a greater extent in Queensland than in any other part of the Commonwealth. We have also got land taxation in Queensland.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. PETRIE: Previous Governments had no land taxation at all in the State, although we had a Federal land tax. While the present Government have been in office they have received from land taxation the following amounts:—1915-1916, £247,044; 1916-1917, £362,535; in 1917-1918, £344,547; in 1918-1919, £578,252. If we take the receipts from income tax, we will find that in the last year of the Liberal Government, 1914-1915, the receipts amounted to £517,000. In 1915-1916, the first year of the Ryan Socialist Government, the income tax receipts increased to £766,560. In 1917-1918, the receipts amounted to £967,520, and in 1918-1919, to £1,677,334. So that the amount received from income tax last year was £1,160,000 more than the Denham Government received from the same source during their last year in office.

Mr. GILDAY: That shows that incomes must be increasing. Is not that a good thing for Queensland?

Mr. PETRIE: In his last estimate of taxation the Treasurer anticipated that he would receive £1,154,000 from income taxation, but, as a matter of fact, he received £523,334 more than he expected from that source. So he cannot blame the country or the taxpayers for not getting the revenue he anticipated. I am not going into the financial position to-night, because the hon. member for Bulimba, who is an ex-Treasurer, is better able to do it than I am, and, when he gets up to speak, he will show the Government, per medium of the Treasury returns, the way the State is drifting.

Mr. KIRWAN: He is the Opposition financial "Big Bertha."

Mr. PETRIE: I think all the financial magnates and capitalists are on the Government side of the House, because it is the members over there who are accumulating money as fast as ever they can.

Mr. POLLOCK: Why are you always picking on to me? (Laughter.)

Mr. PETRIE: I am not picking on the hon. member, although I dare say he is putting by his little bit, too.

With regard to our railways, I think it is deplorable to see the way they are drifting at the present time. In referring to the railways, I do not wish to cast any reflection on the Commissioner or the heads in the Railway Department. I think the Government made a good appointment when they

appointed Mr. Davidson Commissioner, and he has good heads of departments under him. The only trouble is that the Commissioner is not allowed to run the railways in his own way. If he were allowed to go his own way, the railways would be run in the interests of the country, and it would be better for all concerned. In 1913-1914, our railways returned £3 12s. 6d. per cent. on the capital invested. In 1914-1915, the last year of the Denham Government, they returned £3 16s. 7d. per cent. In 1915-1916, the first year of the Ryan Government, they returned £2 11s. per cent., in 1916-1917, £2 1s. 5d. per cent., and in 1917-1918 £1 9s. 7d. per cent. I think the returns for the year just ended will show a further reduction of the revenue from the railways. It is not a very cheerful prospect to look forward to, and something ought to be done to improve matters. I was expecting that I should get the interjection, "What would you do? Sack the men?" I say, "No." I do not believe in discharging men wholesale; but, if the service is overmanned—and it has been proved to be overmanned—then the Government should come boldly forth and find some other avenue of employment for these men which would be more suitable for them, because, as far as we can gather, there are many men in the Railway Department just now topping over one another, and not knowing what to do. The public will realise the seriousness of the position on the railways. The Secretary for Railways recently made a trip to America and the old country, but we are still waiting to hear something about the result of that trip.

Mr. GILDAY: Give him time.

Mr. PETRIE: I will give him time—I am not going to run him down—but by this time he should have been able to give us any information and advice he picked up on his trip which may be beneficial in the working of the Queensland railways. I do not wish to cast any reflection on our railways, but I could not help being amused at seeing a picture of two "diggers" who were over in Egypt, where they saw a train creeping along very slowly. One of them said to the other, "That reminds me of the railways of Queensland." He said, further, "Do you know that the Queensland railways are mentioned in the Bible?" The other "digger" said, "Bunkum! What are you giving us?" And his friend replied, "Look up your Bible, and read that part where it says 'In the beginning the Lord created all creeping things.'" (Laughter.) I do not wish to refer to our railways as being all creeping things, but the humour of that "digger" showed what his impression of our Queensland railways was.

There is a long list of Bills enumerated, which would take a whole Parliament to get through. I do not think it was the intention of the Government, when they framed the Speech, that we should get through them all, but I will give the Government credit for having foreshadowed some good measures. The first on the list is a Fair Prices Bill, in regard to which I am sure they will have the hearty co-operation of every member on this side; but we cannot say anything about the Bill till it comes before us. Then we are to have a Legislative Council Abolition Bill. We hear a good deal about the abolition of the Council, but I do not think it was ever the intention of the present Government to abolish the Upper House. If they

Mr. Petrie.]

are consistent, why do they fill up vacancies as they occur? In time they will have all their own men in the Council, and have it all their own way. The result of the referendum that was taken on the question should be sufficient intimation to the Government that the people of Queensland want to have the Upper House as a protection. I have not always agreed with the system of members being nominated for life, and think that appointments might be made for a term of years only, or that members might be elected, not on the same electoral franchise as the Lower House, but, perhaps, on a property qualification.

There is one good Bill promised, and that is the Main Roads Bill, which I am very glad to see in the programme. Our main roads are not a credit to us; and, when we open up our country lands for settlement, we should also provide good main roads. I hope that the Bill which the Assistant Minister for Justice will bring in will be the means of providing the good roads in Queensland which we so much need. Then there is to be an Elections Act Amendment Bill. There has hardly been a Government which has not brought in an Elections Bill. The Government had it all their own way in regard to the last Bill which they introduced, and I do not think hon. members opposite moved an amendment. We fought it and tried to include some good amendments in it, but we failed, as we were in a minority. They are now going to introduce what I would call the "baby vote."

Mr. COLLINS: You did not call them babies when you sent them to the war.

Mr. PETRIE: I am prepared to give all the soldiers a vote and to do what I can for them. I see that nothing is said about the redistribution of seats. We know the unfairness which exists, as there are some electorates which have not got one-sixth of the population which others have, and it is time something was done in that direction. Then there is to be a Fair Rents Bill. I do not know what shape that Bill will take, but I shall probably have something to say on the Bill when it comes before us. We have several resurrections in the list of Bills. There is the Liquor Act Amendment Bill, and we are anxiously waiting to see in what direction that Bill will go. I do not think we shall see much of it this session; it will be sidetracked in some way or other. Altogether, there is a big bill of fare of thirty-six measures, some of which we have had before.

Before I conclude, I wish to say that we on this side are prepared to assist the Government in any legislation for the benefit of the people. But it appears to me that the Government have shown their weakness in every direction. They said that they were going to govern, but they have been governed by outsiders. They should have come out into the open during the industrial strife we have had and the time of drought, and boldly declared that they were going to take a stand, and not allow the extremists to interfere with them. They would then have had the support of every member on this side of the House.

My time is nearly up, and I do not desire to ask for an extension. I hope the Government will wake up to the situation and cast aside the extremists—that they will stand to their guns and try and get the country out

[*Mr. Petrie.*

of the mire we are in. It will be a difficult matter, and whoever follows them will have a very hard task to straighten out things. I hope that the few words that I have spoken will have due effect on Ministers opposite, and that they will pay a good deal of heed to what I have said.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN (*Kennedy*): Before proceeding to discuss the Speech I must take the opportunity of congratulating the hon. member for Wide Bay on his remarks in moving the adoption of the Address in Reply, and of saying that I agree with him when he said that the great hope he had of peace amongst the nations had been pretty well shattered owing to the way in which the Peace Conference had acted. We all, and I in particular, am delighted at the fact that the war is over. Many of us hoped that the League of Nations would be something towards the stoppage of future war, but, unfortunately, that hope has not been realised. Still, notwithstanding the constitution of the present League, I believe that in the near future the democracies in the countries of the world will be so strong that they will be able to direct the policy of that League towards permanent peace.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIRWAN: That is the only hope.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: That is the only hope we have, and not until then shall we have a League of Nations which will make for peace. Unfortunately to-day we find that it is more a League of those who were victorious—and I am heartily pleased that our side was victorious—a League to keep those who were victorious dominant right throughout the next century. The war has caused the expenditure of a tremendous amount of money, terrible suffering, and loss of life. The money expenditure that has been entailed amounts to about £40,000,000. From that very fact alone, we may expect the enslavement of the workers and producers of the world for some considerable time—probably for something like two or three generations, that is, if the democracies do not wake up to the fact that they must not always be the Gradgrind to pay the interest on the money expended, as we are told, for liberty. There are evidences right throughout the world of unrest. Unrest is not confined to our Australian shores, and to my mind a lot of it has been caused by the great profiteering that has been going on during the war. Many millions of men were taken away from industry. Still production went on, and men who prated of their patriotism were fattening and batten- ing on the worker and those who remained to keep industry going. Millions of money have been made by these profiteers right throughout the world, and now they wake up and find that the world is in a furmole. I am sure that anyone who can read the signs of the times must know that we shall have unrest right throughout the world for many years to come, thanks to the colossal amount of money that the war has cost the nations of the world, and the fact that the workers themselves now find that they will have to foot the bill.

Mr. KIRWAN: They have to foot the bill in every war.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Not only do they foot the bill, but they also shed their blood, and when they come back very little

is made of them. There is a lot of flag-waving and cheering; but, when it comes to giving them a pension, they cannot get sufficient to maintain them in proper and necessary comfort. That, I say, is a shame and a disgrace to any country, and I hold that these men should get sufficient to keep them. There should not be so great an amount of money voted for generals and other officers when the rank and file are left with a bare subsistence. (Hear, hear!) In Britain they are voting hundreds of thousands of pounds to generals and others whilst the poor privates who bore the brunt of the war have scarcely sufficient to keep them.

Mr. KIRWAN: Including V.C. winners.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: We have heard a lot from the Opposition benches, and we have even read in the Press that we need more production. I believe we do, but at the same time we want a more equitable distribution of the wealth of the country. There is great wealth in the country, there is no dearth of wealth production, but there is an unfair distribution of it, and it is going on more to-day than even in pre-war days. It is time that some Government—and I am in hopes that this Government will tackle the question this session—took some action, because unrest is everywhere, and, in my opinion, and in the opinion of many others, 90 per cent. of the cause is the high cost of living. We have to-day men who believed in arbitration and thought that it was going to right the wrongs of the worker. Whilst believing in arbitration, I never did believe that it was going to right the wrongs of the worker. I believe that it is what you might term a jumping-off place, or, more correctly, a stage in the transition to that end.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: Do you believe in direct action?

