

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 26 AUGUST 1919

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

TUESDAY, 26 AUGUST, 1919.

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

PAPERS.

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

The Immigration Agent's report for the year 1918.

Report of the Royal Commission on Public Works upon proposed line from Dunwinnie to St. George.

Regulations Nos. 68, 69, and 70, dated 14th August, 1919, under the Slaughtering Act of 1898.

QUESTIONS.

JONDARYAN SCHOOL BUILDINGS.

Mr. ROBERTS (*East Toowoomba*), in the absence of Mr. Moore, asked the Secretary for Public Works—

"1. What was the time occupied in building the school and residence at Jondaryan?

"2. What was the estimated cost?

"3. What was the actual cost?"

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. E. G. Theodore, *Chillagoe*) replied—

"1. Thirty (30) weeks.

"2. School, £869; residence, £611. Total, £1,480.

"3. School, £885; residence, £597. Total, £1,482."

PURCHASE OF LAND AT SAMFORD.

Mr. ROBERTS asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

"1. Has the Government purchased an estate at Samford, lately owned by Mr. C. E. Nicholas?

"2. What were—(a) the price paid; (b) area of estate; (c) number of stock on the property?

"3. Upon whose report was the estate purchased?

"4. Was the estate inspected before purchase; if so, by whom, and what length of time did the inspection occupy?

"5. Did any agent act between the parties in the transaction; if so, who?"

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

"1. Yes.

"2. (a) £19,958 10s. 9d. = £6 per acre; (b) 3,326 acres 1 rood 27.8 perches; (c) none.

"3. A member of the Land Court.

"4. Yes, by Mr. Staff Surveyor Suter, the Comptroller of Soldier Settlements, and the Land Commissioner, Brisbane district. The length of time occupied in

inspections was sufficiently long to enable the inspecting officer to estimate the value of the estate.

"5. No."

DEATH RATE OF NORTH BRISBANE.

Mr. KIRWAN (*Brisbane*) asked the Home Secretary—

"1. Has his attention been called to a statement made by Doctor Lillian Cooper (Convener of the Standing Committee for Public Health), who, in presenting a report to the National Council of Women held yesterday, stated: 'That the death rate of North Brisbane was now twenty-five per thousand, which was a higher rate than that of Shoreditch, one of the worst slums of London, in which the death rate was twenty-three per thousand'?

"2. Will he call for a report from the Commissioner of Public Health on this matter with a view of taking the necessary and immediate action to reduce the death rate of the city?"

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

"1. Yes.

"2. Yes."

MEAT FOR PARLIAMENTARY REFRESHMENT ROOMS.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*) asked the Acting Premier—

"1. From what shop or shops has the Parliamentary Refreshment-rooms secured its supplies of meat during the twelve months ended 30th June, 1919?

"2. What amounts were paid to the various shops, or, including State meat shops, concerned in respect of meat purchased for the use of the Parliamentary Refreshment-rooms in respect of the year ended 30th June, 1919?"

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

"1 and 2. The Parliamentary Refreshment-rooms are under the control of a committee elected by both Houses. The hon. member for Burnett is a member of the Committee. I suggest that the hon. member make himself conversant with the affairs of the undertaking under his control."

MOVEMENTS OF MR. BROPHY.

Mr. CORSER asked the Acting Premier, representing the Secretary for Mines—

"1. Is it a fact that Mr. Brophy, manager of the State iron and steel works, is at present in Sydney?

"2. Is Mr. Brophy still looking for a site for the State works?"

The ACTING PREMIER replied—

"1 and 2. Mr. Brophy is paying a brief visit to Southern States in connection with the business of his department."

HAMILTON COLD STORES.

Mr. PETRIE (*Toombul*) asked the Acting Premier—

"1. Is it true that the Government is erecting cold stores at Hamilton?"

"2. If so, what progress has been made with such stores?"

"3. What are the buildings and wharves in connection with the scheme estimated to cost?"

"4. Has the authority of Parliament been secured for the expenditure?"

The ACTING PREMIER replied—

"1. Yes.

"2. Work not yet commenced.

"3. £194,000.

"4. Yes, £45,000 (on account) Loan Estimates, 1918-1919."

COST OF "HANSARD" FOR 1917-18.

Mr. ROBERTS, in the absence of Mr. G. P. Barnes, asked the Acting Premier—

"1. Was any report prepared by the Principal Shorthand Writer as to the cost of printing and circulating 'Hansard' during the year 1917-18?"

"2. If not, why was such report not prepared and laid before the House according to the usual custom?"

The ACTING PREMIER replied—

"1. Yes.

"2. There has been no uniform practice in regard to tabling or printing reports from the Principal Shorthand Writer, but the hon. member is at liberty to peruse the report in question if he so desires."

The SPEAKER: I might say that I have the report here, which I now lay on the table of the House so that hon. members, who so desire, may peruse it.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Are there any reasons for its non-publication?

The SPEAKER: None at all.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Is the cost of No. 37 included?

The SPEAKER: That was not in the year referred to.

RAILWAY PASSES TO LOCAL AUTHORITY DELEGATES.

Mr. ROBERTS, in the absence of Mr. Moore, asked the Home Secretary—

"In view of the fact that the Railway Department thinks it justifiable to issue free railway passes to members of the Council of the Queensland Railway Union when travelling to attend council meetings, will he reconsider his decision to deprive delegates to the Local Authorities' annual conference of their free passes for that occasion?"

The HOME SECRETARY replied—

"No."

COAL FROM BOWEN STATE COALMINE.

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*) asked the Acting Chief Secretary—

"1. How much coal was produced from

the Bowen State coalmine up to 30th June last?

"2. What was the value of such coal?"

The ACTING CHIEF SECRETARY replied—

"1 and 2. No coal produced, except for testing purposes, which proved highly satisfactory. The railway to the coalfield is not yet complete, and, therefore, it is not necessary to produce the coal."

LAND RESUMPTIONS FOR SOLDIER SETTLEMENTS—ATHERTON AND TOLGA DISTRICTS.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS laid on the table a return to an order, showing particulars in respect of each farm resumed by the Crown in the Atherton and Tolga districts, made on the motion of Mr. Roberts, on the 7th instant.

Ordered to be printed.

UNEMPLOYED WORKERS BILL.

INITIATION.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS moved—

"That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to make provision for unemployed workers."

Mr. MACARTNEY: What is the nature of the Bill?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The Bill itself raises some rather novel ideas, which can only be fully explained when I have the opportunity of making a speech on the second reading. But, briefly speaking, it is designed to alleviate the evil caused by unemployment, to mitigate the difficulties of industrial workers in regard to interruptions of employment, and to provide for the establishment of an unemployed insurance fund—which will be drawn upon for the purpose of alleviating distress—and for the purpose generally of applying the scheme. Hon. members will understand that the Bill itself raises not only such novel but important principles that it requires a full exposition in order that the matter may be thoroughly understood.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Further information tomorrow?

The TREASURER: I shall answer any reasonable question the hon. gentleman may ask.

Question put and passed.

POPULAR INITIATIVE AND REFERENCE BILL.

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

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

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

"That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the Constitution of Queensland by providing for legislation and repeal or rejection of laws or proposed laws by means of the popular

initiative and referendum, and for purposes consequent thereon or incidental thereto,"

said: I desire to point out that this is the same as the Bill which was previously introduced, and I feel satisfied that hon. members will not want me to go over the ground which I have traversed before, as they are fully acquainted with the provisions of the measure, which will be dealt with more fully on the second reading and in Committee.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed. The CHAIRMAN reported the resolution to the House, and it was agreed to.

FIRST READING.

On the motion of the HOME SECRETARY, the Bill was read a first time; and the second reading made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

BRISBANE TRAMWAY FARES BILL.

ALL STAGES.

On the motion of the HOME SECRETARY, this Bill was passed through all its stages without discussion, and ordered to be transmitted to the Legislative Council for their concurrence by message in the usual form.

BRISBANE TRAMWAY PURCHASE BILL.

ALL STAGES.

On the motion of the HOME SECRETARY, this Bill was passed through all its stages without discussion, and ordered to be transmitted to the Legislative Council for their concurrence by message in the usual form.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. RIORDAN (*Burke*), who was received with Government "Hear, hears!" said: In the first place, I would like to draw the attention of the Government to the food shortage in the Gulf at the present time, with a view to seeing if the Premier cannot do something to relieve the position through the

Federal Government. It is now several months since proper supplies have been despatched to that part of Queensland, and the food stocks of the towns there are getting very short. As the position is very critical, I would ask the Acting Premier to take some steps to secure a boat to be sent to meet the situation. A lot of criticism has been offered against the attitude of the seamen in holding up the food supplies of the North, but I say that the seamen have adopted a very humane view in the matter, and had they adopted the same view as the shipping companies North Queensland would have been in a very sad state to-day. (Hear, hear!) I am very pleased to see by the Press this morning that the seamen have gained a victory over the shipping companies, and that the Federal Government have had to back down completely from the front they took during the last three months.

Coming to the Governor's Speech, I notice that mention is made of a Workers' Homes Bill. I do not think this measure is to be brought in a bit before its time. Dr. Paul

stated during the recent epidemic that the death rate in North Brisbane had been heavier than in some of the slums in London. I am not surprised. The conditions under which the working classes are living are such that they cannot afford to pay the rents asked by the landlords, with the result that three or four families are forced to live in one house. Not so in the case of the people who have been reaping profits and fighting the worker during the war on the patriotic stunt! At Petrie terrace I notice some tumble down cottages on 12, 14, and 16 perch allotments. It is a disgrace to any State to have its people housed in that way. The children are forced to live under unfavourable conditions, and cannot get decent clothing to cover them during the winter.

It is also intended to bring in an amendment of the Industrial Arbitration Act. That is necessary, I think, as the present Act seems to me to be very unjust. The workers' wages are fixed by an arbitration judge, but no limit is put upon the profits of the employer. He can make what he likes, but the worker has to abide by the decision of the court. The wage granted by that judge is £3 7s. per week. Well, a man with a family of three or four children cannot live on that. I do not know how he exists at all, because one finds it pretty difficult in these times to get along on £1 per day. I think, with the present cost of living, £1 per day is just about a living wage, and I hold that every man is entitled to a living wage.

There is also to be an amendment of the Mining Act. That is an Act which wants some amendment. At present claims are held up through exemptions granted by the court. The holders of other mines are just paying the rents, and have not worked them for the past three or four years. The mining inspectors and the wardens visit these fields, but they do not seem to be able to discover these things, and report them, and see that the working conditions of the mines are being fulfilled. I think that some of the officials in the State department could do with a good shaking up.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. RIORDAN: It would not hurt some of them, especially some of the mining inspectors. I know a case of a man who was killed in a mine at Forsayth. The mining inspector arrived in that town paralytic drunk, dined with the boss, and never went to see the conditions of the mine, or whether it was dangerous to the next shift going down at 12 o'clock at night. It did not worry him—he had had his skinful, and he was running no risks. If some of them were forced to go down a mine and put in their eight hours they would be careful that the mine was in good order. (Hear, hear!) I think it would be a good principle for the department, where mining is carried on on a large scale, to have an inspector working in the mines. It could quite easily be brought about by the appointment of a representative by the Government, paid by the Government, for a certain field—under the control of the men and not under the control of the masters, as at present, when they are in a different environment from that of the men, and never go near the men at all. The men are simply ignored.

An application has been made for the erection of a State battery at Kidston. I hear the Government saying that State batteries are not a success, but the State

Mr. Riordan.]

battery at Bamford is doing very well. There are two or three mills at Kidston, privately-owned, and the public cannot get any stone crushed until it suits the mill-owner concerned. I think the Government should do something to relieve the difficult position of the genuine prospector in the Etheridge district. Now I come to some of the old Acts, such as the Mining on Private Property Act. Just to show how that Act worked in the interests of the employer, so that no man could get justice or right by it, I have here a statement of the case of a man named Ganley, who had an allotment at Charters Towers. It is a long and very important document, and I would like the permission of the House to have it inserted in "Hansard."

Mr. ROBERTS: What is the nature of the document?

Mr. RIORDAN: A man named Ganley had an allotment at Charters Towers and the Mills Day Dawn United wanted rights, under the Mining on Private Property Act, to work it. Ganley received no notification and got nothing for his allotment although he appealed to the Government at the time.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that this document be printed in "Hansard" without being read?

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

"[COPY.]"

"Croydon, 11th October, 1910.

"The Mining Registrar,
"Charters Towers,
"Queensland.

"Sir,—My client, Michael Ganley, of Croydon, who is the registered proprietor of a piece of land situated in Mary street, Charters Towers, being allotment 3 of section 28, containing 2 roods, and being the whole of the land comprised in deed of grant No. 51361, a few days ago received a letter from a friend of his in your town, stating that Mills Day Dawn United had posted a notice on that allotment and were applying for the ground.

"As he has received no other notice whatever, I will be pleased if you will inform me what application has been made, or about to be made, concerning that ground.

"If it is an application for a mining tenement under the Mining on Private Land Act of 1909, I take it that Ganley is entitled to be heard before the application is granted, and should have been served with a notice.

"My client objects to any dealings whatever with the land. Trusting to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

"I have, etc.,
"Sgd. J. J. O'SHEA."

"[COPY.]"

"18th October, 1910.

"Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 11th instant, referring to application under the Mining on Private Land Act of 1909, by Mills Day Dawn United Gold Mines Limited, for allotment 8 of section 28, town of Charters Towers.

"The application was made on the

[Mr. Riordan.

19th ultimo for a mining tenement under section 13 of the Act, and is set down for hearing on the 26th instant.

"I understand that Messrs. Marsland and Marsland, solicitors for the applicants, have complied with the Act in all respects, and forwarded the necessary notices (registered) to the last known address of the freeholders.

"Probably your client did not leave his address when removing from Charters Towers.

"I have, etc.,

"Sgd. A. A. STAINES,

"Mining Registrar.

"J. J. O'SHEA, Esq.,

"Solicitor, Croydon."

"[COPY.]"

"Croydon, 17th December, 1910.

"The Warden,

"Charters Towers.

"Sir,—I have the honour to inquire if an application for a mining tenement has been applied for, granted, or registered to or for the Mills United Day Dawn Gold Mining Company Limited or person for land comprised in allotment No. 8 of section No. 28, town of Charters Towers, situate in Mary street, vide section 23, Mining on Private Land Act of 1909, if so, has section 14 of said Act been complied with?

"Has subsection 3 of section 15 of said Act been complied with in respect of filing a plaint in that behalf and having the value of the gold or other mineral thereunder, or supposed to be thereunder, assessed by the Wardens' Court, if so, what is the amount of such assessment?

"My object in asking for the above information is as follows:—

1. I am the owner of the land in question, having purchased same some years ago, it is now, and has been, so far as I know (since March of this year), unoccupied and is unimproved.

2. That I have never received any notice of any kind, either verbally or by letter, that the land in question was being applied for as a mining tenement, vide subsection 3 of section 13, Mining on Private Land Act of 1909.

3. Some time ago I instructed a solicitor here, Mr. J. J. O'Shea, to make inquiries re this matter on my behalf, but up to the present he has not given me any satisfaction as to what he has done, and as he is now absent from here at the Oaks rush, I have decided to communicate with you direct. I would deem it a favour if you would be good enough to give me the information asked for at your earliest convenience, and also if you have had any communication from Mr. J. J. O'Shea, solicitor of this town, in reference to this matter on my behalf.

"Thanking you in anticipation of an early reply.

"I have, etc.,

"Sgd. M. E. GANLEY.

"P.S.—I will be satisfied that you assess the value of this allotment at the same as similar allotments in the same locality.—M. E. G."

“ [COPY.]

“ Warden’s Office,

“ Charters Towers, 4th January, 1911.

“ Sir,—In reply to your letter of 17th ultimo, I have the honour to inform you that on the 29th November last, an application by Mills Day Dawn United Gold Mines Company Limited for mining tenement (goldmining lease) comprising ground embraced in allotment 8 of section 28, was recommended by me, the necessary notices under section 13 of the Mining on Private Land Act of 1909 having been proved to have been given.

“ Your notice, as mentioned in the Mining Registrar’s letter of 16th October last to your solicitor (Mr. O’Shea) was sent by registered letter addressed to M. E. Ganley, blacksmith, Charters Towers.

“ No assessment of the allotment was made, as, in order to obtain an assessment, you should have lodged a plaint for the purpose in the Warden’s Court prior to the 1st instant.

“ I have, etc.,

“ Sgd. ERNEST EGLINTON,

“ Warden.

“ Mr. Michael Edward Ganley,

“ Croydon.”

“ [COPY.]

“ Croydon,

“ 9th February, 1911.

“ The Hon. the Minister for Mines,

“ Brisbane.

“ Sir,—I have the honour to bring under your notice the attached correspondence between the warden, Charters Towers, and myself. I am a wheelwright, carrying on business here for the past 20 years; previous to coming here I was 3 years in Normanton; previous to that I was a resident of Charters Towers, where I carried on the business of my trade for a number of years. While there I became the owner of allotment 8 of section 28, Mary street, Charters Towers.

“ My address for the past 20 years has been ‘Samwell street,’ Croydon. I have had letters and communications at various times re the allotment in question in respect of rates, taxes, etc., from Charters Towers, and those communications have always been addressed to me as above (to Croydon) and have always reached me. You will observe on perusal of copy of my letter to the warden (copy attached) dated 17th December, I asked if any plaint had been filed for assessment and, further, that I was quite agreeable to whatever assessment he would make, as of similar land in the same locality; this letter was registered (464) and was delivered at Charters Towers on 27th December, 1910, four days before the 1st January, 1911. About 20th January I received a reply dated 4th January, 1911, from the warden (copy attached). You will observe on perusal that my allotment (the one in question) was embraced in a Gold Mining Lease applied for on 29th November, 1910, by Mills Day Dawn United Gold Mining Company Limited, that a notice was posted by registered letter addressed to M. E. Ganley, blacksmith, Charters Towers, where I have not been for the past twenty-three years.

“ I did not receive that notice, and have not up to the present done so, no doubt it will have gone back to those who sent it through the dead letter office. How they must have smiled when they got it back, through that channel, knowing that I was in Croydon.

“ The warden further says no assessment was made, as in order to do so I should have filed a plaint for that purpose previous to the 1st January, 1911, in the Warden’s Court.

“ Now the Warden’s Court officials had my letter of 17th December in their hands on 27th December, 1910, wherein I requested the warden to assess the land in question. I respectfully submit that subsection 3 of section (15) fifteen of the Mining on Private Lands Act of 1909 in my opinion provides that the person entitled to mine and who acquires a mining tenement to mine on such private land is just as much required to file a plaint as the owner of the land, to have the supposed value of the gold or mineral supposed to be under it assessed by the Warden’s Court.

“ On receipt of the warden’s letter of the 4th January, I wired the Postmaster, Charters Towers, asking when my letter was delivered (copy), and his reply attached. I then wired the warden on 24th January, 1911 (copy attached), to which the warden had not the common courtesy to reply, in consequence of which I wired Mr. Morgan (copy attached), manager, Royal Bank, Charters Towers, who was my banker when he was here. Mr. Morgan’s reply to me attached, he says ‘Warden advises plaint not lodged before end of December last, remedies under Act thereby forfeited.’

“ These are the facts, sir, as briefly as I could with intelligence put before you. I submit that the fact of the warden having my letter on 27th December, wherein I asked him if any assessment had been made and seeking for information, and further agreeing to abide by his assessment, should have been ample evidence to him that I intended to do what the Act required me to do, to protect my rights, and further I submit my rights should not be forfeited through an error of judgment or otherwise of a court official. I would, therefore, respectfully ask you, sir, if it is within your province, and I respectfully submit it is, to cause inquiries to be made into the matter and instruct the warden to assess my allotment on the basis that its value be the same as those valued in its immediate vicinity, and which have been acquired by the same company.

“ In conclusion, I would just like to point out that, in my opinion, my letter of the 27th December, 1910, should have been received by the warden as the ground work of a plaint (if it is held that the owner only is the proper and only person to file a plaint), and although it may not have been in proper order, I submit I should have been informed by the warden of the proper mode of proceedings, and the matter could have been adjourned to allow this to be done, so that the plaint could have been filed in proper form. Had this been done, there would have been no occasion for

“ Mr. Riordan.”

this lengthy communication to you, sir. On reviewing the whole matter, I feel confident you will not allow the advantage that is evidently being tried to be taken of me, and that you will, as Minister administering the Mines Department, see that an injustice such as this is not perpetrated, no matter by whom it may be engineered.

Thanking you in anticipation,

I have, etc.,

(Sgd.) M. E. Ganley."

"[COPY OF TELEGRAM.]

"Croydon

"25.1.11

"To Postmaster

"Charters Towers

"Registered letter 464 addressed warden Charters Towers What date was it delivered Reply

"(Sgd.) Ganley."

"[COPY OF TELEGRAM.]

"From Postmaster

"Charters Towers

"25rd January 1911

12

Free

"To P.M., Croydon

"Registered letter 464 warden delivered 27th December 12.5 p.m.

"(Sgd.) Woolcock."

"You are under an entire misapprehension in your contention that subsection 3 of section 15 requires an applicant for a mining tenement to file a plaint to have the supposed value of the gold or other mineral supposed to be under it assessed by the Warden's Court.

"What an applicant for private land is required to do is, to give notice of the application as prescribed to the actual occupant of the land, or, if the land is vacant, to affix a notice in some conspicuous place on the land.

"Notice of the application is also to be sent by registered letter through the Post Office to every person who appears by the rate book then in force of the local authority within whose area the land is situated to be the owner or occupier of the land.

"In your case as in all others a careful search was made of the rate book of the Charters Towers City Council, being the appropriate local authority, and copies of entries relating to the lands in respect of which mining tenements were proposed to be applied for were taken.

"In your case there is nothing whatever on the rate book to show that you were residing at Croydon, or any other place than Charters Towers and therefore in strict compliance with the law the registered letter was posted to you with the Charters Towers address? Had we known that you were resident at Croydon we would have posted you a duplicate address to Croydon.

"Furthermore, notice of the application was posted on the land within a period of two days after lodging the application, and was continuously kept posted until the application was heard.

"You will therefore see that there is absolutely no foundation for your asser-

[Mr. Riordan.

tions comprised in the following paragraphs in your letter to the Minister for Mines; that is to say—

1. How they must have smiled when they got it back through that channel knowing that I was in Croydon.

2. On reviewing the whole matter, I feel confident you will not allow the advantage that is evidently being tried to be taken of me, and that you will, as Minister administering the Mines Department, see that an injustice (such as this) is not perpetrated, no matter by whom it may be engineered."

"If you still adhere to these statements there is an end of the matter, and our clients will decline to deal with you in any shape or form. On the other hand if after perusing what we have written, and reflecting on the matter, you are prepared to write to the Mines Department, and to us as representing our clients, withdrawing these statements, and apologising for having made them, then our clients will, purely as a voluntary act of grace, and not as recognising that you have now any legal right thereto, give you the sum of £35, which is after exactly the same rate as they have been paying for mining rights under freehold lands in the neighbourhood of your allotments.

"They would do this simply because they recognise that you would have filed a plaint within the prescribed time had you not for some reason or other, which has nothing to with them, inadvertently lost your right so to do.

"Yours truly,

"MARSLAND AND MARSLAND."

"[COPY OF TELEGRAM TO WARDEN, CHARTERS TOWERS.]

"24.1.11.

"Your letter 4th instant to hand surprised at contents my letter delivered your office 27th December please investigate reply.

"M. E. GANLEY."

"[COPY OF TELEGRAM TO MORGAN, ROYAL BANK, CHARTERS TOWERS.]

"Kindly see warden if any answer to my wire of 24th ultimo, re my letter him re assessment, delivered 27th December reply collect.

"M. E. GANLEY."

"[COPY OF TELEGRAM FROM MORGAN, ROYAL BANK, CHARTERS TOWERS, TO M. GANLEY.]

"Collect 1/- Croydon.

"Warden advises plaint not lodged before end of December last remedies under Act thereby forfeited.

"MORGAN."

"[COPY.]

"9th February 1911.

"Mr. Michael E. Ganley,

"Croydon.

"Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your wire in connection with your freehold allotment on this goldfield, and to advise that the last paragraph of my letter of the 4th ultimo explains your position. I cannot do anything further in the matter."

"I have, etc.,

"Sgd. ERNEST EGLINTON,

"Warden."

"[COPY.]

"Brisbane
"24th February 1911.

"Sir,—Referring to your letter of the 9th instant, relative to a freehold in Charters Towers, I have the honour to state that we are in communication with the warden at Charters Towers on the matter, and you will be further advised later.

"I have, etc.,

"(Sgd.) A. R. MACDONALD,
"Under Secretary.

"Mr. M. E. Ganly,
"Samwell street,
"Croydon."

"[COPY.]

"Charters Towers N.Q.
"22nd April 1911.

"Marsland and Marsland.

"Mr. M. E. Ganly,
"Wheelwright,
"Samwell street, Croydon.

"Dear sir,—Our clients, Mills' Day Dawn United Gold Mines, Limited, have received a letter from the Department of Mines, Brisbane, covering a copy of a letter dated 9th February last written by you to the Minister for Mines, Brisbane. On that letter you have made some statements which (perhaps from your want of knowledge) are not in accordance with facts.

"Furthermore, you omitted to inform the Mines Department that you had been previously offered by our clients a sum for the mining rights under your allotment similar to sums they were paying for mining rights under neighbouring allotments and that you had declined the offer. In making the application for lease referred to we were acting for Mills' United Company and strictly complied with the provisions of the Mining on Private Land Act and the regulations thereunder.

"[COPY.]

"Croydon, 11th May, 1911.

"The Under Secretary for Mines,
"Brisbane.

"Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge your letter of the 19th ultimo, and, in reply, I beg to enclose a copy of a letter I received from Marsland and Marsland, solicitors, Charters Towers, on behalf of Mills' Day Dawn United Gold Mining Company, Limited.

"On perusal of this letter you will observe they acknowledge having received a letter from your department covering a copy of my letter to your department of the 9th February last.

"In their letter to me they accuse me of having made statements (in my letter to your department) that are not in accordance with facts, and further, that I had omitted to inform your department that I had previously been offered a sum for the mining rights under my allotment by their clients, which I refused. They then go on to say what they did re the application for lease, which includes my allotment, and give their opinions on the various matters relating thereto, and further say they searched the rate-book at Charters Towers, etc.,

1919—z

and that there was nothing to show I was a resident of Croydon, or at any other place than Charters Towers, and in strict compliance with the law the registered letter was posted to you with the Charters Towers address.

"They then say as follows:—'Had we known that you were resident at Croydon, we would have posted you a duplicate addressed Croydon.'

"They then, in the second paragraph following the above, say you will therefore see that there is absolutely no foundation for your assertions comprised in the following paragraphs in your letter to the Minister for Mines, that is to say. They then quote two paragraphs from my letter of the 9th to your department, which they did not like, as the assertions therein were only too true, and in a way reflected on their mode of proceedings in matters of this kind. When I wrote you on the 9th February, I was not aware Marsland and Marsland were the company's solicitors. Had I been, I would have said a good deal more, as I have had personal experience of those gentlemen for a number of years, to my sorrow. In the second last paragraph of their letter to me you will observe they offer me £35 as an act of grace on condition that I write your department, and then Marsland and Marsland withdrawing the statements (objected to) and apologising for having made them. Now, I will endeavour to satisfy you from copies of documents in my possession that the two paragraphs they object to were quite justifiable and true in substance and fact, and at the same time prove to you that Marsland and Marsland are quite capable of stating what is not true when they think it will suit, and that they did so in their letter to me of 22nd ultimo.

"I am enclosing a copy of a letter I received from them dated 1896, which shows they well knew my address then, and I feel sure they well knew it when searching the rate-book at Charters Towers.

"I am also enclosing copies of a letter I received from E. D. Miles, formerly a director of this company, and a member of the firm who acts as its secretary, and the address the town council of Charters Towers use in addressing me re rates, etc.

"I am also personally known to Mr. Frank Millican, formerly warden here, and now a director of this company.

"I submit when the question of applying for the lease including my allotment came before the directors he would have known a letter addressed to me residing at Charters Towers would never reach me at Croydon, but would in the ordinary course be returned to the senders. The statement that I was offered £35 for the underground rights is also untrue. I never had any communication with Marsland and Marsland or their clients on this matter, and the only way they can construe making me any offer is as follows:—

"When Mr. F. Morgan, manager Royal Bank, was leaving here for the Towers, I requested him to find out and advise me what amount was likely to be allowed for the underground rights on

Mr. Riordan.]

¼-acre allotments by this or any other company. He did so in due course, stating £35 for ¼-acre allotments. It is possible in making the inquiries he may have made use of my name; if he did so, and spoke to any of the directors of this company, or Marsland and Marsland, it only goes to show that I was a resident of Croydon, and not Charters Towers, but I never authorised Mr. Morgan to deal with this land for £35.

"I have since seen in the Charters Towers 'Register' (newspaper) where several allotments (¼-acre) were assessed at £75 a ¼-acre, notwithstanding the browbeating and bullying tactics of Messrs. Marsland and Marsland from the bench to spectators in their efforts to reduce the amount of assessment to the very lowest.

"With regard to my complying with the condition of Marsland and Marsland's letter, and withdrawing the statements objected to, and apologising for making use of them to your department and to them on behalf of their clients, I have the honour to say that I have not the remotest intention of doing so to either Marsland and Marsland or their clients. I must say I am surprised at their asking me to do so to your department, and making it a condition of their offer to me of £35 for my rights. I respectfully submit it will be time enough for me to do so when I receive a communication from your department containing such a demand and condition. To my mind, it is most coercive for Marsland and Marsland or their clients to make it a condition of paying me £35 for what they consider the value of my underground rights, to ask me to withdraw certain words and apologise to them for having used them in a letter addressed by me to the Minister for Mines, requesting him to redress what I considered a wrong. I have not replied to Marsland and Marsland's letter, and do not intend doing so until I hear further from your department on the matter. In conclusion, I respectfully submit you will, on receiving this rather lengthy communication in connection with my letter of the 9th February last, feel satisfied that I am only asking for the protection my just claim demands, and that I have fairly and truthfully tried to place the whole facts before you, and I claim my case is justly entitled to be heard and decided on its merits.