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: I do not, except as a last resource. As a working man I know that direct action as a last resource must never be taken from the worker. As the hon. member for Flinders said earlier this evening, to give a man just a bare living wage is not sufficient. A man has a right to the full results of his toil—(Hear, hear!)—and fixing his wage by arbitration does not give him that. I want to show where the wealth is going, and where it is necessary for this Government or any other Labour Government to go in order to get from the usurer the amount he has extorted from the producer and the worker. We are told that men are going slow, but I repeat that we want a more equitable distribution of wealth not only in Queensland, but also in the rest of Australia and other parts of the world. I find from "Knibbs" that the production of wealth in Queensland in 1916 was £25,000,000 in the secondary industries alone, that is, in the working up of agriculture and other products, not necessarily to the finished product, for instance not [7.30 p.m.] so far as to the making of boots, but just bringing the hide up to the stage of leather and no further. The sum of £25,000,000 was invested, made up of raw material £16,000,000, fuel and light £310,000, salaries and wages, £4,181,000, and the interest and profits amounted to £4,921,000. The interest and profits exceeded the wages paid to the workers and salaried managers.

Mr. COLLINS: Scandalous.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Scandalous? It is awful. The percentage of profits was 19.37 and of wages 16.26. That is in Queensland. The wages cost of every £100 produced was only £16.26, and the profits were £19.37. If a man invests £10,000 under this system, he gets a profit of 19 per cent. If he invests £10,000 at 10 per cent. he gets £1,000 for the loan of that money, and his £1,000 would be equal to the work and energy of five men working and only getting £200 per year for their labour. Is that a fair proportion?

Mr. PAYNE: No.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Is it a fair system that that amount of money could command services equal to the wages and returns of five working men? No wonder there is unrest; no wonder that the workers to-day are intending to use their political power in the future to get economic freedom and economic justice as a corollary of political power. The classes in the past legislated for their own class interests, and fortified themselves in the laws that practically rule to-day, despite the fact that Labour has been in office for a short time. The workers now are going to initiate legislation in their special interests, and for the well-being of the masses of the country, and not of the few, as has been done in the past. Again, taking the amount of £25,000,000, we will allow a certain percentage on the investment during the process of manufacture, on lands and buildings, on machinery and raw material, totalling £23,650,000. If a man, for instance, has borrowed money at 7 per cent. to lay down a plant and to pay wages and to carry on production until the article is finished, he would then clear a profit almost equal to the amount of wages of the men. For instance, it would amount to £1,655,000 by allowing 7 per cent. while the article is being produced, and, allowing 10 per cent. profit, there would be a profit of £2,500,000. I may say that I believe that a tax on excess profits should be passed by this Parliament, and the State should take every farthing over 10 per cent. of the profits made by an industry. In my opinion, 10 per cent. is too high, but I would say that everything over 10 per cent. should be confiscated by the Government. By this means, you will be able to fix the prices of articles. It is no use saying that we will bring in an excess tax on profits of 50 per cent., because these men will keep 50 per cent. of the profit and are willing to share with the State the remaining 50 per cent.

Mr. VOWLES: Would you average it up?

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: I would make it for three years and no more, and I would take every penny over 10 per cent. By that means, you will be able practically to fix prices, because there will be no incentive to the profiteer to extort by high prices large profits—they will be no use to him. I can go on and give you more startling things than that. The interest and profits, as I have already stated, amount to £4,921,000; deducting the two amounts of £1,655,000 and £2,500,000—a total of £4,135,000—it would leave an excess profit of £886,000. I will now pass on to boots, and, by the way, I wish to remark that we were informed a short time ago that boots are going to be increased by something like 50 per cent.

Mr. KIRWAN: They are going up 10s. per pair.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: There is no necessity for this. A sum of £194,000 was invested

Mr. O'Sullivan.]

in the boot industry in Queensland in 1916 and the wages and salaries totalled £120,000. The added value was £173,000, which means again that labour shows a less cost of production than the amount of the profits. Again, allowing them 7 per cent. interest on their investment while the process of manufacture is going on, and allowing them 10 per cent. profit on that, you would have a profit of £136,000 or, in other words, an average profit of over 36 per cent. That is what the profit is on boot manufacturing in Queensland. These are the profits in the wholesale branch of the business; I am not referring to those profits made by the retailers. It is no wonder that the workers are getting restless when they find that the prices of articles are going up like this, and while the profiteers are crying out, and also their henchmen in the Press, that we want more production—that we want more wealth produced—the equitable distribution of wealth is the problem of the day. Applying my idea of excess profits, you would clear on that item something like £37,000 by taking everything over 10 per cent. profit. We are also told by those opposed to us and opposed to the workers generally that high wages is one of the greatest reasons of the high cost of articles. I say here and now that it is not so. I have made a study of this year after year, and I find that, if the wages go up, the profits go up in a greater ratio. “Knibbs” says that in 1916 the wages in certain industries increased by 6 per cent., but the profits increased by barely 7 per cent. Now we come to clothing (tailoring and slop) factories. We find a greater amount of profit is being made by these exploiters—as I call them—and it behoves the Government to come in with a stiff tax and take from them those ill-gotten gains. They are ill-gotten, when these people extort from the workers such a high price. There is a total investment of £1,039,000—wages, raw material, plant, machinery, and buildings. I have allowed 7 per cent. for interest on plant and machinery, and for depreciation of machinery. Still they made a profit of 35 per cent. over and above the 10 per cent., equal to £425,000. A 10 per cent. profit would mean £139,000. The excess profit over 10 per cent. would be £287,000. The wages amount to £229,000. Now, take dressmaking and millinery. That shows a greater profit. Here is where they are sweating the workers, and where men are amassing big fortunes, particularly in this city, by taking from the consumers extortionate prices for their goods. They have invested £202,000, and out of that they paid in wages £57,000, and made a profit of £107,000—85 per cent. profit on that item. An excess profits tax would realise £87,000. Now, I come to bacon-curing.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: Deal with the State meatshops.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: The profit on the State meatshops goes into consolidated revenue. There is no profiteering there. I will give an instance that came under my notice in going through production, showing the difference between private production for profit and State ownership. Take our railway shops, not only in Queensland, but in New South Wales, South Australia, and the other States. The wages bill in some instances almost equals, and sometimes exceeds, the added value during the process

[Mr. O'Sullivan.

of manufacture. Take bacon-curing. Queensland is the greatest bacon producer of any State in the Commonwealth. The total amount invested was £675,000, including wages, machinery, raw materials, and fuel. They made a profit of £223,000, equal to 49 per cent.

Mr. VOWLES: Foggitt, Jones, and Co.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: I do not care who it is. Those are the figures. I do not suppose Foggitt, Jones, and Co. are the only people who are engaged in that industry.

Mr. VOWLES: Why do you not go and talk to Mr. Jones and make him reduce his profits?

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: The manufacturers pay the small amount of £48,000 in wages.

Mr. VOWLES: Mr. Jones is a good Labour man.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: They got £223,000, representing £109,000 more than the 10 per cent. profit would be. In those five items alone an excess profits tax over 10 per cent. would realise £1,450,000. I heard the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat stating that there has been too great taxation in Queensland. Only the other day the chairman of directors of the Queensland National Bank was exhorting people to go in for more production. After himself declaring a 10 per cent. dividend and taking to reserve a considerable amount of money, he states—

“The higher values obtained during recent years for our products have made our decreased production less noticeable, but this falling off will be more in evidence when trade relations with overseas and enemy countries have been resumed, and we again impress on the community the necessity for renewed industry, the practice of rigid economy—”

Just fancy urging economy after the way in which the secondary industries have made such great profits!—

“as very heavy taxation must be our lot for many years to come.”

Mr. KIRWAN: Nothing like the taxation they put on the workers.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: The taxation should go on those shoulders that can best bear it. An excess profits tax would be an equitable one to impose on the exploiters. By that means we could raise something like £2,000,000 in Queensland alone, and we would not be retarding industry. This quotation proceeds—

“It sincerely is to be hoped that those engaged in the secondary industries especially will give attention to the words quoted, for, after all, the success of the secondary industries is very largely dependent upon the progress and buying power as well as the productive power of those engaged in the primary industries.”

I have shown to this House and to the country that those secondary industries are being run, not in the interests of the producer or of the consumer, but solely in the interests of those who have the money invested in them. Until we go into production for use instead of production for profit, exploitation will continue and unrest will exist. Profiteering will work its own sweet will unless it is checked by wise legislation. Referring

again to arbitration, I believe that the employers should be treated in the same way as the employees—that the manager should have his wages fixed the same as any other employee. I have in mind a man who has control of a big industry in this city, who is paying his manager £1,200 a year. That employer should be placed on the same footing as a worker. Let him have his wages fixed by the court, and let any profits over 10 per cent. be confiscated by the State. Then you would not have an incentive for high prices. To my mind, it would automatically fix the prices of articles.

If a man has £100,000 invested in his business, and he clears something like £20,000 profit, under the old system, when making out his income tax returns, he claimed that profit as from personal exertion, and thereby paid a lesser tax on his income. That should not be allowed, as the profit is made by the amount of capital he has invested in his business, and not by personal exertion, and therefore his income should be subject to the higher tax. I am very pleased that the Government have done all they possibly could to get the ships to run to North Queensland, in order to relieve the position there. We have in the North a very sad state of affairs, owing to the shipping strike. The people in North Queensland are practically reduced to the same state of destitution, so far as the necessaries of life are concerned, as that to which the people of Germany were reduced owing to the British blockade. The present state of affairs in North Queensland has been caused by the stupidity and arrogance of the Federal Government, and the Director of Shipping, Admiral Clarkson, through their domineering attitude towards the men who go down to the sea in ships to make a living. The hon. member for Mirani, when speaking the other night, stated that this Government had not done their duty in this matter. That is a misleading statement, because as early as 21st May, when the shipping strike was in its infancy, and when anything like a sympathetic attitude towards the men might have brought about a settlement of a strike, the Acting Premier, on behalf of the Queensland Government, sent the following telegram to the Acting Prime Minister of the Commonwealth:—

“ Acting Prime Minister,
“ Melbourne.

“ Would you kindly take necessary action to have Howard Smith's steamer 'Burwah' or A.U.S.N. Company's steamer 'Mallina' placed under charter to Queensland Government, in order to meet grave situation in North Queensland through dearth of foodstuffs. As matter is very serious, and admits of no delay, kindly favour me with immediate reply.

“ (Sgd.) THEODORE,
“ Acting Premier.”

It took the Acting Prime Minister five days to reply to that telegram, and, as no reply had been received on 26th May, the Acting Premier sent the following wire:—

“ Acting Prime Minister,
“ Melbourne.

“ When may I expect reply to my wire of 21st instant, asking for permission to charter 'Mallina' or 'Burwah.' Matter very urgent.

“ (Sgd.) THEODORE,
“ Acting Premier.”

On 26th May, after two urgent wires, Mr. Watt woke up, and he replied in this strain—

“ Acting Premier,
“ Brisbane.

“ Your telegram 21st. Only conditions under which 'Burwah,' 'Mallina' could be released would be that current wages and conditions should be adhered to. If seamen consented man the steamers on these terms Commonwealth Government could make full use them without intervention your Government.

“ (Sgd.) WATT.”

What right had Mr. Watt to lay down any conditions to this Government as to how these boats should be manned? He had no right at all. The Queensland Government wanted those boats; they were willing to pay the wages that the men demanded, grant the whole of the conditions asked for, and take the whole responsibility, in order that the people in the North should get food. And yet Mr. Watt had the impertinence and audacity to lay down conditions to this Government. This action on the part of the Federal Government further embittered the men engaged in the struggle, and North Queensland was left without food. I am sure that Mr. Watt does not care one straw about the conditions prevailing in the North. So long as he finds his own southern portion of Australia is served, what cares he for anyone north of Mackay? For the few people up there he has no concern, otherwise he would have done what was asked by the Queensland Government. He had no right to lay down any conditions. It was for the Queensland Government to give the men what the Queensland Government thought was a fair thing in view of the serious position in the North. Had the Commonwealth Government accepted the offer of the Queensland Government, we would have had food ships running to North Queensland at the latter end of May, and there would have been no food shortage in that part of the State. As conditions are at present, it behoves those in authority, and those representing the people, to do their best, and to pass legislation that will be to the advantage and happiness of the people. Here is an instance of profiteering that has been going on, and which will continue to go on regardless of whom it may hurt, or whom it may oppress, unless legislation is passed to prevent it. Many of those who offered their services to the country during the late war have sacrificed their limbs and faculties, and to-day many of them are practically wrecks; nevertheless the profiteer goes on fattening and battenning, and cares not whom he may hurt. I will now quote from the Melbourne "Age" of 7th August, to show what the profiteer is doing; and not only is he doing this in Victoria, but he will do it in Queensland too if he gets the opportunity. There is [8 p.m.] going to be a considerable amount of building in Melbourne in the near future, which will necessitate the use of a lot of bricks, and this is how the profiteer is going to meet the position in Melbourne. I will read the whole article, because it is worth reading—

“ One would have thought that the profiteer, no matter how soulless his attitude towards the general public, would have had some consideration for the men who shed their blood for them in the great war. But the greed of the profiteer is

Mr. O'Sullivan.]

insatiable, gratitude is unknown to him; he is no respecter of persons. He is trying his hardest now to exploit the soldier in the war service homes scheme. When the act was passed it was recognised that the Repatriation Department would be up against the brick and timber combines, and negotiations were entered into to arrange a working basis, so that existing machinery could be used. The negotiations have been made, and are still being made, in some cases, but the brick and timber profiteers have no conscience, and they stand unyielding. The price of bricks in Victoria to-day is about £2 8s. In New South Wales it is £2 13s.; yet the State brickworks in that State turn out bricks at about £2 2s. a 1,000, make a handsome profit, and pay their men a 15 per cent. bonus. The actual cost of bricks at the State works is about £1 13s. Negotiations under the war service homes scheme have revealed the fact that the brick profiteers want to make, roughly, £1 a 1,000 out of the Housing Commission. The latter expect to use 750,000,000 bricks, so that, unless some other source of supply is found, £750,000 will go into the pockets of the exploiters. In the matter of timber the situation is no better. The saw-millers have conceded something to the Housing Commission, but the dressed timber merchants are out to exploit the soldiers as much as the brickmakers. They have offered a slight reduction, but no more than they give to the contractor who pays monthly for his materials. The Housing Commission is faced with two alternatives. Either it must pay the exorbitant prices demanded by the vampires, who are out to exploit the soldier, or it must establish its own brickworks and timber mills. The Commission is already planning the erection of a modern brickworks and an up-to-date timber plant. It must be palpable to the profiteers that nearly all the building activity in the future will be soldiers' homes, and the opinion is generally expressed that when all the soldiers have been provided with homes the scheme will be extended to the civilian population. It would take some months to establish brickworks, but this is sure to be done if the building profiteers do not see reason. It is one of the most scandalous things in the history of Australia that the profiteers who stayed at home and let others go out and fight should seek to line their pockets at the expense of the latter. No community would tolerate such a state of affairs."

No, it should not. Just fancy. £750,000 going into the hands of the profiteers! Yet these are the men who talk about doing justice to the returned men. They tell us that we should make every sacrifice for the returned soldier, while at the same time they want to make £750,000 out of the soldiers themselves. That is an instance of what the profiteer would do in the State of Victoria. Thank God we have a Government in this State who are not going to allow the profiteer to exploit the soldier!

Mr. CORSER: What are you quoting from?

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: From the Melbourne "Age," a paper that supports your party.

Mr. CORSER: You are quoting from a letter.

[Mr. O'Sullivan:

Mr. KIRWAN: No; it is an article. You can see it yourself in the library. You can also see what the Farmers' Union say about profiteering.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: We see now how the profiteers want to treat the returned soldier. We remember how they cheered the soldiers on to go to war, and yet, when these men come back, the profiteers want to exploit them and make them pay high prices. These are the men who are up in arms against taxation when money is asked for to give the soldiers a pension. They want the soldiers to be treated like their forefathers were treated in the old country after they came home after a war when they were asked to subsist on 6d. per day. I have seen them myself subsisting on that amount, and the most they got was 2s. 6d. per day, and a man would have to be a colour-sergeant before he was entitled to that pension. The soldiers are out for a fair pension, and I am with them every time. It is the Federal Government which should give the soldiers a pension, and not leave it to the State Governments to dole out small sums. The State Government should not be expected to pay a pension to the soldiers.

Mr. CORSER: The soldiers do not expect it.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: The State Government are doing more than the Commonwealth Government, or any other State Government, to settle soldiers on the land.

Mr. CORSER: The New South Wales Government gives financial assistance.

Mr. KIRWAN: The New South Wales Government put the soldiers on the land and leave them there.

Mr. CORSER: You settle them on your own land—on a perpetual lease.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: I am pleased to notice that the Government propose to bring in a Fair Rents Bill.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: The workers of Queensland have been expecting this Bill for some time, and I hope we will get it through the Upper House this session. Rents have gone up all over Queensland, and in Brisbane particularly. In some instances rents have gone up from 60 to 100 per cent., and extortionate rents are demanded from tenants. The previous speaker said that he did not know how we were going to adjust rents, but you can adjust the rent of a house better than the price of any article. You know what it costs to build a house, and you can easily find the cost of upkeep, so that it would not be a hard thing to fix a fair rent. I am glad to notice that the Government intend to bring in a Bill to amend the Workers' Dwellings Act. Ever since I have been in Parliament I have advocated that the Government should introduce a Workers' Dwellings Bill for the benefit of the men who have no land at all and the man who cannot afford to buy an allotment. It is the man who is unable to comply with the present Act in this respect that we should give assistance to. At the present time, a man has to have a bit of land and be able to put up a sum of money before the Act can be put into operation. This Bill will be of some advantage to the workers, and will do something towards keeping down the high rents and the high cost of living. That is to-day the greatest

problem that we have; but, if we take our courage in both hands and get from the exploiter that which he extorts from the worker, we shall be able not only to meet our obligations, but to make the position of the worker much happier than it has been in the past. That, I hope, will be the result of the legislation which we pass. I am sure that whatever we do is not going to bring about a heaven on earth—that will take a considerable time—but the Government are going to do all they can to better the conditions of the workers, and make life much happier for the present and future generations of Queensland than it has been in the past.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. CARTER (*Port Curtis*): In rising to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, I would like to express my appreciation of the excellent programme put, through the Speech, before the House. There is a number of most useful measures outlined, and I am hopeful that too much time will not be wasted in discussion, so that the whole of the programme may go through. I have been very interested in listening to many of the informative speeches made during the debate, and I have been somewhat amused at the confusion which seems to reign amongst hon. members opposite. So many statements have been made of such a contradictory character that one wonders what they are driving at. The hon. member for Keppel not inappropriately likened them to a jazz band. There is not only lack of harmony in their speeches, but entire discord. We find one hon. member getting up and making one statement, and another making a statement directly contrary to it. One will say he is in favour of arbitration, and another will tear it to pieces.

Mr. CORSER: No.

Mr. CARTER: Another says that they hold their meetings in secret, and another says they are held openly. The hon. member for Oxley deplored the fact that the practice of having the Address in Reply was still maintained, yet, after deploring, he went on to, what he would call, waste time. I contend that, if anyone regards a thing as wrong, he is morally a very weak man when, like the sheep following a bell-wether, he continues to do it. (Government laughter.) But that is exactly what he did. He wasted an hour of the time of this Chamber, which, from his own point of view, is a very improper thing to do. He is like the man who says, "Bill Thompson broke into the bank, and I am going to break into the bank." "Dick Johnson got drunk, and I am going to get drunk." (Laughter.) That is the sort of attitude the hon. member took up. I expect to see more dignity in the members of this Chamber. I regard this as a very useful method of exposing any grievance we have, or of expressing our opinion on the various proposals that are outlined for the consideration of members, and, therefore, I take my opportunity of speaking. But it surprised me to hear the hon. member for Oxley, of whom I had formed a very high opinion, telling us that he was going to follow the lead because someone else did. If he does something because somebody else does it although he is not in sympathy with it, he is in this Chamber wearing the wolf-skin of the capitalist, and addressing the House as though he was dressed in lamb's

clothing. (Government laughter.) He told us, in replying to an interjection from the Acting Premier, that the whole of their caucus was held just as much in secret as our caucuses. Our caucus is entirely secret. I could not understand any party meeting that was not held in secret. It is not a public meeting, but a meeting to discuss the business of the party, and I quite believe the hon. member for Oxley was speaking the truth when he said that their party meetings were held in secret; but I was surprised, on reading the "Courier" this morning, to find the hon. member for Toowong saying that this was utterly untrue—

"The Acting Premier (to Mr. Elphinstone): How are your caucuses held?"

"Mr. ELPHINSTONE: In exactly the same way as yours."

The hon. member for Toowong, in his speech last night, said—

"The Government of the State was conducted in private—not in the halls of Parliament, but at the Trades Hall, and in secret caucus. The proceedings of the National party, on the other hand, were open as the day. There was nothing they need be ashamed of, and nothing they wished to conceal, and he hoped that would always be the policy of the party."

To-day I listened to the hon. member for Flinders reading some confidential document.

Mr. CORSER: Do you know they are over two years old—written before the last election?

Mr. CARTER: When a man is dealing with a confidential document we naturally suppose that the speeches made where that document is drafted are something of the same character, and not intended for the public; and therefore, when the hon. member for Oxley tells us that his caucus is held in secret, I believe him. But, when the hon. member for Toowong gets up before the public and makes the statement that the party meetings are held in the open, and that there are no caucuses or secret meetings, then I want to say that one of the hon. members is not telling the truth, and I do not think it is the hon. member for Oxley on this occasion. (Government laughter.) When two hon. members make statements so contradictory to each other, one of them cannot be true. The hon. member for Oxley on various occasions has gone out of his way to attack the Bolsheviks, and, no doubt, to attack socialism. I do not know what Bolshevism is, unless it is something on the lines of syndicalism. I endeavoured during the time the cry of syndicalism was raised to try and get at the bottom of it. There is something very plausible in it, and I am quite satisfied that many of the able men who became exponents of syndicalism would not have taken up with it if there had not been something in it. The other evening the hon. member for Oxley went out of his way to tell us that he believed in a system of the different bodies of workers taking over industries. If I have read anything of syndicalism, that is syndicalism pure and simple—that each body of workers must take over that particular industry. I have tried to reason out what use it would be to the community for each particular section to take over an industry. I am satisfied that those engaged in the industry would try to make the most of it, and we should have each industry trying to take advantage of the

Mr. Carter.]

others. Yet we find the hon. member for Oxley telling us that he believes that the unions should conduct and own the industries. While I say that on some occasions I believe the hon. member, there are occasions on which I would require a very large grain of salt to get down what he says.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: It does not concern me what you think.