"I do not want anything from this company or any other (by an act of grace or otherwise), and I will not submit to be coerced into doing anything against my will only what I am justly and fairly entitled to. I will not feel satisfied unless I get a fair deal, which I submit I have not had up to the present.

"Awaiting your further reply,

"I have, etc.,

"(Signed) M. E. GANLY."

"[COPY.]

"Charters Towers,

"25rd April, 1896.

"Marsland and Marsland, Solicitors.

"Mr. Michael Edward Ganly,

"Miner,

"Croydon.

"Dear Sir,—As solicitors for and on

[Mr. Riordan.

behalf of the Brilliant (Charters Towers) Deep Levels Limited, we hereby give you notice that the lease given by you in favour of the Brilliant Extended Block Gold Mining Company No Liability and transferred by the secretary to the Brilliant Extended Block Gold Mining Company, Limited, has been transferred to the Brilliant Deep Levels, Limited, and such transfer was duly registered on 6th day of April, 1896, in the Real Property Office at Townsville.

"Yours truly,

"Marsland and Marsland."

"[COPY.]

"Charters Towers,

"19th November, 1897.

"E. D. Miles,

"Charters Towers.

"Mr. Michael Ganly,

"Croydon.

"Dear Sir,—I have purchased allotment 3 of section 25 in Church street, Charters Towers, adjoining your allotment.

"As you are aware, I am also the owner of allotment No. 1, and I purpose putting up a fence round three sides of your allotment, and request you to pay half the cost. An early reply will oblige.

"Yours faithfully,

"(Sgd.) E. D. Miles."

"Department of Mines,

"Brisbane, 7th June, 1911.

"11.3043.G.

"Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 11th ultimo, covering copy of a letter from Messrs. Marsland and Marsland, solicitors for Mills Day Dawn United Gold Mining Company, Limited, offering to compensate you for the loss of the mining rights in connection with your allotment 8 of section 28, town of Charters Towers, and to say that having succeeded in inducing the company to offer to compensate you for the loss, the department are not justified in proceeding further in the matter.

"I have, etc.,

"(Sgd.) A. R. Macdonald,

"Under Secretary."

"Mr. M. E. Ganly,

"Croydon."

"Department of Mines,

"Brisbane, 17th May, 1917.

"Sir,—I have the honour, by direction, to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated 24th ultimo, and accompanying papers in connection with your freehold allotment at Charters Towers, and application for same as a mining tenement by Mills Day Dawn United Gold Mines, Limited, and to state that Mr. Jones has carefully perused all the correspondence forwarded, but is unable to see his way to take any action in the matter.

"Papers returned herewith.

"I have, etc.,

"Henry S. Marshall,

"Under Secretary.

"M. E. Ganly, Esq.,

"Croydon,

"North Queensland."

Mr. RIORDAN: During the debate on the last Financial Statement I drew attention to a loan of £16,663 13s. 4d., granted in 1914, on the eve of an election as a sop which might aid the return of one of the

followers of the Government of that day. This money has been wasted on Croydon, and recently an inquiry has been held into the matter. I have been discussing this matter with the Minister for Mines, and I have asked him to consider some scheme for the revival of Croydon, and he has promised to do something for the development of the district. He intends sending a diamond drilling plant there at an early date and to try and locate the lost line of reef. In connection with the loan which was granted to Croydon, I would like to read some very important documents. I may say that I don't want to ask leave for these to be inserted in "Hansard," as I shall read them out. (Laughter.) I would also like to impress on the Minister for Mines that the recent inquiry held into the lost line of reef at Croydon was not satisfactory. I think that this inquiry should be continued. I think there is evidence here that should be brought before the Commission. It is also the opinion of Mr. Dunstan and Mr. Ferry that this inquiry should be continued. In answer to a question the other day I got a reply from the Acting Minister for Mines saying that the inquiry had been completed. I don't think it has been completed. It has not been completed satisfactorily at any rate, as I will show by some correspondence I have got here. Last year, in speaking on the Financial Statement, I mentioned a few of the shareholders who were registered at the Supreme Court. There were seven shareholders, and I mentioned the names of Sir R. Philp, Messrs. E. H. Macartney, N. A. C. Douglas, W. Hetherington, T. H. Brown, G. L. Howston, and F. W. Cuthbert. Those are the seven shareholders.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: What Mr. Macartney is that?

Mr. RIORDAN: The leader of the Opposition. I find that the firm of Thynne and Macartney are the solicitors for this company. In the agreement in connection with this advance there was a clause which read as follows:—

"Clause 6 provides that the amount to be advanced shall, when advanced, be a debt due to the Government and without prejudice to any other right of the Government to recover the same, shall be repaid to the Government 'in the manner following that is to say . . . (ii.) . . . if the Minister thinks such sinking, equipping with machinery or working is not satisfactory . . . the money advanced hereunder shall forthwith become due and payable,' and the Minister may—

(a) Take possession of and sell, lease, let or hire, or otherwise deal with the said lease, and all the machinery and other property that may be purchased wholly or in part with any of the moneys hereby agreed to be advanced, and may retain two-thirds of the proceeds of any such sale, and one-half of the proceeds of any such lease, letting or dealing . . .

and for this purpose Cuthbert or the company, as the case may be, 'shall within

twelve months of the date of these presents' (19th April, 1915) 'or whenever sooner called upon by the Minister so to do, give and execute to the Minister a bill of sale over all such machinery and other property, and a mortgage over the said goldmining lease,' or

(b) may . . . require the mine, etc., to be let on tribute."

In going through the file of papers, I notice that the Minister for Mines made the following note:—

"Minute by Minister.

"Solicitors Thynne and Macartney promised; but bill of sale and bill of mortgage were not executed. "A.J.J."

This bill of sale or bill of mortgage was to be executed twelve months after 1915, or soon after if called on by the Minister. No bill of sale or bill of mortgage has yet been executed. Messrs. Thynne and Macartney have been asked on several occasions to execute the bill of sale. Messages have been sent down and letters have been written, but the bill of sale or bill of mortgage has not been signed. This puts the Government in a very funny position. The machinery at this mine is still held by Mr. Cuthbert. No further money has been granted, and the thing is closed down, but the Government have no control over the machinery or the stores, and nothing of that kind can be sold. The Government do not know what is going on there.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: Did they make a profit out of it?

Mr. RIORDAN: No, there was no profit. What I want to know is why Messrs. Thynne and Macartney do not complete this bill of sale. They made several promises that they would do so, but they have not done so. I have a letter here written by the Under Secretary for Mines to Messrs. Thynne and Macartney on the 13th March, 1917, as follows:—

"[COPY OF LETTER FROM THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MINES, BRISBANE, TO MESSRS. THYNNE AND MACARTNEY, BRISBANE.]
17. 465-3 C.

"13th March, 1917.

"Gentlemen,—

"With reference to the subsidy being paid to the Iguana Consols, Limited, under agreement dated 19th April, 1915, between Frederick William Cuthbert and the Honourable the Minister for Mines, and agreement dated 31st May, 1916, between Iguana Consols, Limited, and the Honourable the Secretary for Mines, I have the honour to request as the machinery and plant is now installed at the mine, that the necessary bill of sale and mortgage be prepared in terms of the agreements."

Messrs. Thynne and Macartney replied to that letter on the 16th March, 1917, as follows:—

"Sir,—Re Iguana Consols, Limited. We are in receipt of your communication of the 13th instant, and have the honour to inform you that we have applied to our clients for their instructions with respect to the preparation of the securities mentioned. Is it your intention that we should prepare and submit drafts of same for your approval?"

Mr. Riordan.]

The Under Secretary for Mines again wrote to Messrs. Thynne and Macartney on the 28th March, 1917, as follows:—

“Gentlemen,—In reply to your letter dated 16th instant, I have the honour to request that you will kindly submit drafts of the bill of sale and mortgage, to be prepared by you in terms of agreements made between Frederick William Cuthbert and the Honourable the Secretary for Mines, and Iguana Consols, Limited, and the Honourable the Secretary for Mines, in connection with the subsidy being paid to the said company.”

Messrs. Thynne and Macartney replied to that on the 29th March, 1917, as follows:—

“Sir,—Re Iguana Consols, Limited. We have the honour to acknowledge receipt of yours of the 28th instant, and the matter is having our attention. The secretary is obtaining an inventory from Cloncurry of all the chattels to be included in the bill of sale.”

Messrs. Thynne and Macartney have not completed this bill of sale.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: They have still got it under consideration?

Mr. RIORDAN: Yes; I think they should get the bill of sale completed.

Mr. KIRWAN: There is a bit of “go slow” policy about that.

Mr. RIORDAN: I think Mr. Macartney should also consider the advisability of signing this document, seeing that he is one of the shareholders and one of the firm of solicitors.

Mr. MACARTNEY: How many shares do I hold?

Mr. RIORDAN: It does not say. I could not find that out.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I hold one formal share.

Mr. RIORDAN: This grant was made by the Government on the application of Mr. Cuthbert. He had no assays made. All he had was the word of a man who had died ten years previously. He said that Mr. Kellaway had shown him an assay. Mr. Cuthbert then issued a prospectus to the public, and the public rushed it because the Government made a grant of £16,000. The public has been misled.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: What Government issued the grant?

Mr. RIORDAN: The Denham Government.

Mr. MULLAN: The Liberal Government.

Mr. RIORDAN: I have never seen anything liberal about it. They were liberal enough with the people's money to give away £16,000 without any assay or anything else, just on the report of Mr. Cuthbert. Mr. Grant was the Minister for Mines who lent the money. It was proposed to sink a shaft 12,000 feet to get at gold which was worth £2 16s. 6d. per ounce. It is a strange thing that grants of this kind are made. I know that two geologists reported unfavourably on this proposal.

Mr. COLLINS: What geologist?

Mr. RIORDAN: Mr. Jackson and Mr. Dunstan. I would suggest to the Minister for Mines that he should get a geologist to visit the field and give Croydon another chance. Give it a fair trial, not a trial by Mr. Cuthbert or any vested interest of

[Mr. Riordan.

Croydon. That loan was a good thing for Mr. Cuthbert, because he had a lot of old machinery to sell, and he sold it.

Mr. FREE: Did the shareholders get any dividends?

Mr. RIORDAN: No. Mr. Cuthbert has a store there, and the more extravagance in the management the more profitable it is to the manager of the mine. The manager of the mine was Mr. Cuthbert at £3 a week.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: Is that a living wage?

Mr. RIORDAN: Mr. Cuthbert got more than a living wage out of it. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman was connected with the Government that made that grant. If he was, then he ought not to be proud of it.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: I did not happen to be a Minister then. I had left the Government.

Mr. RIORDAN: I want to point out to the Government that something must be done for the development of the Gulf. There is ample opportunity for the Government to start another State in North-western Queensland. Promises have been made for thirty years about developing the Gulf. Reports have been written by Mr. Phillips, by Captain Pennefather, and by Mr. Cullen, but nothing has been done. The people's leg has been pulled all the time. I do not think there is any leg-pulling about this Government. (Opposition laughter.) This Government have a genuine desire to do something for that portion of the State, because there is plenty of opportunity to do something there. To carry out that scheme the Government must go in for a railway policy. A railway to the Gulf is absolutely necessary, and also a deep-water port. Mr. Cullen made a report, in which he says there is no chance of a deep-water port in the Gulf, although Mr. Elliott said there was a chance. Mr. Cullen says that a lighterage scheme would be practicable in the Gulf. Here is an extract from Mr. Cullen's report—

“It is, in my opinion, necessary to recognise that oversea trade with the head of the Gulf can only be carried out by means of lighterage. There seems to be a somewhat vague but general opinion that lighterage is prohibitive to the development of trade, but such is not necessarily the case. To quote our own experience the greater part of the trade through Townsville was effected by lighterage over a distance of some 7 miles more or less up to about 1904; to the present time the whole trade of Mackay is conducted by lighters. Capetown and Durban in South Africa, until comparatively recent years, were lighterage ports, and I believe I am correct in stating that some of the New Zealand ports, such as Gisborne and Napier with refrigerated exports are also lighterage ports.

“If it be accepted that lighterage must be resorted to in the Gulf, the whole question is simplified. There would be no restriction on the size of vessels, as the deeper draughts would merely anchor a little further off shore, and such vessels would not be hampered by considerations of tide, save in so far as the lighters were affected by the river bars.

“The acceptance of this method of transfer also reduces the question of the railway terminus to the simple one of which is the best country to traverse, not

so much from the point of view of engineering difficulties, as all routes seem to be favourable in that respect, but from the point of view of the best country for future settlement, and of affording the best service to existing settlement."

Mr. Cullen says the thing is simplified. All that remains is to decide the best [4.30 p.m.] route, and the Public Works Commission has recently visited the Gulf to ascertain which is the best route. Mr. Cullen continues—

"The foregoing statement is possible owing to the fact that lighterage can be favourably conducted, with the sole limitation of the bar depth, either from the Albert or from the Norman. I do not think any other locality offers equal facilities. Settlement already exists on the upper waters of both rivers, and what Gulf trade has taken place has been conducted by lighters through these two rivers."

Mr. Elliott says a deep-water port was found at Bailey Island, but Mr. Cullen has turned that proposition down, and now lighterage seems to be the only possible means of carrying on trade. The visit of the Public Works Commission to the Gulf was a very hurried one, but they took evidence in different towns. Of course, it is said that there are vested interests in the Gulf, but the men carrying on business in the Gulf are in a very small way, and there are no great vested interests there except the squatters. The Commission took evidence from miners and others interested, and when their report is issued I think we will get railway communication with the Gulf. The possibilities of the Gulf with railway communication are enormous. Mr. Calvert, who has recently visited the district, took the flow of the different rivers, and has reported favourably on the scheme. He says there are a million acres of land that could be irrigated from the Gregory and Nicholson rivers, and he gives a chemical analysis of the soil on the Gregory and different rivers. In addition to those million acres along the banks of the different rivers, there is a large area of second, third, and fourth class country, which should be classified and cut into decent-sized blocks. The present surveyors, when cutting up blocks, do not take into consideration the class of land which they are cutting up. For instance, at Mount Surprise the plains were cut into 640-acre blocks, which is not a sufficient area in that district to feed half a dozen head of stock. It is ridiculous to have men out there doing this sort of thing. They must do it with some object, because any man in the State service who was sent out on a commission like that could see in a moment that blocks of 640 acres would not be taken up for closer settlement. Mr. Calvert, in his report, says—

"The lower portion of the Gregory River, consisting of black alluvial clays, is subject to flooding, and no scheme would be advisable unless it included a system of flood control on the Upper Nicholson and Gregory rivers.