Mr. CARTER: I know it does not. It does not concern me what the hon. member thinks, and I am sure very few hon. members in the House are concerned with what the hon. member thinks. The hon. member has a nice voice and speaks in a nice way, but when you analyse the stuff he has said, it is so contradictory that one does not know where he stands. Some hon. members on the other side begin to think that he should come to this side.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Not while you are there.

Mr. CARTER: But judging him by his statements, we do not want him on this side. One hon. member opposite will get up and tell us that there is no such thing as profiteering and, generally speaking, try to get the people to believe that there was no such thing. On the other hand, the hon. member for Oxley says that there is.

Mr. CORSER: Who said there was not?

Mr. CARTER: The hon. member for Burnett said there was not. He said there was no such thing—that it was purely mythical. The hon. member said—

“The ‘remorseless profiteer’ is to be made the scapegoat of this Government. For the most part, the profiteer in Queensland is merely a myth, and a political myth at that. It is brought about merely to bring a few electors on to the right track.”

Mr. CORSER: “For the most part.”

Mr. CARTER: A purely mythical profiteer! Other hon. members, by inference, have tried to lead the House to believe that there is no such thing as a profiteer. We know that their great god, “Billy” Hughes, says he is going to attack the profiteer, and is also going to attack the Bolshevik when he returns to Australia.

Mr. CORSER: Well, he will have you.

Mr. CARTER: He has had the whole of Australia pretty badly. (Government laughter.) He says he is going to attack the profiteer on the one hand and the Bolshevik on the other. The Bolshevik is attacking the profiteer. Hughes represents to-day the capitalistic section. It is true that he has been almost everything that has a name as a political party. So have hon. members on the other side. They have had a dozen different names. The leopard cannot change his spots, but they can change their names—(Government laughter)—but we know them despite their names. It is like painting a sparrow’s feathers to make it a canary. (Government laughter.) They can call themselves what they like—they are the capitalistic party. It was only necessary to listen to the speech of the hon. member for Flinders to-day to realise the attitude they are taking up. We know of the document, “Dear Macartney,” of a few years ago. We know of the scheme of the profiteers, the insurance companies, who were going to find so much money for the party opposite to fight their battle. I know that in my district subscriptions came, not from the workers’ unions, but from very wealthy men, to conduct

campaigns against myself and others. I have here a little document indicating their methods of getting a large sum of money for the coming Federal and State elections. These people belong to the capitalistic party; and, if anybody is a profiteer, it is the capitalist; and yet we find an hon. member like the hon. member for Oxley, who was put into the House by the money of the capitalistic section, saying that there is profiteering. And if I know anything about the profiteers, they do not give a £1 unless they get £1 5s. or £1 10s. back. If they hire wage-slaves—they do not care whether they are in the trenches, or in the tunnels, or on the other side of this House—they want full value from them. They may give them good clothes; they will give them food to eat, and wine to drink; but still they are slaves to their party, and they have to come to heel when the whip is put upon them. They represent the capitalist section, pure and simple, and when they come and tell us that they believe that the capitalistic system is something damnable, how are we to believe them? The hon. member for Oxley said—

“I am one of those who believe, and I have never ceased to state it, that the profiteering which is going on is most damnable.”

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Hear, hear! and other things are damnable in this House, too. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. CARTER:

“There are numerous instances of profiteering in our midst, and, when the Bill comes forward dealing with the question, I shall do all I can to assist the Government to frame a measure which will be reasonable and applicable to the present position.”

The last few words are the important ones. The hon. member will say that the Bill is not reasonable and applicable. No matter if the Bill were perfection in itself it would never be “reasonable and applicable” in the views of a man who represents the capitalistic section in this Chamber. He may make what speeches he likes to the electors at Oxley and tell them how damnable profiteering is. He may tell them that and a number of other things; but, when the whip is cracked, he will come to heel, and, if he does not, somebody else will represent Oxley in his place.

Another question I wish to discuss is how the Nationalist section treat the poor farmer they pretend to befriend. We have from time to time heard a great deal about the butter question. It became necessary when this party came into power to take over the butter because of the boodling—profiteering—that was going on. The hon. member for Drayton has gone so far as to say that the late leader of his party—whom at one time he worshipped—that Mr. Denham—and he said it with a sneer on his lip—was no farmer; he lived on the farmer—that was practically what he inferred. And since the Government found it necessary to take over the butter and handle it as they did, they did exceedingly well.

Mr. CORSER: The Commonwealth did.

Mr. CARTER: It is quite interesting to hear a member of the Nationalist party trying to claim all the advantages this Government has given to the farmer for the Nationalist party. The hon. member knows that he has indulged in numerous tirades

[Mr. Carter.]

against the Secretary for Agriculture for doing this useful work for the farmer. There is no man, as Minister, who has taken a greater interest in the farmer than the hon. gentleman during the term he has occupied the position of Secretary for Agriculture. He has brought in many most useful measures, and he handled the butter question in a masterly way as compared with private enterprise or Federal control of the industry. I am going to give you the Federal conduct of the question in a few minutes, so that we can draw a very vivid contrast between what has been done by the State for the farmers and what has since been done by the Commonwealth. The hon. member for Drayton for months and months called across this Chamber, "You have stolen our butter." What can the hon. member for Burnett mean when he says that the Federal Government took control, when the hon. member for Drayton constantly abuses the Secretary for Agriculture for taking their butter? Under State control we find that for the portion of the two years when butter was controlled by the State the factories were enabled to pay to the farmers a better price than has been paid before or since. During 1915-16 the price paid by the factories was 1s. 2½d. per lb. for their butter contents.

Mr. CORSER: And it cost the Government 2s. 6d. a lb. to make butter at Gatton College.

Mr. CARTER: During 1916-17 the Government were able to pay the factories 1s. 4½d. for the butter contents, and on top of that the Agricultural Department distributed about £32,000 amongst the factories, equivalent to another 1½d. per lb. for the butter fat. What does that mean? It means 1s. 6d. per lb. I want to give the hon. member for Burnett a little information, and I have made inquiries as to when the Federal Government took control of the butter. We find that in October, 1916, they started to take it over. They [8.30 p.m.] issued their first proclamation on the 6th January, 1917. I would like the hon. member for Burnett to take notice of that. The price they fixed was 158s.—equivalent to 1s. 5d. per lb. manufactured. On 10th September following they fixed the price at 152s. 4d. per cwt.

Mr. CORSER: The farmers fixed it. They are on that board.

Mr. CARTER: The farmers had no part whatever in fixing this.

Mr. CORSER: They are represented on that board.

Mr. CARTER: On 17th September, 1917, the price was fixed again, and on 11th October, 1917, the price was fixed at 149s., on 29th October at 149s., on 23rd May, 1918, at 154s. It was sold to the Imperial Government, through the Commonwealth, at 154s., less 3½ per cent., and the price then ruling in Great Britain was 225s. per cwt.

Mr. CORSER: And secured it to the farmers.

Mr. CARTER: The price was 225s. I am going to enlighten the hon. member for Burnett, who professes to be a farmer, about its being secured to the farmer.

Mr. CORSER: I have had some of it; it has been returned to us.

Mr. CARTER: I know all about it; I will tell hon. members what they had returned to them. We find that up to the 28th November, 1918, the price did not exceed 168s., but on that date it rose to

172s. 8d. f.o.b. It did not matter what the price was in England; that is all they could get for it, and nothing has been returned since. On 22nd February, 1919, the price fell to 168s. 8d., and on 7th May of this year it was fixed again at 177s. 4d.

Mr. JAMES: Those are Queensland figures.

Mr. CARTER: They are Australian figures generally. We find that the price ruling in London in 1914-15 was 130s.; in 1915-16, 150s.; in 1916-17 the highest price was 205s., in 1917-18 it ranged from 200s. to 233s. 4d., and in 1918-19 it ranged from 233s. 4d. to 252s. per cwt. It did go up as high as 286s. In 1917 Danish butter realised 500s. per cwt. I might say that this was during an exceptional period, at the time when the Danish people were taking in exchange cement and other material for making pill-boxes to assist the Germans in the war. At that time the price was fixed in Queensland at 151s. per cwt.

Mr. CORSER: Do you deny that the farmers received their excess profits?

Mr. CARTER: I am not denying anything at all. I am making a speech, and, if the hon. member will cease imitating a galah parrot, I will quote further figures.

Mr. CORSER: I am glad you call it a speech.

Mr. CARTER: I want to say that the Federal Government, in May, 1917, fixed the price of butter in Queensland at 154s., less 3½ per cent., and the price in London at that time was 229s. The cost of conveying it to London at that time was 25s. per cwt. And now we come to what the farmers got returned from that, and this is the sum which the hon. member for Burnett was speaking about. That amount of 25s. covered the cost of shipping and marketing, so that the price in Australia on board ship was 204s. per cwt. net. The price paid to the farmers was 151s. net. The result was that there was a matter of 53s. difference, and we find later that 19s. per cwt. was paid out of that 53s. There has been the greatest profiteering in England. They could not afford to pay 500s. in 1917 and something like 300s. for Irish butter and then sell ours at anything under the same price. We know that the price of Australian butter was 229s., if not more—that is, wholesale—and we find that all that the farmers got out of this was 19s., which, added to 151s., makes 170s. At the time when the Secretary for Agriculture in Queensland was handling the butter, he handled it at such a profit to the farmer that the factories were enabled to give to the farmers a price equal to 1s. 6d. per lb. for the butter-contents of their cream. During the time that this Government were handling it the farmers received 1s. 6d. per lb., whilst 1s. 3d. and 1s. 4½d. had been the best prices paid under Federal control. And yet we know that butter is something like 300s. per cwt. in Great Britain. With regard to the 19s., the hon. member for Burnett went out of his way to say that an arrangement was made by which they were to get so much. The Chief Prices Commissioner of the Federal Government in Melbourne gave me this information a little over a year ago—

"Advices had been received that there had been a profit in Great Britain on the sale of last season's butter shipments from Australia. After the contract had been concluded at 149s. 4d. per cwt. for supplies sent to Great Britain, the

Mr. Carter.]

butter producers made a request for a share of the profits on the sale of butter in the United Kingdom. This was assented to, and as a result the producers of Australia would receive a further dividend on the butter shipped last season. He had not been advised as to the amount of the dividend. The British Government did not appreciate the request for a share in the profits, and it was not likely that the same conditions would prevail in connection with the contract for shipments during the approaching season."