"Between the Gregory and Leichhardt rivers, and bounded on its south side by Cartridge Creek, extends a belt of good plains of 1,000,000 acres in extent. This country is generally well grassed, but is entirely devoid of permanent water except on the river frontages.

"It has large areas of good soil suitable for agriculture, and seems to lend itself admirably to a simple scheme of irrigation. By the erection of a weir at The Nob, on the Gregory River, the water would be diverted from the river over towards Cartridge Creek, and could, by such a system of distribution as suggested by the red lines on the plan which indicate proposed main canals, be conducted to almost any portion of the million acres.

"Assuming that the volume of water available without making any provision for storage, but allowing for the satisfaction of riparian rights on the river banks, is 90,000,000 gallons per day; this would permit of an area of 10,000 acres of lucerne being served with a fifteen-day period of inundation.

"The remainder of the million acres could be divided into grazing selections for pastoral purposes, and would be provided with a system of canals, ensuring a permanent supply of water for stock. These canals would form portion of the drainage system of the irrigation area, and, therefore, would serve a double purpose. By this means alone, at a very low estimate, some 40,000 cattle could be depastured, and on country which for several months of the year is entirely without natural water. By the use of fire-ploughs, and by adopting a systematic method of fodder conservation, this area might be made to carry possibly 100,000 cattle."

Mr. Calvert points out that any portion of those million acres could be irrigated, and he also furnished a map pointing out the way in which the water would run from the Gregory into Cartridge Creek. Mr. Calvert goes on to say—

"From the junction of Surprise Creek above Kajabbi, where the Mount Cuthbert Railway crosses the river to below Augustus Downs, there is available sufficient water in the underflow of the river to permit of very extensive agricultural development under irrigation. The land available would be a strip 1 mile wide each side of the river for a length of over 125 miles, an area of some 250 square miles, or 160,000 acres.

"A conservative estimate of the underflow shows that there is sufficient water, without replenishment, to irrigate, with 4-inch waterings at fifteen-day intervals, some 160 acres of land for every mile of the river's length, a total area of 20,000 acres.

"If the 160,000 acres were divided up into farms so that 12½ per cent, of each farm was available for irrigation each year, then a very considerable settlement would be possible along the river."

It is impossible to get people to go out and settle there under the conditions at present prevailing in the Gulf. The only way is to build a railway there, and then the people will follow. There is sufficient inducement now in the Gulf for the Government to start the scheme. For the last thirty years the people have been told, "You will get a railway." Every politician who went to the district said, "Yes, you will get a railway," and that ended the matter. We want to be more honest. We want to tell the people there that we are going to build a railway,

Mr. Riordan.]

and then build it, and not stop at promises, as has been done for the last thirty years by the Liberal Government, the Denham Government, and every other Government that has been in power. I could go on quoting from this report of Mr. Calvert's all the afternoon, but it is available to any member of the House, and I suppose hon. members will be sufficiently interested in the State as to come along and have a look for themselves. Mr. Brünlich, of the Agricultural Department, in giving the results of his analysis of the soils brought down by Mr. Calvert, says—

“Soils No. 807, 809, and 817 appear to be very promising agricultural soils in good physical condition, and soil No. 808, although of more sandy nature, could also be well utilised. The last soil—818—is too clayey and contains too much magnesia, indicating want of drainage, and is of totally different nature. All soils are characteristic in containing very low amounts of humus and nitrogen, which, of course, would be improved by cultivation. They contain fair to good amounts of lime and potash, but are deficient in phosphoric acid, which, fortunately, can be applied at low cost, being the cheapest of all fertilisers, by application of rock phosphate or bone meal. There is no doubt that the land could be successfully cultivated, particularly with possibility of irrigation, and crops like lucerne, castor-oil plant, peanuts, and cotton should be promising. The suitability of climate and locality to certain crops should be ascertained by establishment of small experimental plots or demonstration farms to teach prospective settlers the best mode of cultivation and most remunerative crops.”

All these reports are very favourable, and the Government should do something for this part of the State, in addition to getting reports, such as past Governments did. We want the Government to go right ahead and develop that district. Mr. Pennefather and Mr. Cullen reported on the prospects of obtaining a deep-water port. Mr. Elliott said a deep-water port had been found, but I am prepared to accept Mr. Cullen's scheme, and hope that the Government will do the same. I am not fighting for any particular line. I will be satisfied so long as we get a line to the Gulf that will be to the best interests of the State, and not to the best interests of the politicians or member for the district. I think hon. members should look to the development of the State, and not to the development of the next election. This is a big scheme, which will involve the expenditure of a lot of money—perhaps a million of money—but it must be remembered that Mr. Denham, when in power, spent £500,000 on a sugar-mill in the South Johnstone district; with what result? He brought about an increase of 250 in the population of that district, and the thing has been a practical failure ever since.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Because the mill was built in the wrong place.

Mr. RIORDAN: It may have been built in the wrong place, but the Government should have seen that it was built in the right place. Perhaps some influence was brought to bear on the man who went up to report on the site. Mr. Cullen also made mention in his report of the Norman and Albert rivers. So long as a railway is built

[Mr. Riordan.

there the people of Normanton and Burketown do not care where the port is. Then again, on the Norman River, there is a suitable site for a meatworks, and in order to show that the cattle industry around Normanton is a very big industry, I have secured a return from the Petty Sessions District of Normanton, dated 20th June, 1916, which gives the number of cattle in the district as 125,466, and the number of horses as 2,434. The Government will be going in for meatworks, and I hope when they are picking a site that they will take into consideration the possibilities of a meatworks somewhere in the Gulf. The Government have lately acquired a good many stations up there, and I hope they will buy a few more, because I think it is good business. While on the State stations I would also like to suggest that the Minister in charge of State enterprises might draw the attention of his official—especially the general manager of the State stations—and make him realise that he is to do what the Government want him to do and not merely what he wishes to do. The Government have provided workers' accommodation, but this official should be made to carry out the regulations, and not merely to promise to do it. He should also deal with the blacks on the State stations and see that a fair number of married men get a chance of working these stations. Plenty of married men would go out on these stations if the Government would provide a governess for their children and make provision to have the children educated. The men would be more contented and more likely to stay then. But I am afraid that unless the Minister impresses this on the mind of the general manager he is likely to forget that he is out of Mr. Jowett's employment. I notice from the remarks of this official that he is rather hostile to the Government. He is prepared to carry out a policy which will bring discredit on the Government. I want the Minister to keep his eye on this gentleman, because if he is prepared to accept the salary paid to him by the Government he should be prepared to do the work in a fair and conscientious manner. It may be a good idea when making these appointments, all things being equal, to appoint a man who is prepared to sign the platform of the Labour party.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: “Hear, hear!” and Opposition laughter.

Mr. RIORDAN: My friends opposite me laugh, but if a man is running a business and he is hostile to it, he has no chance of making it a success—he can either make it or break it—and I think Mr. McGugan could very well do with a rap across the knuckles. Perhaps the State may be successful in getting a better man; indeed, I have no doubt that they would have no trouble in getting a better man to run their stations. However, let that matter go at that for the present.

I should also like to bring under the notice of the Minister for Agriculture the inconveniences which men travelling stock are put to in these different districts. A man going to a race meeting or to a picnic has to wire down to Normanton, say, to get permits to travel stock, when a policeman in charge in the different towns could very easily attend to the matter.

Another thing is the health of the people

of the North, which ought to be brought under the notice of the Home Secretary. Different little hospitals, 30 or 40 miles apart, are being subsidised by the Government, and for the biggest part of the area there are no doctors. There are four hospitals within 25 miles of one another, and if the Government took over the whole of these hospitals one doctor could attend to the lot. If a good salary was given, a good man could be got, but under present conditions no one can be got. The Government sent a man up during the influenza epidemic, and since his arrival the epidemic has broken out and there has been a good many cases. I hope the Home Secretary will give consideration to the question of taking over the hospitals in the Burke electorate and the far Northern districts. There will be no difficulty in the doctor getting about by motor transport on the railway, and this could easily be arranged between the Home Department and the Railway Department.

In conclusion, I hope that the Government will do something at an early date towards linking up the Gulf by railway with the deep-water port or with the lightering.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GILDAY (*Ithaca*): This is one of the occasions when a member sitting behind the Government has an opportunity of dealing with the extensive programme they have submitted, and of expressing his approbation of those things which have been so prominently placed before the people of the State during the last twelve months. Anyone who reads the programme must come to the conclusion that it is one which is worthy of the consideration of every member of this Chamber. It contains many proposals which will be for the benefit of the people of Queensland as a whole. I do not propose to refer to all the legislation which it is proposed to introduce this session, but I will occupy the brief time I desire to address the House on two or three very important matters to which I think we should give our serious attention.

I want first to make a passing reference to the seamen's strike, which has just been settled. I think that every hon. member will realise the great importance of that strike. Any fair-minded man must come to the conclusion that the seamen had a good case from the very inception. They were asking for four points to be decided, and, owing to the fact that the general public were behind the seamen, it appears to me that the strike should have been settled many months ago.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GILDAY: The strike has been in operation, particularly in Queensland, something like six months, although it has not been in existence so long in the other States. What concerns me is this: If the seamen's claim was wrong in the first instance, why did the Federal Government come down so late as a few days ago? That goes to show that the seamen had a just cause, and that the Government, through their mismanagement, kept the people in a state of chaos during the last six months. I think the Queensland Government are to be commended for the action they have taken, and the seamen have to be commended for the action they took with regard to the people in the North. Every possible endeavour was made by the Government to send food to the

people in the North. It was a very critical time when pressure was brought to bear upon the Federal Government, who had control of the shipping, and were masters of the situation. If they had had any sense of fairness towards the people of Australia, instead of showing preference to a few monopolists, the seamen's strike would have been settled long ago. Since the cessation of hostilities there has been a great deal of industrial unrest, not only in Australia but in every part of the world, and the question we have to consider is as to what is the cause of this unrest? One of the ways in which the Federal Government endeavoured to perpetuate the seamen's strike was by putting the leader of the men in gaol. I remember when I was the general secretary of a very strong industrial organisation, and as a paid official I had to go to the public and state what the men I represented intended to do. If I was loyal to the people who paid me I could only do the same thing as Mr. Walsh did—that is, go out and advocate the claims of the seamen.

Mr. GUNN: Yes; but he defied the Government.

Mr. GILDAY: He did nothing of the kind. He emphasised the fact that the men would not go back, and that he would assist the men in their action. He did exactly the same as a lawyer defending a case. When they put Mr. Walsh in gaol, they knew that it would incite the men a great deal more and prolong the strike.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Is that why Walsh made the speech he made—in order to go to gaol and incite the men more?

Mr. GILDAY: It was not that Mr. Walsh wanted to incite the men; but any fair-minded man who understands the industrial movement knows that if you put a paid official in gaol it is going to incite the men. I think that any fair-minded man will realise that there must be something wrong with our industrial legislation which has for its object the improvement of the conditions of the employees. I believe in arbitration, but the way in which it is carried out, and the advantage which is taken by those who control the supply of the necessaries of life, show that there must be something more done in connection with arbitration to protect the worker. I was one of those who first sat in Queensland on wages boards, which were presided over by independent chairmen. I represented the employees in the meat industry, and it was decided that the industry could stand a certain rise in wages. That would have been all right if the price of the commodity had remained the same, but immediately afterwards the price went up by 1d. per lb., so that the men were worse off than they were before the increase. It was recognised that it would mean ½d. per lb. on meat, but as soon as the men got a rise of 5s. or 6s. per week the price of meat was put up 1d. per lb. The employer got the benefit of the deal, as he was practically ½d. per lb. better off. Until the Arbitration Court says, when it fixes the wage at £4 per week, that that wage shall buy so much, it is not worth a jot. When we realise the price of commodities,

[5 p.m.] ties, it is a wonder that there is not more industrial trouble than there is at the present time. I have here a few figures I want to place before hon. members, because I guarantee there are very few men in this House who realise the size

Mr. Gilday.]

of the increase in the cost of commodities since the beginning of the war. I deal first with normal times.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Since the Labour party came in?

Mr. GILDAY: I will deal with the question of the Labour party. I am glad the hon. member mentioned it. In this table the first lot of figures represent the retail cost of articles in 1914, and the second represents the cost to-day, and I want to ask the House how the workers can survive those increases, notwithstanding the fact that they have had certain rises in wages—

	RETAIL.		
	1914.	1919.	
	s. d.	s. d.	
Candles ...	0 7	to 1 3	lb.
Cornflour ...	0 5	0 9	„
Jam ...	0 8½	1 1	tin
Canned fruit ...	0 10	1 5	„
Milk ...	0 7½	0 11	„
Mustard ...	0 7	1 3	„
Syrup ...	0 6	0 9½	„
Cocoa (local) ...	0 6	0 10	„
Kerosene ...	4 3	10 6	„
Wax vestas ...	0 4½	0 9	doz.
Safety matches ...	0 3	0 6	„
Oatmeal ...	0 3	0 5½	lb.
Rolled oats ...	0 7	1 1	pkt.
Macaroni ...	0 5	0 10	„
Rice ...	0 2½	0 7	lb.
Sago ...	0 2½	0 7	„
Tapioca ...	0 2½	0 7	„
Salt ...	0 0¾	0 1½	„
Washing soda ...	0 0¾	0 2½	„
Bacon ...	1 0	1 7	„
Flour ...	0 1½	0 2¼	„
Soap (common) ...	0 5½	1 5	bar
„ (Barilla) ...	0 7½	1 9	„
Pickles ...	0 7½	1 3	bot.
Meth. spirits ...	0 2½	0 10	„

So that what you could have bought in 1914 for 14s. 8d. would cost to-day £1 11s. 6d., an increase of 115 per cent. The hon. the leader of the Opposition said: "And a Labour party in power." Take, however, the price of meat, which has been controlled by the Government, and which is cheaper in Queensland than in any part of the civilised world. The Government had power to deal with that question. Take also the insurance business, dealt with by the Government. Instead of the insurance companies making large profits, similar to those of the other large monopolies who had the power to do it during the war, as a matter of fact the cost of insurance has gone down considerably—I think by 20 per cent. The Government have also taken in hand the manufacture of arsenic. That is to be given to the people at a considerably less price than they are paying at the present time.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Wait and see.

Mr. GILDAY: Well, we will wait and see. Whilst I am a very strong believer in protection and the encouragement of Australian industries, we ought not to give the opportunity to such industries to become profiteers at the expense of the people. We find that most of the articles I have mentioned are manufactured in Australia, or produced in Australia. The people who are controlling them to-day have formed themselves into combines for the purpose of extracting as much as they possibly can out of the

[Mr. Gilday.

people. I think that the only cases in which prices have not gone up have been in regard to commodities controlled by the State.

Mr. MACARTNEY: What about liquor?

Mr. GILDAY: The things I have mentioned are more important than liquor. Those are things that affect the women and children of this State. The one who is keeping the home together is the one who feels the pinch when she finds the prices of commodities rising. This Government have no power whatever to deal with these commodities. We have a Bill which will be submitted to the House dealing with the cost of living, but, unfortunately, it is a question that should be dealt with by the Commonwealth to make it effective. I am quite satisfied that, if the Commonwealth were dealing with it, it would be more effective from the point of view of Australia as a whole.

Mr. COLLINS: Didn't "Billy" Hughes propose to hang all the profiteers?

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: And the Bolsheviks.

Mr. GILDAY: I am dealing with this question to show why industrial unrest exists. Men working in various industries are regarded as getting certain rises through the medium of the courts, and yet industrial chaos exists. It is not only so in Queensland, or even in Australia, but right throughout the civilised world, and we must find the cause of it. I take it that the cost of living is soaring up so quickly owing to the fact, perhaps, that we are going through a certain transition stage because of the war. I realise that before the war a number of men were producing in the different parts of the world, but because of the war conditions were upset, and there is no doubt that a large number of those producers were driven into other spheres altogether, and that what surplus stocks were on hand have been exhausted during the war. Now, there is another link between the producer and the consumer, that is, the vendor of different classes of commodities. This is where the profiteer, the big manufacturer, gets in the thin end of the wedge. He knows perfectly well that there are no surplus stocks, that they can only be drawn through his factory, and, of course, he is making the people pay the piper. I think it is the duty of the Commonwealth Government and every State Government to put their heads together and deal with this very important question. Immediately it is dealt with I am satisfied we will have a more contented community than we have at the present time. Let us take a concrete case, that of the trade in kerosene and benzine. I hope hon. members will not dispute the fact that there is a very strong combine in Australia in regard to oil.

"The trade in these two articles, in use in most Australian homes, is confined to very few hands. Three companies—the Vacuum Oil Company, the Texas Oil Company, and the British Imperial Oil Company—control 99 per cent. of the kerosene trade and over 98 per cent. of the benzine trade of the whole Commonwealth. The power that can be exercised by such a monopoly is too self-evident to need further explanation.

"While it has been impossible to secure full particulars of the trade of the three companies in question, because of the exclusive bookkeeping methods of

two of them, it is possible to present the trade figures of the Vacuum Oil Company, which, of itself, controls two-thirds of the entire Australian trade in kerosene and benzine.

"The figures relating to the Vacuum Oil Company, set out hereunder, will reveal, in no unmistakable manner, the extent to which profiteering in these two articles of daily use has been allowed to go on unchecked—"

This is one of those matters that affect the primary producer very much, but I have not heard hon. members opposite urging any argument against a monopoly in that direction. They always claim to be friends of the primary producer, and he has to use all the commodities I mentioned previously, and he is also a very big consumer of different classes of oil for the various kinds of work on his farm, and yet hon. members are silent. This is how the Vacuum Oil Company have made profits during the last few years—

Year.	Capital.	Accrued Profit and Reserves.	Profit made.
1912 ...	600,000	203,254	301,140
1913 ...	600,000	357,470	263,400
1914 ...	600,000	471,646	274,020
1915 ...	800,000	603,626	402,560
1916 ...	800,000	806,203	579,520
1917 ...	1,600,000	1,270,583	483,000

"Astounding as these figures read, it is necessary that the following further details should be read in order to get a fuller appreciation of the profits secured from the people of Australia on the sale of these two very necessary commodities.

"At the outbreak of the war kerosene was selling at 6s. 11d. per case. In February, 1915, it was increased to 7s. 5d.; in April, 1915, to 7s. 8d.; in December, 1915, to 8s. 4d.; in February, 1916, to 9s. 4d.; in May, 1916, to 10s. 10d.; in July, 1917, to 11s. 6d.; in May, 1917, to 12s. 6d.; in July, 1917, to 13s. 6d.; and in January, 1918, to 14s. 6d.

"As regards benzine, the price at the outbreak of the war was 13s. 4d. per case. In February, 1915, it was increased to 13s. 10d.; in December, 1915, to 15s.; in February, 1916, to 17s.; in May, 1916, to 19s.; in July, 1916, to 19s. 8d.; in May, 1917, to 20s. 8d.; in July, 1917, to 21s. 8d.; and in January, 1918, to 23s. 3d."

As the years went on profits were made at every possible opportunity—they did not wait six months and then regulate the prices, but whenever they saw an opportunity they raised the figures, and the result was that practically every month the prices of those commodities went up. They rose by leaps and bounds. I have mentioned that I believe in the protection of our industries against outside commercial invasion, more particularly in regard to Japanese manufacturers. I consider that we should encourage local industries, but at the same time we must not allow local industries to exploit the consumer. This is just as important a question as any we can deal with. If we are going to encourage the local manufacturer and the Australian manufactured goods we must not allow them to become a trust and exploit the people. On the other hand, I say unhesitatingly that those industries that are to be established in Australia should be protected from the

individuals who have the goods to sell. Take the wool industry, for instance. We all know that wool has gone up to a considerable price, and that it has steadily advanced during the last four or five years. That was brought about by the war, because so much woollen clothing was required for our soldiers on the other side of the world. Dealing with the woollen industry, I consider that one of the first commandments for public men in Australia should be that the people of Australia, who produce the wool, should not be exploited owing to the fact that we have a surplus of wool. In such cases we can send the wool abroad. I do not care what price they get on the other side of the world, so long as we can protect our people in Australia from being exploited. Then, with regard to the cattle industry, we know that there has been an increase in the price of leather. The manufacture of boots is an important thing in Australia, and makes one notice the rotten administration of the Federal Government so far as boots are concerned. The Federal Government have the power of dealing with prices, if they will only exercise that power. I remember reading a short time ago where the Minister who controls price-fixing in the Federal House lifted the embargo so far as the price of hides was concerned. When he removed the embargo from the price of hides, he said that if any undue advantage were taken by the producers of hides through the lifting of that embargo, then he would immediately re-enact the regulation, and so deal with the question. What took place? Only one week elapsed after he made that statement when hides went up in price to 1s. 11d. per lb. Previously the boot manufacturers were buying their hides for 6d. and 7d. per lb. The sudden rise took place owing to the fact that there were American buyers in Australia. That was why hides went up to such an exorbitant price, and the people of this State have to suffer in consequence.

Mr. FRY: Your Government are searching the world's markets to dispose of their hides.

Mr. GILDAY: You have made your speech, and I think it is infra dig. for you to try and make another speech while I am speaking. If the Government did what you say, then I know nothing about it. What concerns me is the insincerity of the so-called "Nationalist Government" now controlling the Commonwealth for not dealing with price-fixing when they had the opportunity of doing it. If the Commonwealth Government only dealt with this matter in the manner in which they should have done, it would have prevented boots from going up in price by 10s. a pair last week. The leader of the Opposition will agree with me that boots have advanced in price by 10s. a pair.

Mr. MACARTNEY: I have not been buying any boots.

Mr. GILDAY: It is a good job the hon. gentleman has not been buying boots, else he would have to pay the increased price. The manufacturers of boots should be protected so that they would be in a position to give us cheaper boots, but if the exploiters are allowed to come in and rush up the price of hides, then it is impossible for the boot manufacturer to supply cheap boots to the people of Queensland and Australia. If this sort of thing is to be allowed to go on, and

Mr. Gilday.]

if the price of boots is to be increased 400 or 500 per cent., then it is going to cause no end of industrial unrest.

Mr. SIZER: Your Government are holding their leather until they get a higher price for it.

Mr. GILDAY: You seem to know more about it than the Government themselves. There has been no attempt made by the Commonwealth Government to deal with the price of tallow so far as local requirements are concerned. I have been informed that grocers have received notifications from the soap manufacturers advising them that soap is going up from week to week. If this sort of thing continues, soap will be at such a price that it will have to be regarded as a luxury in a man's home. These are things which will have to be carefully reviewed by the Commonwealth Government—because it is a Commonwealth matter, and should be attended to by that Government—because, otherwise, I am satisfied that there will be a great deal of trouble amongst the consumers.

Mr. COLLINS: "Billy" Hughes is going to hang them all. It is all right now; all the profiteers will be hung.

Mr. GILDAY: This is a matter of interest to members opposite and to people outside this House altogether. Everyone knows how the profiteers are exploiting the people to-day just because they have a monopoly in certain lines. I have an extract here, which shows how one monopoly exploits the people of the United States. It says—

"AMAZING OIL PROFITS.

"HISTORY HAS NO PARALLEL.

"According to the 'Oil and Gas Journal' (U.S.A.), the output at Tulsa, Oklahoma, is 450,800 barrels per day. At the price of 3s. 9d. per barrel (the rate three years ago) this oil would have brought over £81,504 per day, £570,528 per week, £2,445,124 per month, and £29,758,760 per year of 365 days. At the present price of 9s. 4½d. per barrel, the figures are £383,760 per day, £1,566,310 per week, £6,102,800 per month, or £74,372,400 per year."

Mr. MACARTNEY: What material are you talking about?

Mr. GILDAY: Oil.

Mr. MACARTNEY: What sort of oil?

Mr. GILDAY: Why, bless my soul, surely you know what oil is! (Laughter.) It is very amusing to me to hear the leader of the Opposition dealing with the state of affairs in Queensland and referring to the financial position of the Government. I do not pose to be a financial expert by any means because I consider that to deal with the financial problems as they should be dealt with means a good deal of study and a lot of time and attention devoted by anyone wishing to properly deal with the question. All the same, I have enough common sense to know that this Government have had a lot of adverse conditions to contend with since they have been in office. They not only had the war on, and drought conditions existing in the State, but they had to deal with the requests for increases of salaries from the dissatisfied public servants. When

the Government came into office the railway service was a seething mass of discontent so far as the employees were concerned.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Is it not so now?

Hon. J. G. APPEL: Yes, it is the same to-day.

Mr. GILDAY: No, it is not. They are more satisfied now because they have had increases of wages granted to them.

Mr. STOFFORD: At any rate the railways have been kept going, but the Commonwealth Government could not keep the ships going.

Mr. GILDAY: If the profiteers are going to continually keep putting up prices there is no alternative for the Government but to also increase the salaries of their employees in the same way as men working in other industries who are having their salaries and wages increased. When the Government came into office there was dissatisfaction in the public service owing to the stoppage of the automatic increases. Since then the Government have had to spend £1,000,000 in increasing the wages of the railway servants alone. The Government have also had to provide for increases to the teachers and police, and other public servants, compared with what they were under the Tory Government. It is an easy matter for a Government to show surpluses when it does not give the increases asked for, but considering all the increases that this Government have paid I think that the deficit of £170,000 in the last financial year is only a small matter after all. It must not be forgotten that 60,000 stalwart workers left Queensland for the front. The result was that there was a loss of production in the State caused by the absence of that number of men. In addition, we had bad seasons. Everyone knows that there has been very bad seasons in Queensland during the last two or three years through no fault of the present Government. If anyone visited the Bundaberg district to-day they would see a most pitiful sight, because the cane crop will be practically useless this season. In addition to that we know that since the cessation of hostilities at the front the great copper mines in this State have been closed down, and that has meant a loss of freight to our railways.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Do you suggest that the stoppage of the war stopped the mines?

Mr. GILDAY: Of course, it did. What else stopped the mines?

Mr. KIRWAN: Every copper mine in Australia closed down except one.

Mr. MACARTNEY: You know the reason for it. Your I.W.W. friends. You know the trouble all right.

Mr. KIRWAN: They did not shut down when the war was on.

Mr. GILDAY: The remarks of the leader of the Opposition amused me very much when he was dealing with the present financial position. I well remember at one time a cartoon was circulated showing that if the Labour party got into power the grass would be growing in Queen street. The cartoon also showed goats eating jam tins as the result of the Labour Government. I am reminded by the hon. member for Keppel that there are less goats in Queensland to-day than there were when the Liberals were in power.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: Does that mean that less jam is eaten?

[Mr. Gilday.

Mr. GILDAY: We were told that if the Labour party got into power that there would be blue ruin and that Queensland would be settled altogether.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: So it is.

Mr. GILDAY: In spite of the fact that we were told that grass would be growing in Queen street under a Labour Government and the goats would have to eat jam tins, I will show how a number of firms have prospered during the last few years. It shows that these big firms have done as well under a Labour Government as they did under a Tory Government.

[5.30 p.m.]

"Burns, Philp, and Co., year ending 31st March: Profit, £215,014; dividend 7½ per cent.; £75,000 carried to reserve; £24,000 added to insurance fund; £12,000 to staff bonus account; and £10,264 carried forward. Net profit, 1917, £145,880; 1918, £183,820; 1919, £204,969."

Those are the profits of these poor, unfortunate people, Burns, Philp, and Co., who were going to be ruined by a Labour Government. Then we will take the Canada Cycle and Motor Agency, Limited—

"Canada Cycle and Motor Agency, Limited: Profit for year ending 30th April, £7,761 (after writing off bad debts and depreciation).

"John Hicks and Co., Limited: Profit for year ending 30th April, £5,476.

"Moreheads Limited: Profit for year ending 30th April, £19,248.

"Mount Morgan Goldmining Company, Limited: Profit for year ending 1st June, 1919: £111,640."

That is the company which gave eight hours' notice to close up everything; which had no regard for the people who had established big places of business in Mount Morgan and no concern for anyone else.

Mr. STOFFORD: And never had a call in their life.

Mr. GILDAY: That company never had a call on their capital, and yet we find they were going to close down because their profits were not large enough. Is not that an iniquitous thing? Then, take the Queensland National Bank Limited.

"Queensland National Bank, Limited: Profit for half-year ending June, 1919, £54,394.

"The following comparison shows the business of the bank during the past two years:

Gross profit, 30th June, 1917 ...	£131,939
Gross profit, 31st Dec., 1917 ...	126,607
Gross profit, 30th June, 1918 ...	134,352
Gross profit, 31st Dec., 1918 ...	145,693
Gross profit, 30th June, 1919 ...	140,781

"Queensland Brewery Company, Ltd.: Profit for year ending 30th June, £14,773.

"Townsville Gas and Coke Company, Limited: Profit for the year ending 31st March, £7,049.

"Walter Reid and Co.: Profit for year ending 31st May, £46,489.

"Western Queensland Pastoral Company, Limited: Profit for year ending 31st March, £36,625."

The above figures, which represent a very small proportion of the profits made by

Queensland trading concerns, are taken from the "Trustees' Review," which is very authentic in that connection.

Mr. SIZER: Your Government is responsible for the profits made by the breweries.

Mr. GILDAY: Did you ever hear such a narrow-minded remark in your life; that this Government is responsible for the profits made by the breweries? I gave the hon. member credit for having better sense.

Mr. SIZER: What about the picture shows?