There we have direct evidence of the sort of contract that was made. I will also read what Sir Thomas McKenzie said in the "Courier" of 8th November, 1917—

"It seemed strange that in the sale of produce loyalty should furnish a handicap, whilst disloyalty commanded a premium. The New Zealand dairymen got 1s. 5d. per lb. for butter, and the Irish nearly double."

I am satisfied there was no disloyalty in Ireland, though it may be all very well for him to talk about disloyalty. We find that in Ireland they got 2s. 10d. for their butter, as against 1s. 4d. in Queensland. And this is the Nationalist party that hon. members on the other side of this Chamber are in a few weeks going to ask the people to support. That is the sort of attitude they take up. I am quite satisfied that the hon. member for Oxley will be out on the platform, and with a most blatant voice will ask for the return of the Federal member of the Nationalist party, and yet he comes to this House and he tells us he believes that profiteering is damnable. I want the electors in Oxley to listen to his speeches when the time comes.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: You come and talk to them.

Mr. CARTER: I will talk to the electors when the time comes. I want to say a word or two about the treatment of Queensland by the Nationalist Federal Government. The prices of butter in Australia on 14th May, 1918, were as follow:—Queensland, first grade 149s. 4d., retail 1s. 6d.; New South Wales, the same; Victoria and Tasmania, 162s.; South Australia, the same price as Victoria; West Australia, 168s. This shows the differentiation between the States at this time. Victoria was getting 162s., and this State only got 149s. for its butter, and not because it was of poorer quality. It was of the same quality, and yet hon. members on the other side, professing to be the friends of the farmers, will go to the country and tell the farmers that they are still their friends, and that the Labour Secretary for Agriculture was robbing the farmers when he put the factories in the position to receive 1s. 6d. per lb. for the butter contents of their cream. Such a price was never equalled in Queensland. Despite the fact that Victoria was given an advantage of 12s. per cwt. for butter manufactured in Australia, they had the audacity and the hardihood to go to the country and tell the people that they are the farmers' friends. They are either not intelligent enough to understand the position, or they are not honest enough to tell the people the truth.

Mr. CORSER: You robbed us of our butter and hawked it round Melbourne.

Mr. CARTER: That is the position with regard to the butter question. The hon.

[Mr. Carter.

member had no word to say last session against the Dairy Produce Bill, but his friends in another place—the Nationalists of the same party—have held this important measure up for twelve months now. The farmers know they have been robbed by the factories; they are constantly crying out about being robbed, and when they asked for this Bill in order that they might get a fair deal from the factories which have been robbing them, the hon. members used their influence, doubtless, with their colleagues in another place, and this Bill was held up for twelve months. I was very pleased to see it submitted the other day, and I trust it will now go through without further opposition.

At fifteen minutes to 9 o'clock p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Mr. Bertram) took the chair as Deputy Speaker.

Mr. CARTER: I was a little surprised not to have heard a single word of protest or of sympathy from hon. members on the other side in regard to the treatment meted out to a great number of Queensland citizens—men who are law-abiding, honest, industrious, and loyal. Because they happened to have been born in a country with which the Empire was at war, they have been subjected to the very worst treatment, and hon. members on the other side of the Chamber have uttered no word of protest. They must be possessed of the same information which is in my possession. They must know of the treatment which has been meted out to these people. They must know what is threatening many people in Queensland to-day. Yet no protest was raised against it. During the early part of the war, in my electorate a number of citizens as innocent as any member in this Chamber of any word or act of disloyalty were taken from their homes and thrown into the internment camp. In the Lockyer district, a man who, I am satisfied by the dozens of references and certificates I have read, is of unimpeachable character—Mr. Sachse, a solicitor at Gatton—was taken, and for three months interned in the camp at Holdsworthy. No charge was ever made against him. In regard to the gentlemen who went from my district, no charge has been made since. They have been given no trial, and there was no evidence whatever of any act of disloyalty. In the district from which they were taken, people expressed amazement that they were taken away. I have here a letter marked "Confidential and secret," which is an attempt to induce the people to whom it is addressed to give a statement regarding Mr. R. F. A. Sachse's disloyalty. They say—

"I understand that those persons who are able to give statutory declarations will not do so, for fear of their names being divulged. I wish to point out that all statutory declarations are treated as strictly confidential, and the names are not divulged."

What an opportunity for despicable, dishonest persons to put away a man whom they want to have put away. I know it happened in my district! There were in my district four or five men who were guilty of no offence, who are languishing in an internment camp because someone had a grudge against them and desired to have them put away for the time being. This letter goes on—

"I shall be pleased if you will submit a statutory declaration concerning

Sachse's disloyalty. A similar letter to this has been forwarded to the following citizens:—Mr. Clark, Mr. McMurdo, Mr. L. Cossart, and Mr. W. D. Armstrong."

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Oh!

Mr. CARTER: Mr. Sachse's internment synchronised with the visit of Mr. W. D. Armstrong to Melbourne.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Is that the ex-Speaker?

Mr. CARTER: The ex-Speaker of this House had one of those letters. We had taken from my district a man who was innocent as a babe. No charge was ever made against him. When he came back to Gladstone he was given a welcome by his work-mates, because they knew of his honesty and innocence. They knew why he went there. He had a welcome such as no other man who has returned to Gladstone has had. They knew he was wronged, and they wanted him to understand that they regarded him as being innocent. They treated him as he deserved to be treated. Since then this man has been subjected to a good deal of inconvenience in having to report. When he complained, that restriction was withdrawn. But something worse has taken place. There are a number of men who were not interned, against whom no suspicion of disloyalty was raised—men who had the misfortune to come here in 1913, at the invitation of hon. members on the other side of this Chamber. I think the Denham Government did not do wrong in trying to induce good European citizens to come here. They are excellent settlers. I have no fault to find with them. War broke out. Of course, they could not have foreseen anything of that kind. If they could, I am satisfied that Mr. Denham was a man of sufficient intelligence and breadth of mind still to desire good citizens for Queensland. This is a letter written to the wife of an unfortunate man who has been threatened with deportation because he was not long enough in Queensland to become naturalised. No charge has been made and no evidence has been brought against him. The public do not know him except as an honest, industrious man, who has nothing to say to anyone—

"Mrs. O. Meiberg.—It is possible that your husband will be deported. If so, you and your children will have to accompany him, except under the following conditions:—

"1. If you were a British subject before your marriage, you have the right to refuse to accompany your husband, and you will be allowed to remain in Australia.

"2. All children born in Australia have the right to remain here if they so desire.

"It would therefore be necessary for you to forward to this office immediately your certificate of marriage and the certificate of birth of your children.

"In the event of your not being able to produce these certificates, it will be necessary for you to supply this office with the date and place of your marriage and also the full christian name, date, and place of birth of each of your children.

"Should the children desire to stay here though their parents are deported, they will have to state their desire in writing.

"In exceptional cases the wife of an enemy subject may be allowed to remain in Australia even if she were not a British subject before her marriage, in which case it is necessary that she state fully her reasons for not desiring to accompany her husband."

Only a few years ago it was the howl of the party sitting opposite that the Labour party stood for a breach of the marriage laws—the dissolution of marriage. What does this mean? A man who has been united to the woman he loves has been torn away from her. The little ones, the sacred product of these two people, are to be torn away from both parents; they are to be sent out of the country—a country languishing for citizens. We talk about the sacredness of the marriage tie! Fancy the Nationalist party getting up now and canting about the sacredness of the marriage tie and these people being torn asunder. Talk about Bolshevism and free love! What do they mean by this? We know the lives of most of these men would not be worth the living once this evil thing is done. These children, born in a free country and brought up under the very best conditions under which children could be reared, are to be sent to a hostile country—a country that does not want them. These people left that country because they had no more time for it; the conditions were not good enough for their requirements, and they came here because they preferred Australia. They were prepared to renounce the land of their birth and become naturalised Australians; and, when a man is prepared to give up the country of his birth and swear allegiance to another Government, I say that man means business. These men who have come here are prepared to do that, and, if they are thrust back on the country that they have left, they would have a hostile reception. And these Australian children are to be cast out of Australia and sent to Germany because their parents, who have committed no wrong, have not been here long enough to become naturalised. This is the sort of thing that is going on, and we have no word of protest from the other side of the Chamber. I do not care what blood a man possesses, and I do not care what his colour or what his religion is; any man with any sentiment of humanity or Christianity in him would object to that kind of thing; and yet it is taking place under a Nationalist Government. We are told that the war is over; we are told that peace has been signed. We were told nine months ago that the war had ceased, and that there was an armistice, and yet these people, despite all these facts, are to be taken away from the country and sent—where? I am going to read a petition that came from a number of these people.

Mr. WEIR: Did that come from the Binjour Plateau settlers?

Mr. CARTER: It did not come from the Binjour Plateau settlers.

Mr. CORSER: Why did your Government refuse to give these people advances under the Agricultural Bank Act?

Mr. CARTER: I am not here to carry on a dialogue. I am here to say what has occurred. This is the petition that was sent by a number of these men to the Hon. W. G. Higgs, M.P.—

"We, the undersigned, address you as the Federal member representing this

Mr. Carter.]

district, and desire to place our position before you, and ask you to kindly use your best endeavour to place the facts in the proper quarters, with a view to having justice done to us. That is all we ask—justice.

“Firstly, we might inform you that several of the wives of unnaturalised German settlers in this district have received letters from the military authorities notifying them that it is possible their husbands will be deported (copy attached). The husbands are living with their wives and have not received any communications whatever as to the possibility of deportation. This has caused them much alarm, and has also greatly disheartened them, as also several others, who are single men. These methods seem very strange to us, and we consider that if any such drastic action was contemplated, it would be only fair and right that the men concerned should be notified. We do not know of anything that we have done to warrant such action, as we have been peaceable, law-abiding and industrious citizens since coming to the country. Our position is different to that of having, say, been under German rule in some German colony that may have come into British possession as a result of the war. We left Germany of our own free will, as a result of having had much inducement and encouragement held out to us to come to this country, and we were greatly attracted by the bright prospects in store in the free Commonwealth of Australia. We came prepared to make this our future home, and have gone on to the virgin scrub land, and by dint of perseverance and industry have carved homes for ourselves, where we would be content to live for the remainder of our lives. We might point out that our work not only benefits ourselves, but greatly assists in developing this new land, thus adding to the Commonwealth. If we are left here in peace we will continue industriously to further develop the land up to its highest possible state. We brought with us the whole of our savings for our past life amounting to £200 and £300, and as much in one instance as £400. We have spent all this and several years of our life in addition, and have now no desire to leave this country. Our more youthful years are past, and we certainly do not want to commence life all over again in some other land. We were quite prepared and anxious to become naturalised British subjects, but the war came on, and ever since we have been refused naturalisation. We can produce certificates to show that we have never received any punishment for crime in the country of our birth, nor have we conflicted with the law in this country of our adoption, thus showing clearly that we are not what may be termed ‘undesirables.’ If we are deported we run the risk and danger of being refused admission to Germany, as we left there voluntarily, and have been away for a period of years.