Mr. GILDAY: The interjection of the hon. member brings me back to one matter that I forgot to deal with, and I thank the hon. member very much for reminding me of it. A good deal has been said about what could have been done in connection with finance if a Liberal Government had been in power. I have already pointed out the happy position in which the Government finds itself owing to the fact that they have dealt with big financial questions that other Governments failed to deal with during the number of years they were in power. This Government does not possess the happy knack of using the pruning knife on the public service; neither are they in the habit of putting off a number of workers in any particular industry and thereby leaving that industry in a state of stagnation. But let us compare their attitude with the attitude of the Federal Government in order to make one branch of their service show a surplus. Take the General Post Office. We all know that the Post Office did not pay its way and this is how a present National Minister in the Commonwealth Parliament succeeded in making a surplus in connection with that department. In the annual report of the General Post Office, he says—

"The Estimates were cut to the bone, and consequently many necessary build-ings and additions had to be postponed, new telegraph and telephone services had to be deferred or refused, whilst at the same time maintenance had to be neglected. The inevitable has resulted. I have been unable to grant many applications for new telegraph and telephone services or connections, hundreds of prospective telephone subscribers are waiting, and their numbers are growing. . . . There has been a very great reduction in the number of employees in the engineering section, the figures on 30th June, 1914, being 5,779, and on 30th June, 1918, only 4,698—a reduction of 1,111, which means an annual saving in salaries and wages of, approximately, £183,000. Further reductions in all divisions of this section are being made, and these economies are being effected without interfering with the efficiency of the service."

Then, of course, there was the increase of 50 per cent. in the postal rates—a sound commercial proposition—as well as the increase in the telephone rates—equally sound from the same point of view. And, of course, with a starved service, wholesale reductions in the staff, and increased rates we get a surplus, even in a nationally-owned service. It is a very easy matter indeed for any Government to show a surplus if they like to go in for a policy of stagnation, and that is really what was done in connection with the Post Office. I am not going to subscribe to that method of conducting public business. No. hon. member can dispute the fact that the Post Office to-day is undermanned and that it is impossible to get a proper service,

Mr. Gilday.]

more particularly in the country, owing to the reduction in the number of employees, and it is practically an impossibility to get telephones or post offices established in any part of the State. The hon. member for Nundah also reminded me of another matter when he interjected about the picture shows. I do not know why the hon. member made that interjection, but I desire to take this opportunity of criticising what they call the National Government in the Commonwealth, for taking a mean advantage of the women and children who attend picture shows.

Mr. KIRWAN: They taxed the soldiers' orphans up to 35½ per cent.

Mr. GILDAY: Yes, the Commonwealth Government taxed them 35½ per cent. on the cost of their tickets—a direct tax—when the people were not in a position to pay it. The picture show industry is the one industry that did not do any profiteering; they were satisfied to charge 3d. for children and 6d. for adults both in the suburban shows and in the Queen street shows. The Federal Government, like the hawks, would take the eyes out of a person.

Mr. STOPFORD: They swoop down.

Mr. GILDAY: They do, and take everything possible from the poor, unfortunate women and children. They were not prepared to impose a direct tax and say "You have to pay so much," but they got it in connection with the picture shows.

Mr. SIZER: They got a little from "Under and over 7."

Mr. GILDAY: Yes, and I have seen the hon. member spend a "bob" or two that way, and the hon. member should not denounce anything that he has supported.

Mr. KIRWAN: He must have been profiteering then.

Mr. SIZER: I went there with the hon. member for Brisbane.

Mr. KIRWAN: The hon. member for Brisbane never went there in his life.

Mr. GILDAY: There is another matter mentioned in His Excellency's Speech which should appeal to every member of this House, and that is the question of main roads. I listened last session to a very able speech by the hon. member for Mount Morgan on the main roads question, and I am pleased indeed that this matter has been mentioned in the Government's policy. Being a member of the Public Works Commission, I have had an opportunity of seeing the greater part of Queensland during the last two or three years, and while on this matter let me say that every member of this House should have an opportunity of visiting the different districts in the State. I realise that the expense would be great, and that it would be impossible for any hon. member to visit the various districts in the State on his present salary, but at the same time, if every hon. member had that opportunity it would be a good thing for the State as a whole. The main roads policy is one of the matters that is placed prominently in the Labour platform, and, no doubt, every member sitting behind the Government will subscribe to the Bill dealing with the question when it is brought forward. The paragraph in His Excellency's Speech reads as follows:—

"Recognising the need of a better system of constructing and maintaining the principal highways of the State, my advisers will introduce a Bill providing

[*Mr. Gilday.*

for a board to work in co-operation with the local authorities and to control the main roads."

I was always in favour of such a policy. I remember, many years ago as a boy, when my people were making a living on the land, having to travel over very bad roads to get to a selection. As a matter of fact, in Victoria, in those days, there was no such thing as a roads board, and the roads were in a deplorable state, being in a somewhat similar condition to that of many of the roads in Queensland to-day. As one who has seen the bad condition of the roads in the past, I realise what the pioneers have had to put up with through bad roads. Victoria has got over that difficulty. They have a road board, and they have allocated a fair sum of money this year for road purposes.

Mr. GUNN: A Tory Government.

Mr. GILDAY: I do not care what Government it is. This is an opportune time for Queensland to deal with this matter. If it was good for New South Wales many years ago, it should also have been good for Queensland many years ago, but previous Governments did not see the necessity of dealing with the question. It is pleasing to note that the present Government is going to deal with it in a most effective way. In England a road board was formed by statute in 1909 for the improvement of road communication, the income being derived from the proceeds of the duties on motor spirits and carriage licenses. Of course, I have no knowledge of the contents of the Bill which will be brought forward, but I understand that the question has received every consideration by the Government. I understand that fresh legislation is also to be introduced in the New South Wales Parliament in regard to this matter during the coming session. Hitherto, the different districts in New South Wales carried out a road policy just as it suited them. The different localities there had full control over the distribution of the money which was allocated for the purpose of road building, but the Government now intend to exercise control in the matter, which I think will be a very good thing. It should not be left to any particular section of the State to control the roads, which are of such national importance. In Victoria some attention is also being given to the road question just now. I read in a Melbourne paper that the Victorian Government propose to spend £400,000 on developmental roads this year, but this sum is considered to be quite inadequate, more particularly as that Government are spending £10,000,000 in settling returned soldiers on the land. I think that the soldiers settled in Queensland should be employed in making roads to their farms while their farms are developing, and they would be bound to put good work into it when they realised that the roads would improve their own property.

When the Public Works Commission were taking evidence in the Atherton district on a railway proposal to open up the tableland, the engineer in charge of the Public Estate Improvement Fund estimated that a good macadamised road could be made there, 18 ft. wide, for £2,000 per mile. I think myself that we could make concrete roads for less than that, and with a coating of tar they would last for all time, practically.

Mr. GUNN: It would cost more than £2,000 a mile, though.

Mr. GILDAY: I do not think it would. The first cost would be practically the whole cost. It is true that the Government would get no revenue directly from a road constructed in this way, but the Government would get its share in the additional traffic that would be brought to the railways. In many parts of Queensland we noticed fine agricultural and dairy lands languishing for want of proper development—all because of the absence of suitable transport facilities. With the improvement in motor traction, a good road constructed to an agricultural district about 9 or 10 miles from the railway would enable the settlers to use the road at any time of the day or night to send their products quickly to market. In some instances the farmers with modern motor vehicles could carry their own products direct to market, without unloading at the railway siding at all; but my idea is to use the roads in co-operation with the railways, particularly in the back country, where good roads can be made to open up new areas and provide fresh freights for the railways. What we require are highways that will form links of great road systems. The road-building must be systematised so that long lengths can be built, if necessary, passing from one shire through another, the whole, of course, to serve as feeders to our railways. The road problem appears to be on the way towards solution. There is a Main Roads Improvement Association in Queensland, and, judging by the remarks made in a deputation to Mr. Gillies the other day, that association also welcomes the Government proposal. To show how good roads tend to reduce the cost of transportation, it is estimated that it costs 1s. 0½d. per ton per mile to haul loads over the ordinary country roads, while to haul the same load over a well-made concrete road would cost only 3½d. per ton per mile. Good roads, acting as feeders to railways, will mean the settlement of more people in rural areas. The population of the Commonwealth is about 5,000,000, and of this total there are 2,000,000 people in New South Wales. I was surprised to read a day or two ago that there were no less than 800,000 people in Sydney—nearly half of the population of that State centralised in the capital. We do not want that state of affairs to exist in Queensland, and one way to prevent it is to give the men settled on the land ready access to market for their products. We want to protect the consumer and see that he gets the right article at the right price, and we want to protect the producer by seeing that he gets his produce to market with the least possible delay at a time when prices are good. We also want to protect the worker by seeing that he receives a fair share of the values which he helps to create. In the United States of America the Federal Government subsidises a highway commission, and this body provides the means for the construction of main roads as well as their maintenance in the various States. No doubt, all this information has been collected by the Government, and the measure will be on up-to-date lines.

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

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): While a lot of irrelevant matter may have been introduced during this debate, I feel satisfied that good results will accrue from the ventilation of the subjects which have been dealt with, and

I do not altogether look upon the debate on the Address in Reply as being a waste of time.

I would like to refer to what has been said in connection with the deportation and internment of Germans. So far as the Federal Government, or any other Government, is concerned, in time of war the dominant factor must be national safety, which must override every other consideration of an individual character; and in order to provide for national safety in time of war Governments have to introduce drastic legislation and make regulations for that purpose. When such legislation is introduced, what should be the duty of every citizen of a country?

Mr. CARTER: To give fair play to all others.

Mr. TAYLOR: I did not interrupt the hon. member, and I hope he will keep quiet; I will give him all he wants before I finish. In carrying out such action it is impossible for the Federal or any other Government not to inflict hardships on some persons, and hardships have, no doubt, been, and will continue to be, inflicted in connection with this matter. We know that the State Government, in connection with the outbreak of influenza in Queensland, introduced drastic regulations in the interests of the whole of the people. With regard to the legislation which was introduced at the outbreak of the war, it is inconceivable to me that any man in this Chamber can say that a German is as loyal as a Britisher.

Mr. CARTER: If he is not disloyal, he is.

Mr. COLLINS: What about the King on the throne?

Mr. TAYLOR: It is asking what no Britisher could expect to get from any German. If any hon. member had been interned in Germany during the war could he have been loyal to Germany? Yet some hon. members say that Germans are as loyal as Britishers.

Mr. KIRWAN: Did they not go to the front?

Mr. TAYLOR: We could not expect them to be as loyal as Britishers, but we could ask them to be neutral during the war.

Mr. STOPFORD: What about the new Bill in the Federal Parliament to deport Britishers who are not born in Australia?

Mr. TAYLOR: When you have finished, I will go on. From the latest figures I have been able to get, which I suppose are several years old, it appears there were 12,000 Germans, including both sexes, in Queensland at the outbreak of the war.

Mr. COLLINS: What Government brought them here?

Mr. TAYLOR: Out of that number, only a little over 2 per cent. were interned. That speaks volumes for the neutrality of the 10,000 Germans who did not get interned.

Mr. STOPFORD: But they are being deported without being interned.

Mr. TAYLOR: If people play with fire in the time of war, the chances are that they will get scorched. If this 2 per cent. had only behaved themselves they would not have been interned, or deported, as some of them have been and probably more will be.

Mr. CARTER: There was no evidence of disloyalty.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Taylor.]

Mr. TAYLOR: We have heard a good deal about what the Federal Government have been doing with regard to the deportation of these people. The poor old Federal Government has been a splendid "joss" to be walloped by hon. members opposite.

Mr. KIRWAN: They were walloped by your own people.

Mr. TAYLOR: I wish to quote the following questions which were asked on this subject in the Federal Parliament, and the answers given thereto. On 27th June last the Federal "Hansard" report states—

"DEPORTATION OF ENEMY ALIENS.

"Mr. BRENNAN asked the Acting Prime Minister, upon notice—

1. Is it a fact that persons, members of the white races, supposed to be of what is termed enemy origin, and who are married to natural-born British subjects, are being deported or about to be deported from Australia?

2. If so, have any such married women declined to accompany their husbands so forcibly deported, and what, if anything, does the Government propose to do for the maintenance of such women and the children of such marriages?

"Mr. WATT: The answers to the hon. member's questions are as follows:—

1. Up till the present, there appears to be no case where an enemy subject domiciled in Australia, married to a natural-born British subject, has been deported.

2. See answer to No. 1."

Mr. CARTER: It is not true—there was one up in my district.

Mr. TAYLOR: On 23rd July, the following questions were asked in the Federal Parliament, as appears in the Federal "Hansard"—

"DEPORTATIONS.

"CIRCULAR TO WIVES OF ENEMY ALIENS.

"Mr. TUDOR (for Mr. Higgs) asked the Acting Prime Minister, upon notice—

1. What were the instructions given by the Government or its Minister or Ministers under which the military authorities sent a letter to wives of aliens stating that it was possible their husbands might be deported, and setting forth the circumstances under which the said wives and the Australian-born children of enemy aliens might be allowed to remain in Australia?

2. What was the most recent decision of the Cabinet, the date and the terms thereof, in regard to the deportation of enemy aliens?

"Mr. GROOM: The answers are—

1. No instructions were given by the Government or its Ministers authorising the sending of the letter referred to, which was sent out by the district authorities under a misapprehension. The attention of the officers responsible has been drawn to the error, and the matter has been rectified. In cases, however, where internees, or uninterned enemy aliens, have applied for repatriation, and where internees have been ordered to be deported, the wives have been communicated with by the district commandant to ascertain

whether they desired to accompany their husbands.

2. The most recent decisions of the Cabinet were authorising the appointment of a number of magistrates—drawn from various States because of their local knowledge—to sit as an aliens board to deal with applications from internees for permission to remain in Australia, and the appointment of a committee of reference, consisting of Judge Williams, Brigadier-General R. E. Williams, and Mr. Teece, for the purpose of advising, on such recommendation of the aliens board as the Minister considers should receive further review, also for the purpose of securing a general uniformity of decisions."

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

Mr. TAYLOR (continuing):

In Federal "Hansard" of the 15th August, the hon. member for Capricornia, Mr. Higgs, is reported as moving the adjournment of the House of Representatives to discuss a question of importance. The question had reference to the deportation of the Germans, and I would recommend every member on both sides to read the whole of the debate. There are 15 or 20 pages of it, and so I cannot read it all, but I find that during the course of the discussion the Acting Prime Minister referred to the courts which had been constituted in order that the Germans might have the trial which we have been told in this Chamber they had no chance of getting, and in the course of his remarks he said—

"By an instruction prepared by the Commonwealth Crown Law Department, the magistrates were directed to have regard to the following conditions:—

"That the Commonwealth Government has decided that in dealing with appeals, the following considerations should guide the magistrate:—

(i.) Whether the appellant has such ties with the Commonwealth that he is, or is likely soon to become, practically Australian; for instance, persons within the following classes might usually, in the absence of strong grounds to the contrary, be exempted from repatriation:—

(a) Those whose upbringing has been Australian, e.g., persons of ten years or more residence who came to the Commonwealth when under sixteen, persons of twenty years or more residence who came to the Commonwealth when under twenty.

(b) Persons over sixty years of age who have been in British Territory not less than twenty-five years.

(c) Families of ten years or more residence where the children, or some of them, are not less than ten and not more than eighteen years of age, and have been or are going to Australian schools, and are either British born or English speaking.

(d) British-born women who have married Germans, whether exempted or not, and other women married to husbands exempted under (a) or (b).

[Mr. Taylor.

(ii.) Whether the appellant's sympathies have been shown to be on the side of the Allies.

(iii.) Whether owing to age, infirmity, or other cause the appellant cannot be expelled without inhumanity."

That was the recommendation made to the magistrates who composed that particular court in order that the Germans might have a fair trial.

Mr. CARTER: Fair, do you call it?

Mr. TAYLOR: During the discussion Mr. Higgs made several recommendations, and to show that the Federal Government were anxious to do a fair thing, I would point out that he said this—

"The hon. member for Capricornia has given us a series of suggestions other than his proposal that there should be an open trial. Some of these suggestions have, for me, novel features, and I shall see that they are recommended for the consideration of the Acting Attorney-General (Mr. Groom) and the Acting Minister for Defence (Senator Russell), in order that we may determine how far they are capable of adaptation to what we consider to be safe principles."

I fail to see anything unjust or inhuman or unfair in the Commonwealth Government's recommendation that those things should be considered in connection with any appeal that a German might make before he was repatriated. I feel that a German who was disloyal during the war is disloyal now, and I feel satisfied that if any Government attempted to do the fair thing the Commonwealth Government have been doing that in connection with the German internees and deportees.

Mr. GUNN: Here, the hon. member for Port Curtis delivered a German speech.

Mr. CARTER: Not a speech, an explanation, but if I did I would not mind you putting it into English and reading it.

Mr. GUNN: I do not know the language.

Mr. CARTER: I know you don't. I am not ashamed of it.

Mr. TAYLOR: It has been stated that wives and children were torn away from their husbands and fathers, and that general cruelty and inhumanity were practised towards these people. Every member of this House knows perfectly well that in carrying out the functions and duties of government not only to-day, but practically every day, in our law courts, husbands are being taken away from their wives and children and sent to St. Helena and Boggo road.

Mr. CARTER: After fair trial.

Mr. KIRWAN: A trial by jury.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. SIZER: You would be hanged if you got the trial they get.

Mr. TAYLOR: In order that justice may be done it is an absolute impossibility that the innocent shall at all times escape. Suppose a man or a woman commits a crime. Who suffers? Not only the individual who has committed the offence, but the friends and the relatives also suffer, and it is quite impossible that anything else should be done. I say here that the charge that has been made against the Federal Government is unfair, and is a charge that should not have been made in this House.

Personally, I have sufficient confidence in the personnel, even of the Ryan Government or any Government in connection with matters of national importance such as this, to believe that they will endeavour to do the fair and reasonable thing, and that they will not act, as has been stated in this Chamber, in an inhuman way to any individual, be he German or British.

Mr. CARTER: That is exactly what they are doing. I say—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. TAYLOR: There are a good many things in the Governor's Speech upon which there is disagreement; but there is one thing on which we all agree. We are all gratified, as has been stated time and again in this House, to know that the war is concluded, and that it has been concluded in favour of Great Britain and her allies. With regard to the remarks that have been made about the League of Nations, I take it that the work of that conference has not been finished yet. Even yet there may be established a league of nations that will endeavour, so far as it is possible, to see that war shall be no more. To traduce the leading men of the principal nations of the world who met in the conference in France to determine what the terms of peace should be, and what Germany should pay, to impute sinister motives to a band of men such as that is "over the odds" altogether, and is not a fair thing. I think that the men who met in that conference were actuated by the highest motives that could actuate any body of men in any part of the world.

Another question that has been introduced into this debate has been that of conscription. We have been told that those who advocated conscription are going down to oblivion. Well, I am satisfied that we will have a good many mates when we go down to oblivion.

Mr. CARTER: You will have all your friends down there warming it up for you. (Laughter.)

Mr. TAYLOR: I take it that the first and primal duty of any Government is the preservation of the lives of the people, and their second duty is the preservation of the property of the people that constitute the State or Empire, wherever it may be. If those be the main functions of a Government—and I do not think anybody can dispute it—I take it that the Government have a right to call upon both, if the necessity demands it. We are told that conscription is undemocratic. Personally, I do not know anything more democratic, and I feel I have nothing to be ashamed of—and never will be ashamed of anything in my action in connection with any conscription campaign. One leading woman, speaking in Melbourne on this subject during the first conscription campaign, said, "It were better that a man should die that his country should live than that a man should live and his country die." That is a sentiment to which we can all say, "Hear, hear!"

Mr. CARTER: You wanted to make the other fellow die.

Mr. TAYLOR: I think that it is a right, a fitting, and a proper sentiment, particularly so far as Australia and the people of Australia are concerned.

A good deal has been said with regard to the high cost of living. To my way of

Mr. Taylor.]

thinking, three things have been contributing to that condition of things in Queensland. The first is lesser production, the next is strikes, and the third profiteering.

Mr. CARTER: Your colleague, the member for Burnett, said there was no profiteering, that it was a myth.

Mr. TAYLOR: I wish the hon. member would go home and sleep. (Laughter.) There may be other causes, but I think those are three things contributing to the high cost of living at the present time. But, notwithstanding that we know it is high, nevertheless the fact remains that here in Queensland, and Australia probably, we are the most cheaply fed people in the world at the present time. Our sugar is reasonable, our bread is reasonable, and our meat is reasonable. I think that is a matter that we can congratulate ourselves on.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: Because there is a Labour Government here.

Mr. TAYLOR: Now I wish to speak more particularly of cultivated land. I am not especially referring to the sugar-producing area. About twenty-five years ago—perhaps more—the dairying industry was started in Queensland, and during the intervening twenty-five years that industry has continued to grow and increase.

Mr. PETERSON: But cultivation has gone out.

Mr. TAYLOR: While we are very pleased to note that the dairying industry has increased in Queensland, still simultaneously with the growth of that industry the cultivation of land on those particular farms engaged in dairying has not expanded or increased to the extent it should have done. There has been a larger home consumption to maintain the stock on the farm, and the consequence has been a lessened production has been grown to be sent to the cities and towns. The consequence is that we are reaping the harvest of higher prices through the very fact that the production of the farm is largely being consumed in connection with the dairy.

Mr. PETERSON: The farmer used to get £1 10s. per ton for his lucerne.

Mr. TAYLOR: Yes; and he used to get 2s. per bushel for his maize; but that does not alter what I am saying—that the cultivation of land has not increased to the same extent it should have done with the growth of the dairying industry. Until such time as that extra cultivation takes place prices will continue to rule high. Take the matter of maize-growing. At the time I am speaking about, the maize-growing area of Queensland was the Darling Downs. To-day, so far as maize production is concerned, it is practically a back number. The Darling Downs does not grow anything like the quantity of maize that it grew twenty years ago. Maize production has gone out, and dairying has taken its place. The opening up of the North Coast and the extension of railways into the North Coast districts to Rockhampton, and the opening up of Kingaroy, has brought those areas into cultivation, and a considerable amount of maize is produced from those particular areas. But the extra growth there has only amounted to what used to be cultivated on the Darling Downs.

Mr. PETERSON: Three years ago a farmer on the Dawson Valley got only 1s. 6d. per bushel for his maize. Would you ask him to continue that?

[Mr. Taylor.

Mr. TAYLOR: The matter is a serious one, and should engage the serious attention of every member of this House. It is the duty of every member to consider how to increase production in this State. I certainly think that in certain directions in the growth of maize and in the growth of lucerne and potatoes Queensland excels, but we want those areas increased. Until we get the cultivable areas increased so long will we have no spell of high prices.

Mr. PETERSON: Will you assist the producer by seeing that he gets a reasonable price for his products?

Mr. TAYLOR: Every time. We hear a good deal of talk about a fair and reasonable price, and about the fixation of prices. I will give hon. members opposite an example of what has occurred during the last few months. I will take a humble article of food which is used for human consumption and for cattle food—that is, the pumpkin. A few months ago pumpkins were quoted at £25 per ton. Why? Because there were practically none available. To-day pumpkins are worth £4 per ton. There was no fixation of prices so far as pumpkins were concerned. With the extra production extra quantities became available, and the price dropped from £25 to £4 per ton. Can hon. members opposite explain that? There was no price fixed for it, and yet the law of supply and demand regulated it so that to-day they are worth £4 per ton.

Mr. PETERSON: Should not a farmer get a reasonable price for his product?

Mr. TAYLOR: Wheat has been to all intents and purposes, so far as Queensland is concerned, a failure. For the past ten or fifteen years we have not had five good seasons throughout the whole State. It is time we dropped the wheat failure. We have been trying for twenty-five or thirty years to grow wheat, and it is time we dropped it and got on to something which will enable the producer to get something for his labour. We had a little drop of rain yesterday, and we were all very glad to see it, because we know that it will do a lot of good. All the same, we know that winter rains are absolutely necessary in Queensland year in and year out for the successful production of wheat. Hon. members must admit that during the last ten or fifteen years the climatic conditions in this State have undergone a considerable change. There was a time when, with a certainty, it could be said that Queensland would have a wet season, and when we had a wet season it would be followed by a real good winter and a real good season throughout the State. But now, as hon. members must know, the seasons which we used to call normal seasons have become abnormal: To get a good wet season and a good harvest is becoming abnormal in Queensland. In order to combat these seasons it is necessary to have an increased acreage under cultivation so as to make up for the deficient supply which seems to be taking place year after year throughout the whole State. Regulation of prices may be a factor in reducing the cost of living, but increased production, which lessens cost, will solve the problem more speedily and efficiently. I am satisfied that, so far as profiteering is concerned, increased production will sound the death knell of any profiteer. It is when

supplies become limited that prices go up. When there are small supplies on hand that is the time the profiteer can put in his fine work. Increased production will get over the difficulty and do more than all the fixation of prices that any Government may propose to introduce. With regard to strikes, we are all pleased to know that the shipping strike is over. It has been a long strike and a big struggle, but it is a strike that should not have taken place at all.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. TAYLOR: Notwithstanding that there may be a good deal to be said in favour of the seamen in this dispute, I still contend that that strike should not have taken place. The necessary machinery was there, and it only wanted to be put into use to put an end to the strike. If that machinery had been put into action, no doubt what the seamen are getting to-day they would have got three months ago. The hon. member for Brisbane stated the other day that the conditions under which the British and American seamen were working were superior and better than those of the Australian seamen.

Mr. KIRWAN: I say it again.

Mr. TAYLOR: While the British and American seamen may be getting more wages than the Australian seamen, the fact remains that they work three days a week more than are worked by the Australian seamen. The Australian seamen work eight hours a day while the British and American seamen work twelve hours a day. I challenge the hon. member for Brisbane to refute that statement.

Mr. COLLINS: What is the accommodation like?

Mr. TAYLOR: I am just pointing out that the British and American seamen work twelve hours a day.

Mr. STOPFORD: Are you advocating twelve hours a day for seamen?

Mr. TAYLOR: No, I am not advocating twelve hours a day for seamen. The hon. member for Brisbane said certain things, and I am pointing out that he did not state everything.

Mr. KIRWAN: I did not say anything that was untrue, at any rate.

Mr. TAYLOR: I did not say that you did. I contend that the Federal Government are not to blame for the strike.

Mr. COLLINS: Whom do you blame?

Mr. TAYLOR: I blame the seamen. (Government laughter.)

Mr. COLLINS: Of course, you do.

Mr. TAYLOR: From the commencement of this strike the Federal Government have been negotiating with the seamen the whole time. They had numerous conferences and interviews, and did all they could to fix the matter up. The Federal Government did not attempt to man the boats by any free labour, or any other kind of labour. They showed their willingness on every occasion to meet these men, and discussed matters so that an amicable settlement could be arrived at. Hon. members opposite know perfectly well that the seamen have been fighting each other in the various States during the whole period as to what they should do and what they should not do. So far as the Federal Government are concerned, I consider that they acted splendidly throughout the struggle,

and if the men had only accepted the advice of some of their leaders the strike would have been ended months ago. It was stated that the "Kadina" was offered to the Queensland Government in the early days of the strike if the Government would undertake to see that the vessel was supplied with coal, but the Queensland Government could not give that guarantee. Then we have the spectacle of the "Allinga," controlled by the Government. Why was she tied up at the wharves all the time?

Mr. SMITH: No; she is controlled by the Adelaide Company.

Mr. TAYLOR: I thought this Government governed? I thought this Government had control?

Mr. STOPFORD: We thought the Federal Government governed until the ships stopped.

Mr. TAYLOR: I thought the Queensland Government would have sent that boat to Townsville with flour. We find that it was the Commonwealth Government which sent the "Chillagoe" with foodstuffs to Queensland during the strike. The Queensland Government sent the "Musgrave" to Townsville on one occasion. Why did they not continue to send the "Musgrave" to the North instead of sending the "Remora" and other smaller craft? The Government should have kept the "Musgrave" going to the North with foodstuffs. Yet hon. members opposite scream at the Federal Government for not having done this and that when their own Government has failed in connection with the whole matter. My opinion is that Queensland—and Australia, too, for that matter—wants to take off its coat and get to work.

Mr. COLLINS: Well, take off your coat and get to work!

Mr. HARTLEY: You mean that the worker should take off his coat and the profiteer keep it on?

Mr. TAYLOR: We all work.

Mr. CARTER: Work points. (Laughter.)

Mr. TAYLOR: I am not so good at working points as the hon. member. He is the best pointer in the House. So far as Australia and Queensland is concerned, hon. members know that there is plenty of work in Queensland and very fair and favourable conditions at the present time if the people would only get to work. Queensland, at the present time, is missing the opportunity of its life. There is every opportunity owing to the prices our primary products are bringing in other parts of the world to make a name for ourselves and the industries of the State, but on account of the strikes and trouble that are taking place it is really a break on progress and it is preventing the wheels of industry from going round as they have a right to go, and as they should go. With regard to the Arbitration Court, there has been a good deal said about the Arbitration Court. Can it be truthfully said by the workers of Queensland that the Arbitration Court has failed in this State?

Mr. COLLINS: Yes.

Mr. WHITFORD: Absolutely.

Mr. TAYLOR: It seems to me that there is only one part of Queensland where the Arbitration Court may have failed, and that is in Townsville. Why did it fail there? Because the Government did not stand behind the Arbitration Court when it should have

Mr. Taylor.]

done. If the Government had done that, we would not have had the trouble that we have got to-day. We know when the railway strike broke out in the North that that was the commencement of the trouble. We have had a continuance of that policy ever since, and so long as the Government act in the way they have been doing, we will have a continuance of that policy. It cannot be said by any hon. member here, that the judges of the Arbitration Court in Queensland, or Mr. Justice Higgins, of the Federal Arbitration Court, are biased in favour of the employers. Not a single man in this Chamber can get up and say that such is

[7.30 p.m.] the case. We know they are not.