“In the event of the authorities being determined to force us out of the country, and persisting in their determination, although greatly against our wishes and despite our protests, we would ask that,

[*Mr. Carter.*

at the very least, our request, as follows, be acceded to:—

“(1) That we be given the right to choose the country to which we may go, other than Germany. (We would quite understand that British possessions would in such a case as ours be closed against us.) Also the right to book our own passage on whatever ships we choose. We do not want to go back to Germany, and we do not think that Germany wants us. We think it only reasonable to be able to choose our determination, and cannot see that it would make any difference to the authorities.

“(2) That we be given ample notice of the intention of the authorities, so that we may have sufficient time to arrange our affairs, and dispose of our property. This would take some considerable time to do, if it is to be done to our best advantage.

“(3) That we be allowed to take the full value of our assets with us in money, or failing this, we otherwise be granted a certain amount to take with us, and proper security be given us for the remainder, so that we can draw on our money after peace is declared, and wherever we may be. We do not think that the above would be asking too much, because even in Czarist Russia the above clauses of concession were granted, but, above all, in conclusion we will again emphasise that we would prefer to remain in this country, and assure you we will give no reason for regret that we be allowed to do so.

“We respectfully subscribe ourselves.”

Yet, despite that petition, and despite the fact that no inquiry whatever could obtain evidence of these people being anything other than of the very best character—

Mr. ROBERTS: Did you see Mr. Watt's reply in the Federal House on Thursday last? He said these people would not be deported.

Mr. CARTER: I did not see Mr. Watt's reply, but I know that only the other day they sent away a number of people.

Mr. WHITFORD: They prefer the kanaka and the Jap.

Mr. KIRWAN: Two shiploads have gone already.

Mr. CARTER: I want to give a little further evidence of their attitude towards these people. I have already expressed my surprise, and it did surprise me, but I have further evidence of the attitude of the National party. This is from the “Daily Mail” of 15th August, 1917—

“At the annual conference of the National Political Council, held in Brisbane, Mr. Gelston, of the National Political Council at Townsville, and the leader of the Northern party, moved—

That stringent steps be taken to regulate and restrain the rights of all citizens of enemy origin and their children of the first generation, and as the first step towards such an end all such persons to be disfranchised for the period of the war.”

It is left to our imagination as to what they meant. Since that period we have realised what they mean by “regulating and restraining.” During the last election a

Nationalist organiser went through my district and told the Germans that, if the Labour party were returned to power, they would be robbed of their farms; and yet we find this resolution in regard to "regulating and restraining." We find a little later than that a conscription referendum was put to the people and the very thing outlined by Mr. Gelston was done during that referendum to Australians of German parentage—that is, to people born in Australia; and, if a man is born in Australia, I think he has as great a claim as any man in the world to a footing in Australia. In my district out of thirty names on a certain honour board more than twelve of the names were German; yet during the 1917 conscription campaign, whilst they were liable for conscription, steps were taken to prevent them from having a say as to what should be done with their bodies. Yet we find on 27th June, 1918, the "Brisbane Courier" writing as follows:—

"The restoration of the postal vote may be expected, while the question of the enemy alien franchise will probably be dealt with. At present certain persons, though disfranchised at the military service referendum, are able to vote at Federal by-elections, and a provision for their general disfranchisement will, no doubt, be made."

I understand that it has since been made, and these men will have no say in the country of their birth. We are told by hon. members opposite that they believe in fair play, and yet not one word of protest has been uttered by them against that kind of conduct. Not one of them has said a word against the deportation of men without a fair trial. No man should be sent away without being tried first. If he gets a trial, and, if he is proved to have done wrong, then let him be punished for it. But at any rate he should have the right of a fair trial before he is deported. Look at the case of Paul Freeman. They took him away from Queensland after the armistice was signed. He was taken from Queensland last January. Two or three attempts have been made to land him in other countries without a trial. He was first taken to America, but the Americans did not think him desirable and would not allow him to land. He was then brought back again to Australia, and was given no opportunity of being heard in his own defence. He is still desirous of remaining in Australia, but the Federal authorities have decided to deport him. There is no reason why he should be deported at all. We are told by the Nationalists that they are a fair party. The war is over, and there is a continuance of this kind of thing. Why do not hon. members opposite protest against it? I notice there is to be an amendment of the Immigration Restriction Act introduced into the Federal Parliament. That amendment prohibits the entry into the Commonwealth for a period of five years, or until the Governor-General by proclamation otherwise determines, of any person of German, Austro-German, Fulgarian, Hungarian, or Ottoman nationality. Yet in another paper of the same date we find a statement that German business men are to be allowed to enter Britain under specified conditions, provided that their presence in the country will prove beneficial to British trade. That is the way these people are being treated

in Queensland. I am sorry that my time is drawing to a close, because I would like to say more on that question.

There is another matter I wish to speak on, and that is the war propaganda carried on by the Tory party. We know that they went out of their way to make statements during their war propaganda, and they frequently said, "Wait till the boys come back and you will see what they will do." In the conscription campaign the soldiers turned down the Nationalists. When the soldiers returned to Australia we find that they met a lot of the O.B.E. soldiers—"Only Been in England." I notice that a few of these creatures and a lot of ladies who pretended to do war work were hired by the party opposite to disturb meetings whenever Ministers got up to address them. I stood in the Market Square myself amongst these people, and I heard them telling men what to do to create a disturbance. They were well drilled and well trained. During the Eight-hour procession there was a conspiracy to create a riot and endanger the lives of women and children. There is no doubt that they tried to create a riot in Queensland. I believe that the party opposite have adopted a new name—"S.O.S."—"Soolers on of Soldiers." There are men who are weak-minded who were Tories when they went away, and were still Tories when they returned. No matter how many kicks and cuffs they received, they remain Tories, and will do so until they die. Some of these returned Tory soldiers are aspirants for Parliament, and possibly some have got into Parliament. These are the men who talked about smashing up the "Standard" office. They were going to smash up the "Standard" office if something was not withdrawn. It wasn't withdrawn, and no smashing took place, for the simple reason that amongst the soldiers were a number of intelligent men. These intelligent soldiers formed an association of their own because they would not stand that kind of thing. They took up the same manly stand in fighting for their rights that they took up when they went to fight in Europe. I listened to the speeches of the hon. member for Oxley and others.

MR. ELPHINSTONE: I thought I would come again.

MR. CARTER: The hon. member will always come again. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) The hon. member for Oxley followed the Hon. T. C. Beirne in the speeches at the Market Square. The other speakers referred to the red flag, but the hon. member for Oxley talked about a flag coloured white, yellow, and green, and he wanted to deal with those people who differed with him in religion. Fancy the hon. member trying to drag in a religious discussion!

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Who did?

MR. CARTER: The hon. member for Oxley. He talked about Sinn Feiners. The hon. member went to the Market Square under the pretence of moving a resolution of loyalty, but he took the opportunity of soiling these men on. Mr. Gelston went out of his way to refer to me in his remarks, and we know that a soldier in Bundaberg stated that £15,000 had been offered to help the soldiers for a certain purpose. That statement has never been contradicted. After hearing the statements made by the hon. member for Flinders to-day, we can believe

Mr. Carter.]

the story of the £15,000. That money was raised for the purpose of creating disorder in Queensland and in order to discredit this Government. We know that an hon. member of this Chamber talked about the danger of "monkeying with dangerous men." It shows that he regarded them as dangerous. Then we have Dr. Sutton getting up and telling the soldiers that they knew how to manufacture bombs out of jam tins. Fancy members of the party opposite telling the soldiers to make bombs out of jam tins in order to destroy life and property, just to discredit this Government! That is the attitude taken up by the supporters of hon. members opposite, by the people who battered and fattened on the war. I know one gentleman who, in addition to drawing his parliamentary salary, got so much for wearing his uniform, and also got paid for one or two other little matters.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and laughter.

Mr. CARTER: The same hon. member has tried patriotism. He has tried many things, and failed, and that is the most profitable occupation he has ever had in his life. I want to say that, in my opinion, this thing will continue. Nothing is sacred to the party opposite. They are prepared to take any measures to get back to power, because they know that, if our party keep in power, justice will be done to the people. They know that to raise the taxation necessary to meet the immense charges which this war has caused, and to pay the increased wages required to carry on production, this Government will put the burden on the right shoulders. They know that we will tax the wealthy; and the people returned to this House by the money subscribed by those wealthy people are trying to stop us, and no lie will be too black or vile, and no action too evil, if they can prevent us from getting back to power. That is their object, and for that purpose they are carrying on this evil propaganda.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FRY (*Kurilpa*): I concur in the gratification which has been expressed by His Excellency and members of this House that the dreadful war which has devastated Europe and caused such an appalling loss of life has come to an end. I wish to express my sincere sympathy with those who have been bereaved, and with those who have been wounded and are suffering from the effects of the war. I hope that the way will open for a lasting peace; but, while I hope for a permanent peace, I hesitate to agree with those who believe that the war which has just ended has been the finish of all war. I have endeavoured to weigh the factors which are working for and against peace. I have taken into consideration the things which affect the social, industrial, and political life of the people of the world, and I have arrived at the conclusion that a great change must come over the minds of the people before any tangible scheme which will be accepted by all the peoples of the earth can be arrived at. The paramount difficulty of settling international questions appears to be the racial question, and the harmonising of their views. The only possible way that we know of at present is by arbitration; but whether or not arbitration will be acceptable to all parties as the means of settling their disputes in the future it is hard to say. I think that hon. members

[*Mr. Carter.*

will agree with me that international peace can be expected only when the various nations of the world embrace arbitration as the means of settling their internal and external disputes. If Germany had agreed to arbitrate, the war of 1914-1919 would not have occurred, and the peace of the world would have been maintained. To be effective, arbitration must be supported by means of enforcing obedience to the tribunal's ruling, and it is on that point that I see trouble. We have only to consider the effectiveness—or, rather, the non-effectiveness—of arbitration in our own State to realise this fact. In the Commonwealth of Australia, particularly in Queensland, the people have an ideal opportunity of testing arbitration, or peace by negotiation. We have a Labour Government in power, and a temperamentally-fitted court to deal with disputes; but it is robbed of its effectiveness by the failure of the Government to support the court. Instead of supporting the court, the Government are lying dormant whilst their supporters tell us that they are justified in not accepting the award of the court when its decisions do not give them all that they want. They state that they have not surrendered the right to strike. In my opinion this is the crux of the position—the spirit which keeps the world at war, and one of the chief factors which makes war possible, and a lasting peace impossible. The people in our midst who decry arbitration, and preach class hatred, and who engineer social, industrial, and political unrest, are just as great a menace to the State as the Prussians who preached the gospel of hate in pre-war days were to the world. The difference is, that one is local and the other is international. The gospel of hate preached by the Prussians ended in a war of brutal violence, outrages, ravishings, destruction, spoliation, and a sorrowing world. Where the class hatred which is being preached by the supporters of the Government, and some of the members in this House, will lead Queensland to we cannot tell. Arbitration has not been thoroughly tried in Queensland. Whilst the hon. member for Flinders was talking about arbitration, I asked him whether, if arbitration was not acceptable in its present form, he would tell us on what foundation it could be successfully based, and he replied, "See the Labour party's platform." To an intelligent House that seems to be a case of a man saying "I want something different, and I know what I want, but I won't tell you, for I can't tell you." That seems to be the logical conclusion of the statement of the hon. member for Flinders.

I want to refer briefly to the soldiers' settlements at Beerburrum and Pikedale. Last session we heard a lot about the Beerburrum settlement, and the statements were very conflicting. I went to Beerburrum to find out for myself the state of affairs there. I took the opportunity of consulting with Government officials and with the settlers there. Their statements were given freely, and I hope to deal with them in an honest, straightforward manner. So far as the system of control at Beerburrum is concerned, I favour it, as I see in it a considerable amount of good; but, so far as the ground is concerned, I am not in accord with the area selected, as I think Beerburrum is not likely to be a place which is going to attract many people.

Mr. WHITFORD: Do you know anything about agriculture?

Mr. FRY: The best ground at Beerburum is on the tops of the hills. When you go to a lower level of a few feet, where the drainage is not so good, the pineapples are not growing as well as those on the ridge. From the information given to me, I have come to the conclusion that the ridges only will produce the crops.

Mr. WHITFORD: Why not speak from personal experience?

Mr. FRY: I am speaking from the experience of men who have tried it, and the hon. member's experience, so far as Beerburum is concerned, is no more reliable than that of the man in Queen street, because he does not know anything about it. So far as the fertility of the ground is concerned, it is going to be a problem. The Government advertised all over the world that they are clearing 5 acres for each settler, but they know they are only clearing 3 acres. The settlers tell me that they cannot make a living on anything less than 5 acres. I am told that the reason the Government do not clear 5 acres is that, if they clear the 3 acres, the settlers can put in their time clearing the other 2 acres while their crops are coming on. I think that that is rather a foolish policy, because it must be apparent that, if 5 acres are cultivated and the crops are growing, the returns are coming in more quickly than if only 3 acres are cultivated and two are lying idle, and that, when the returns are beginning to come in the profits begin to be made which are going to make those settlers comfortable and happy. I think that the department controlling that settlement should take that phase of the question into consideration and clear 5 acres so as to let the settlers get the returns at the earliest possible moment. The pineapples which were grown there generally were good, but the suckers which have been supplied to the settlers are not in all cases satisfactory, except those supplied to the first few settlers when the sympathy was great and the men received all the assistance possible. Now about one-third are old suckers which will not bear fruit for a considerable time.

Mr. WHITFORD: Who is your authority for that?

Mr. FRY: My authority is the authority of the men on the land and the Government agent.

Mr. WHITFORD: Name them.

Mr. FRY: Name them! The hon. member is carrying on like a child instead of an hon. member of this House. The settlers are there, and what I say is perfectly true. The farms, generally speaking, are in a fair way, but there are only a few good farms. Mr. McLean holds the most profitable—the show farm of the place. I think that there are two that are beginning to pay, Mr. McLean's and another which is coming on just as well, but the others are not progressing as they should do. I am not going into the details of the administration; I have said that I think the system appears to be good. Mr. McLean has sent pineapples to Melbourne, and, after all expenses were paid, he got a return of about 9s. a case, which paid very well. I am also informed that so long as the men can get 3s. 2d. a case clear and the case returned during the glut season, they would be very satisfied with their crops and would be able to make things pay. But there is in the minds of these settlers a certain amount of doubt as to

whether the fruit trade with Melbourne will not be taken away when the canning factory is in full swing, and I should like to get an assurance from the Minister in charge as to that matter, because it means to the settlers at Beerburum the difference between making things pay and not pay. I trust that the trade to Melbourne will be continued if it is in the interests of the producers, as the return which they get in Queensland is just about one-third of what they get in Melbourne. Summing up, I should like to say that, from my observation there, the success of this settlement depends upon good, healthy plants, proper administration, and good markets. I went to Beerburum for the sole purpose of finding out for myself the truth of the position, as so many statements had been made in this House last session.

I want now to make a few remarks with reference to the Pikedale settlement. I am informed that the cost of clearing 5-acre blocks is £25 per acre, and that the measurement frequently falls a chain or two short of what is charged for, that is to say, the men are charged in full, but the clearing is not given to them in full. I am also told that the preparation of the land for the tree-planting is anything but what it should be in country like that, considering the men the Government are putting on it. The first ploughing is done five or six inches deep with a pony plough, and then the men have a plough given to them with which to finish the work. They have a very difficult job before them, as the majority are amateurs and the work is very hard, and such that, experienced men would find a difficulty in carrying it out effectively. I am informed also that the horses are bought by the Government in bulk and served out in a promiscuous sort of way and charged to the settlers. It is said that the horses are very much lower in value than the price charged—profiteering on the part of the Government, I presume. The method of handing out material is said to be lackadaisical, because the store is closed at various periods in the day, and the men lose considerable time in going along to get wire and other requirements.

Mr. ROBERTS: They have asked for that to be altered.

Mr. FRY: I have no doubt they have. That is the reason I am bringing the matter up in the House. If I were of opinion that the matter would be dealt with in another manner, I would place it before the departmental heads. I am not approaching the question in a hostile spirit, but in the interests of the men who have to make a living—the men for whom we have to provide, and I think that any opposition from the Government on a question like this is unwarranted and unjustified. I would also point out that the timber which is supplied for the building of the houses is for the most part stringy bark, generally straight from the saw to the building, and the weather-boards contain a good deal of heart wood, and after a few months the wood shrinks and big crevices of about half an inch wide appear between the boards and in the floors.

Mr. W. COOPER: That is the builder's fault.

Mr. FRY: I say it is the fault of the supervising officer. Surely the officers representing the Government are not so blind or so foolish as to send green timber with which to build houses! To show how the

Mr. Fry.]

Government regard it, all their buildings are built of sawn wood from Brisbane—seasoned wood—but apparently what is good enough for the settlers is not good enough for Government officers. I wish to bring under the notice of the Minister the fact [9.30 p.m.] as reported to me that there is discord and disgust and disappointment prevailing at the settlement. I trust that the Minister will take into consideration the remarks I have made and make some inquiries into the matter and rectify conditions which are not altogether right.

I want now to refer to the question of unemployment and the homecoming of the soldiers. We know very well that there is in our midst a tremendous amount of unemployment. Men are walking the streets, and soldiers are returning. Yet we find that production is being held up. We find that production is not going on as it should do. The primary industries of the State are not being developed, and, generally speaking, the secondary industries are being curtailed. The result is that our raw material is not coming forward, and the factories are not working as they should to find the work that is so desirable.

Mr. WHITFORD: Tell me one factory in Australia that is not producing.

Mr. FRY: On the question of production, I want to refer to imports into Queensland during the year ended June last. I have taken these figures because the year was a very small one, as there was very little shipping. We imported wearing apparel to the amount of £450,356. Is it not possible that we could encourage industries for the manufacture of these things? Of woollen textiles, we imported £123,269. Here, in a country where we are growing wool and sending it out of the country, we are importing back into the State textiles to the value of £123,269. That is again a case where our own labour could be used, provided encouragement is given to the manufacture of these articles. In a lesser way, we have imported cords and twines to the value of £20,988, paints and varnishes, £34,500, machines and machinery £276,552, and other manufactured metals such as hardware, and including motor cars and vehicles, £1,166,954. Is it not worth while to encourage factories for the manufacture of hardware, for the common utensils and tools which we use every day of our lives? Is it not right for the Government to assist even to the extent of advancing money for the purpose? We have also imported rubber, principally tyres, to the value of £82,218, leather goods £13,646, wicker work, raw and manufactured, £32,322, earthenware, glass and stoneware, £111,014, manufactured stationery, excluding paper, £90,454, fancy goods, etc., £112,471, and miscellaneous articles £259,650. The total of the imports was £6,077,130. You will notice amongst these articles that we are importing leather to the extent of £13,646. I want you to bear that in mind because of something which has appeared in the Press—that is the question of State manufactured leather. We have been informed to-night that boots are rising in price 10s. per pair, and I would like to quote here a paragraph from the "Daily Standard" of 11th August, 1919. Mr. Tudor, in the course of a speech, said—

"Something had happened during the past week that affected every member of the community. Everyone who wore

[Mr. Fry.

boots was going to be penalised. Why? Not because the tanners or bootmakers were going to seek higher wages; the reason was a scarcity of hides in America. Americans were buying hides and paying double what the Australian tanners were giving. Hides in 1916 were shipped out of Australia at 6½d. to 7d. per lb., and now they were 1s. 11d. per lb. The manufacturers said they didn't know where they would be in the near future. The men getting these huge profits were those engaged in the big meat companies and the hide brokers."

Further down in the same column of the same paper we read this—

"LEATHER FROM STATE CATTLE.

"It is understood that some of the hides of the Government cattle have been tanned in Brisbane and the leather supplied to the Government Stores. Samples are also being sent to the Queensland Agent-General in England to test the market."

Mr. CARTER: What are you talking about?

Mr. FRY: The hon. member asks me what I am talking about. I am talking about something which materially affects the Government. Here we have a Government who own State stations—the hides of the beasts and the beasts themselves belong to the people—and hides are being tanned in Brisbane and the leather is being sent abroad to test the markets of the world, to get the highest prices possible to be obtained, and this while we have a shortage of leather in Queensland. We are told that there is big competition throughout the world for hides and leather, and the Government are sending samples home to test the market. If we did not draw attention to it just now, it is quite possible that we might find large shipments of the people's hides and leather going out of the State. (Government laughter.) Hon. members may laugh, but is it not a fact that when you are sending the leather from the State stations into the markets of the world, instead of keeping it at home to supply the local consumption, you are robbing the people of their rights by more than the price which those hides would bring? The Government are not justified in taking on the exportation of any commodity from any State enterprise so long as the people of the country are requiring those materials. This statement is an official one. It appeared in the daily Press on the same date, so I take it that it is the intended policy of the Government. While we are talking about hides I want to draw attention to the fact that we exported to oversea ports 103,850 hides valued at £203,406. I think we are responsible, to a great extent, for the difficulty we are in regarding hides. I want to show how industries, if they are properly encouraged to progress, will absorb men who at present are on the labour market. In a paper called "Coo-ee," which is published for the Australian Natives' Association, of 30th July, 1919, there appears the following with respect to the Dunlop Rubber Company:—

"This company commenced manufacturing operations in 1899, having purchased from the parent Dunlop Company, of England, who started its Australian operations in 1893, the trading rights and patents for the Australasian and New Zealand territories. The

capital of the Australian company at this date was £170,000, and its operations until 1902 were confined to the making up of tyres, etc., brought out from England in a semi-manufactured form. In the year 1901 a small allotment was purchased in Montague, South Melbourne, and plant installed to the value of £25,000. In 1904 the capital was increased to £250,000, and the plant doubled. In 1906 capital was again increased to £290,000, and again in 1912 to £520,000. The freehold property then stood at £51,853, and plant at £54,000. In 1916, capital was increased to £1,000,000, freehold property to £122,634, leasehold £22,768, and plant at valuation to £174,000.

"In 1904 the company employed 400 hands, which, in 1914 increased to 2,000, and at the present time 2,500 hands find continuous employment in the operations of the company. The area of the company's works at Montague and Abbotsford exceeds 10 acres, while the floor space covers an area of 620,000 square feet, or nearly 14 acres in all."

Mr. WHITFORD: What do you wish to prove there?

Mr. FRY: That, if your Government had any sense, they would encourage industry and absorb the unemployed. The question is not one of the tariff in that case. I want to see the industry encouraged. I know that with production you must have protection. You may have protection, but, if you have not production, the industries are not likely to go ahead. To protect an industry, and not to have the men working in it, is an idea that would enter into only a fool's mind. With protection you must have production. I will now quote from the same paper, of 30th May, 1919. In this article it is advocating protection—

"Australia, after always having proclaimed itself protectionist, has never got protection. The foreign producer floods its markets, and the domestic industries struggle against this lower paid labour. This is proved incontestably by the fact that in 1902 the Commonwealth imports per head were of the value of £10 11s. In 1915-16 they were up to £15 14s. There is a national peril in these figures. Australia has now, on Commonwealth debts, State debts, and private debts, to pay abroad annually £18,000,000 in interest. Up till recently, except in times of great borrowing abroad, she paid her interest bill by the excess of her exports over imports. For the last five years that has ceased, and our imports are now in excess of our exports. Even in the year 1916-17, when the export value went up with a jump of 33 per cent., it was only on account of war prices, and but for that would have been lower than pre-war years. We are thus drifting to leeway in national indebtedness, quite apart from our loans.

"This is emphasised by the fact that our gold production, which once paid for our imports from abroad, has unfortunately declined from £16,000,000 in 1903 to £7,000,000 in 1916. This deluge of importation has arisen from the riot and carnival of foreign dumping in perfumery, jewellery, confectionery, wines and spirits, silks, musical instruments, and other articles of luxury. This signifies

a double-edged misfortune. On the one side our debts abroad are increasing; on the other hand the opportunities for industrial expansion at home are dwarfed and stunted.

"This is no fanciful contention. The histories of France, of Great Britain, of the United States, and of Germany, have all disclosed the same phase of industrial danger; and in self-defence those States had all to grapple with and overcome the menace. It was the shrewd Bismarck, who, in 1879, made it an imperative item of his policy that Germany should regain command of her own markets. She did so, and quadrupled her wealth in a few years. The United States of America is a monument of the proof that wealth and industry are stimulated by an efficient tariff."

At ten minutes to 10 o'clock p.m.,

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Mr. FRY: I agree with them so far as they advocate that, and I do so because, when we are dealing with matters of industrial importance to our own State—when we are dealing with questions of unemployment—we must take a very much wider view than when we are dealing with something which exists in our own local town; we must know what is going on outside, and know the competition that we shall be compelled to meet. I find in the "Pacific Ports" magazine for July of this year a little paragraph, which I think very fittingly can be taken into consideration when we are dealing with matters concerning our industries. We find that America is out looking for trade. Under the head "The Most Envious Situation" this magazine says—

"It has been frequently said, and by those who are well posted on the subject, that a country which finds itself in the most enviable position in the foreign commerce trade is that country which exports the largest quantity of highly manufactured articles, and imports the largest quantity of raw materials to enter into manufactures. That position, up to the present time, the United States has not enjoyed; nor has the United States, until recently, been notably prominent in its activities looking toward the development of foreign markets. However, of late there has been a noticeable improvement along this line, and a turn in the tide of affairs, and to-day every nook and corner of the world is covered by experts from the United States. Many of these are Government officials sent out through the Department of Commerce and the State Department, such as, for instance, commercial attachés stationed at strategical trade centres, trade commissioners, special agents, and those who are sent to certain sections of the country to make specific investigations. Then, there are, of course, the consuls, vice-consuls, and consular agents, who are accredited to the State Department, but who report regularly to the Department of Commerce the commercial activities of the various countries. With these classes of advisers and informants on activities abroad, and with the information brought back by these representatives, and the representatives of the commercial organisations, privately-owned institutions and others to the manufacturers of the United States, it is to be hoped that in a very short time

Mr. Fry.]

the advantages of the foreign field will be so impressed upon the 'Mr. Micawbers' that they will awake to the full importance of the task that is before them."

The United States have come to realise that they cannot hold their own in the commercial world unless they get a fair return for the money that they pay for labour; and they are searching the world for an outlet for their surplus manufactures. They will go in for dumping, and, unless we can produce what we require and a little more than we require, we shall be up against the problem of these people dumping, not only in Australia, but in Queensland.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: If they can give us good stuff, why should we not buy from them?

Mr. FRY: If that is the opinion of the hon. member—that we should support foreign trade—then he can keep his opinion, because the present state of affairs has been brought about by him and those who think like him. The need of using your own manufactures before using foreign manufactures is paramount, and the time will come when those men who have been abroad, and who have seen things in a far broader way than those who have stayed at home, will endeavour to enter into the field of manufacture and manufacture those articles which we do not produce at the present time. The figures in regard to the progress of Queensland's industries for 1917 and 1918 are very much at variance, and I would like the House to allow my figures to be published in "Hansard" without my reading them. There are quite a number of figures.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the figures be taken as read?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The TREASURER: No.

The SPEAKER: I do not understand whether it is the pleasure of the House or not.

The TREASURER: Read them.

Mr. FRY: The figures are as follows:—

Year.	No. of Factories.	No. of Employees.	Salaries and Wages.		Value of Raw Material.	Value of Output.	Value of Plant and Machinery.
			£	£			
1912	1,790	49,957	3,771,901	3,771,901	11,068,455	18,785,606	5,443,153
1913	1,835	42,563	4,057,191	4,057,191	11,183,539	23,658,759	5,877,387
1914	1,793	43,282	4,211,459	4,211,459	15,710,764	25,691,655	6,588,673
1915	1,775	42,079	4,226,635	4,226,635	15,938,583	25,444,812	7,051,113
1916	1,782	40,148	4,191,251	4,191,251	16,127,926	25,544,455	7,543,873
1917	1,793	40,416	4,879,940	4,879,940	20,938,266	31,839,302	7,846,334
1918	1,777	40,987	5,120,588	5,120,588	19,692,101	30,559,176	8,391,480

[Mr. Fry.

You will notice that the amount of raw material which was produced in 1918, notwithstanding the inflated values [10 p.m.] of raw material at that time, was less than in 1917. If you peruse

these figures you will see the result of the go-slow policy in Queensland. Whilst wages have increased, the value of raw material produced is less in 1918 than in 1917. It costs more money to-day to produce less goods, owing to the go-slow policy. You will see that I quote imports from other countries, because our go-slow policy is leaving open the door for these people to dump their goods at a lower rate than they get in their own country, whereas, if we got a fair return for the wages we pay in Australia, things would be different. I would like to point out that during the war period, from 1915 to 1918, we had 204 strikes in Queensland. These strikes affected 40,107 men, and the loss in wages amounted to £415,748.

Mr. CARTER: What was the loss in profits?

Mr. FRY: It shows that those who are decrying arbitration and going into strikes are not working in the interests of the working men. They are working in the interests of themselves, for we know that most of them aspire to get into Parliament. They want to stir up the men in order to keep the strikes going. These men have lost over £400,000 in wages, whereas, if they had gone to arbitration, they would have attained their object, and would have retained that money. That shows, to my mind, that the men who are decrying arbitration are doing a wrong thing, so far as this State is concerned. I would like to refer to the evidence given by the Premier before the Coal Commission in England. It appears in the London "Daily Mail" of 7th May last. The Premier in that evidence said that various State enterprises were carried on successfully. He said that State tanneries were being successfully carried on. Where are they?

Mr. BRENNAN: That is a misprint for "canneries."

Mr. FRY: Well, where are the canneries?

Mr. BRENNAN: They are just starting.

Mr. FRY: The Premier said that the mineral oil enterprise was being successfully carried on as a State enterprise. Where is it? There was a hole made in the ground at Roma to a certain depth, from which nothing is coming. What about the saw-mills? Are they successful? He said the iron and steel works are working successfully. Where are they? I know they are working up a considerable amount of interest amongst Government supporters as to where they are going to be placed; but, so far as working in the interests of the State are concerned, they do not exist at all. I draw attention of hon. members to the following advertisement which appeared in the "British Australasian" in London:—

"QUEENSLAND.

"The Land of Plenty!

"Renowned for its great wealth of resources, prolific harvests, salubrious climate, richness of soil, even rainfall.

"Five and a-half times larger than Great Britain and Ireland. Three times the size of France.

"Population, 641,000.

"Splendid opportunities for farmers.

"Millions of acres of fertile land awaiting settlement.

"Freehold agricultural farms from 2s. 6d. per acre."

Is it not a misstatement to say that freehold land is offered in Queensland at 2s. 6d. an acre?

Mr. F. A. COOPER and other GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: No.

Mr. FRY: I would like to ask the Secretary for Public Lands where that land is?

The SPEAKER: I would draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that those statements have been made by other hon. members.

Mr. CARTER: Tedious repetition.

Mr. FRY: I would like to know where the land is. With regard to the land tax, I believe in a land tax myself.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FRY: A land tax is the fairest tax which can be imposed.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FRY: If it is used to break up large estates.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FRY: If the large estates are broken up, they can be made available for cultivation and production, and in that case a land tax that would burst up these estates would be doing good work. That would enable men to take up small blocks of land. If men are not encouraged to take up small blocks of land to cultivate them, there is something wrong. I am interested, as the representative of a city electorate, in seeing production in the State go on. I want to see the primary and secondary industries rise until our production equals our consumption. It is all a question of supply and demand; and, so long as we cannot meet the demand, the man who lives in the city is going to find the cost of living high. The question of foodstuffs is of vital importance to our people. Here again I want to draw attention to the fact—

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member has exhausted the time allowed him under the Standing Orders.

Mr. F. A. COOPER (*Briefly*): I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Question put and passed.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

The ACTING PREMIER: I beg to move—That the House do now adjourn. The business to-morrow will be the continuation of the debate on the Address in Reply.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at fifteen minutes past 10 o'clock p.m.