I take it that the judges have been eminently fair right throughout the whole piece and yet hon. members get up and say that the Arbitration Court has failed. I say it has not failed. And we have no evidence of failure in the State of Queensland at the present time. What have the men to lose by the Arbitration Court? Before any body of men take their case into the Arbitration Court it is a foregone conclusion, absolutely and entirely, that the men will have nothing taken away from them, but that they will have something given to them. It is quite unthinkable that any award could be made by the Arbitration Court of Queensland which would state that any surplus wages paid to the employees should be refunded to the employers, but in the retrospective awards which are made by the court the employers are compelled to pay retrospective money to the employees, if the court so directs. Yet the men flout the court, treat the agreement as if it were a scrap of paper with which they have nothing to do, and with which they have no concern whatever. We are quite prepared to admit that there are anomalies in connection with the Arbitration Court. There are anomalies in connection with any court. There are anomalies in every direction, and it is the duty of the people to correct these anomalies. We should give the Arbitration Court a fair chance, and that is what is not being done in Queensland to-day. There is a constitutional way of dealing with the matter, and if other than constitutional means of dealing with difficulties as they arise are adopted, then the law will be thrust on one side and we shall have chaos continuously, the same as we have it at the present time.

Profiteering, as we know, is a glib phrase and we hear of it everywhere, yet, as I said a few minutes ago, there is probably no place in the whole world where living is cheaper than it is in Queensland at the present time. If the profiteer were doing the tremendous damage which it has been said in this Chamber he has been doing in Queensland and in Australia, the figures in connection with the Savings Bank would not have been as favourable as they are. I take it, if there is anything which is a fair criterion of what the people are doing and what they are saving, it is our Savings Bank, and I would like hon. members to take notice of the figures. The Savings Bank balances at the end of 1908-9 amounted to £5,158,219; an average per customer of £48 7s. 6d. There was a steady rise during the following years until we come to the year 1917-18.

Mr. STOFFORD: That is when the war loan came out.

Mr. TAYLOR: I would like the hon. member to listen to these figures, as he may

[Mr. Taylor.

learn something that will do him good. At the end of 1917-18 the deposits in the Savings Bank had risen to £13,000,000.

Mr. COLLINS: Marvellous!

Mr. TAYLOR: It is marvellous. The average per depositor was £56 odd. In these figures no account is taken of the amount of money at deposit in the Federal Savings Bank, nor yet any account taken of the amount of money drawn from these banks to invest in the various war loans of Australia. Surely, if the people had been ground down and crushed by profiteering in these few short years they would not have been able to increase their savings by nearly £8,000,000! Those figures show exactly what has taken place, and in the State Savings Bank of Queensland there are 240,000 accounts—about one-third of the whole of the people of the State, including the babies, have accounts. Surely profiteering has not worked any great injury. I am quite prepared to admit that in some countries it has, but, so far as Australia is concerned, I do not think it has worked anything like the injury that hon. members opposite would like us to believe. At the same time, I say profiteering should be curbed and guarded, and quite apart from the Labour party, that is the opinion of every member of this Chamber. We are told that for the year ended 30th June, 1919, Australia imported goods to the value of £99,000,000 and exported goods to the value of £113,000,000. It is a regrettable fact that we have to import goods to the value of £99,000,000, and I feel satisfied that if it were not for the industrial troubles which exist at the present time throughout Australia, that instead of importing £99,000,000 worth of goods as we did for the year 1919, we should have imported probably only about £50,000,000; and we should have been able to export the finished article, as we have a right to do. It is up to every man in this country to see how it is possible to increase our manufactures so that we shall not only be a self-supporting country, able to supply our own wants, but also able to help in supplying the wants of other countries. We find in Australia to-day buyers from America, Europe, and Great Britain operating in our primary products which are taken across the sea and returned to us in the way of made-up goods. That should not be. Take our own State of Queensland. I dare say if it were possible to get the figures we should find that we were probably importing from the Southern States 50 per cent. of the boots used in Queensland. What is the explanation of it? Why should that be? My own opinion is that the opportunities for manufacture in the State of Queensland were never better than they are to-day. We should tackle the problem fairly and squarely, and not come into this Chamber or go to outside organisations and talk about working six hours a day and spend the rest of the time on squatters' chairs. We are never going to maintain ourselves and compete with the other countries of the world by working six hours a day.

Another matter in the Governor's Speech which has caused a considerable amount of discussion is the abolition of the Legislative Council.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear! Let her go!

Mr. TAYLOR: I have not been in this Chamber a very great length of time, but I have been here long enough to find out that,

in introducing legislation in this Chamber, very great care is taken prior to its introduction, while it is passing through, and when it is sent along to another Chamber, in order to see, so far as we possibly can, that before it is placed on the statute-book it is effective and that it will work well when put into active operation. But after it has left this Chamber, and after it has left the other Chamber, it is not finished with. We have our courts to interpret it, and we then find difficulties even after all the trouble that has been taken. And we find that the time of each session is taken up, to a greater or lesser degree, in amending Acts passed in a previous session of Parliament. If you are going to have only one Chamber, how are you going to get on with your legislation? The whole of the session is going to be taken up with amending faulty legislation passed in previous sessions. Then, we have an Unemployment Bill. Something, certainly, has to be done with regard to unemployment; but whether an Unemployment Bill is going to solve the problem is a difficult matter to tell. We know perfectly well that every unemployed man is a charge on the community, and if we can possibly find some avenue by which that man shall be continuously employed it will be a far better scheme than by a system of insurance, allowing him to remain unemployed. We should try and keep our people employed. It is no credit to Australia that it is necessary to have an Unemployment Bill at this stage of its development. When the Bill comes before us we shall know a little more about it. Another measure which should be advantageous is the Fire Brigades Bill. As I understand the present conditions with regard to the fire brigade, when a brigade in any locality becomes gazetted it is the method for the Government to pay one-third of the maintenance of that brigade, the local authority interested to pay one-third, and the insurance companies to pay one-third. I think it ought to be the other way about—the insurance companies to pay two-thirds, and not the local authority and the Government—because they are practically one and the same. Considering it is the insurance companies which derive the greatest benefit, it would be an excellent thing if a Bill were introduced throwing the greater responsibility for the maintenance of existing brigades on to them, and not on to the Government or the local authority.

There is one measure which I have not heard a single member on the Government side talk about. I do not know whether they are ashamed of it. It is the eighteen-year-old vote. They have been religiously silent on that. Look at the Treasury benches at the present time. Fancy eighteen-year-old boys sitting along there! Fancy an eighteen-year-old boy in your chair, Mr. Speaker, as well as on the benches, and filling all the responsible positions in society to-day! To be consistent, how can hon. members say it is not a fair and a proper thing, if you are going to give them full citizen rights and the franchise at eighteen years of age, to put them on the Treasury benches, and in the highest positions in the land?

Mr. LARCOMBE: Your own Government started it in the Federal sphere.

Mr. TAYLOR: Youth is a splendid thing.

Mr. COLLINS: When they went to the front you admired them.

Mr. TAYLOR: Youth builds castles in the air and rears them up to a splendid height. As years go by and the castle comes toppling down without any great injury to him who built it or to anyone else, they find things are very different from what they thought when they were eighteen years of age. As we go through life we must admit that, as we gain in years to a certain period, we gain in knowledge and experience. Experience cannot be gained by eighteen-year-old boys and girls. When I look at the Treasury benches and see the hon. gentlemen who fill those positions, I ask myself, "Are they serious? Do they really mean it? Are they honest in their intention to bring in a vote for eighteen-year-old boys and girls?"—men with grown-up families, who know what their children are like at eighteen years of age. I do not decry youth, but I think that if ever it was a case of legislation gone mad it is in connection with this proposal of an eighteen-year-old franchise.

Mr. STOFFORD: They were good enough to stop a bullet, if you had had your way.

Mr. TAYLOR: Another matter in the Governor's Speech which I think is a very good thing is that referring to reafforestation. There has been a tremendous rise in the cost of timber all over the world. It is so in Queensland, and it is likely to remain. It is only by an active system of reafforestation that it can be combated. If we have more timber grown we shall partially solve this question of the high cost of living. As long as we denude our forests as we have been doing in past years, so long will the cost of building material continue to rise.

Mr. COLLINS: That is the only good thing you have said to-night.

Mr. TAYLOR: I thank the hon. gentleman. There is another thing which will commend itself to most of us in this Chamber, and that is in connection with the aborigines in this country. I feel certain that members on both sides of the House are of the opinion that we have not done as much as we might in connection with our aborigines. We are quite prepared to admit that we have done a good deal; but when we think of the conditions of quite a lot of these people at the present time, any legislation to better their condition which can be introduced should be introduced. I desire now only to express the hope that during the session the legislation which will be introduced will be in the best interests of the whole of the people of Queensland, not on class-conscious lines for one party only.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. D. RYAN (*Townsville*): I was very pleased to hear the declaration which fell from the hon. member for Windsor on the increased prosperity of the people of Queensland, as disclosed by the Savings Bank deposits. I congratulate the hon. gentleman on his discovery. At the same time I congratulate the Government on bringing about such a splendid result, and I hope that a continuance of that administration will further increase the prosperity of the people. I do not think I should have been taking any part in this debate were it not for what I might call the indecent zeal of the opponents of the Government in their endeavour to shift the responsibility for the food shortage in the North on to the shoulders of the present Government, instead of condemning those who really were

Mr. D. Ryan.]

responsible for the situation. As a member of a Northern constituency, who was in constant touch with the Government, I think it is only proper for me to stand up in my place in this House and declare that the Government did everything possible to send food to the people who were on the verge of starvation in the North.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. D. RYAN: The matter of the food situation has been wilfully and grossly misrepresented. The distress was brought about through the perversity of the Federal Government.

Mr. COLLINS: Hear, hear!

Mr. D. RYAN: The State Government did everything possible—in the first place to prevent the situation arising, and in the next place to transport food there in a very trying and critical time. The situation was the result of the action of the Commonwealth Government in refusing to charter to the State Government ships which were in Brisbane, with a view to conveying food to the people who were starving in the North. For some time previous to this hold-up the Federal Government harassed Queensland and its Government through their quarantine regulations with regard to shipping. Even the Press of Brisbane complimented the Acting Premier at that time on the stand which he took; but as it did not suit the policy of the Opposition, and of those people opposed to the State Government, the attitude of praise was changed to one of condemnation, and there was an attempt made to shift the responsibility on to the State Government. It is now, however, a matter of great satisfaction—and I speak feelingly as a Northern member—that the late deplorable strike has come to an end. The seamen had very grave cause for the action which they took, and if the Commonwealth Government had exercised ordinary reasonableness, the distress, misery, and unemployment which resulted from the strike would not have occurred. It is another instance of the Commonwealth Government, because a trial of political strength is at hand, callously reducing the country to want, misery, and unemployment in order to serve its own selfish purpose. The Commonwealth Government could have prevented all this trouble, but they chose to indulge in a hold-up of transport and industry, with a desire to hurt unionism and to terrorise the workers of Australia. The advocates of this mad policy of terrorism and spoliation have made every effort to condemn and disparage the seamen. They told the people that the Arbitration Court was open to the seamen, but they knew that the seamen could not go to the Arbitration Court because of a previous appeal to the High Court by the employers. I do not regard the Arbitration Court as the end-all of industrial disputes, neither do I look upon it as adequate machinery for settling and adjusting industrial disagreements. There is a great weakness in the Arbitration Court. Whereas it can fix the price of labour as a commodity, it cannot fix the price of the commodities that labour produces; consequently, while it requires the worker to work for the price it fixes, in the meantime the employers can raise the price of the goods he produces, thus lowering the wages. The employers have every time tried to defeat the award of the court. They have done it by two methods—one by appealing to the

[Mr. D. Ryan.

High Court for a prohibition, whenever a favourable decision has been obtained by the workers, and the other by raising the prices of commodities. They may choose one method or the other; but they usually choose both. The claims of the seamen were eminently reasonable. The shipping industry is flourishing, and the wealthy corporations of shipowners are in a position to meet those claims without any financial strain to themselves; but the main fact is that the shipowners are a greedy craft, and are allied with other heartless profiteers who, through the advantages obtained from the war, are leagued in an Imperial capitalistic partnership, and who see in the League of Nations a grand directorate of capitalism, one of the duties of which will be to provide a safeguard against democracy and labour unrest. The shipping interests are confined to a few close rings united in the more pleasing name of the "shipping conference." Four or five magnates in the old country run the ships of Great Britain. They rule the groups, which combine and extend to Australia. I will give a list of names to show how these combine operate in Australia. The Furness-Withy group is one of the most powerful and profitable enterprises in the world. Sir Owen Phillips wields a control even more powerful. Then, there is what is known as the Inchcape group, which has a big interest for Australians. At the present time the Inchcape group controls the bulk of the Australian, New Zealand, South Sea Islands, and Australian-Pacific trade, in addition to a considerable proportion of coastal traffic. This group, including its associated feeder lines, operates 9,000,000 tons of shipping in the Australian trade. If we follow this we find how they bottle up Australian trade. The Inchcape group consists directly of the Inchcape-Peninsular and Orient ring, Orient Steam Navigation Company, Union Steamship Company, British India Company, Federal Company, New Zealand Company, and apparently Burns, Philp, and Co. A cablegram appearing in the Press on 3rd July, 1916, said—

"The Peninsular and Orient Steam Navigation Company have acquired thirty-one vessels of the New Zealand and Federal lines, closely working with the British India lines. The Peninsular and Orient fleet now numbers 226 steamers with 1,386,689 tons."

Another cablegram supplies further evidence of how trade has become bottled up in the interests of these combinations. It is dated 25th May, 1916, and states—

"A provisional agreement has been made for the amalgamation of the Cunard shipping line with the Commonwealth and Dominion shipping lines. The Cunard thus extends its influence to Australia and New Zealand."

It is interesting to observe how those groups dovetail into the colossal combine. The Morgan combine controls the Furness, White Star, Shaw-Saville, Leyland, Atlantic Transport and Dominion lines, including the International. A New York cablegram, dated 20th May last, said—

"A British syndicate offered to buy apparently a portion, if not all, of the whole of this group, and offered something like £46,000,000."

So we see how the greedy grasp of the shipping octopus has fastened round Australia.

It is something that has come out of the war. The war was fought for democracy, we are told. These shipping magnates have no time for arbitration, but are champions of direct action and what hon. members opposite call, when indulged in by the workers, brute force. Let us see how the shipping combines, commonly called "the shipping conference," can indulge in direct action or brute force themselves. A little while ago the Commonwealth Government procured some ships to trade to Australia, or to do some other trading in the meantime. At the end of the war how did the shipping conference treat Government enterprise where it interfered with their interests? A few weeks ago we had this cablegram from London—

"The Commonwealth Government steamship line, in accordance with a promise given by Prime Minister Hughes to the Anglo-Australian merchants and traders, is offering shippers extra inducements to avail themselves of its facilities, but shipping circles declare they are undisturbed by the concessions offered."

The shipping conference determined to continue the boycott against Government enterprise. That was an instance of their direct action and brutal force. That was at the termination of the war. But a

[8 p.m.] further cable which appeared in the daily Press last Monday shows how easily the shipping conference shift their evil deeds on to the seamen. Yesterday's cable, dated Friday, said—

"Considerable comment has been made in shipping circles in London that the seamen's strike is affecting seriously the Commonwealth line of steamships. It is pointed out that in consequence of the employment by the line of seamen with a home port in Australia—"

A suggestion to employ coloured foreigners, I presume—

"twenty-two ships are held up in Australian ports, whereas oversea vessels are moving freely round the coast."

There is a peculiar cast in the features of that cablegram. Strange that all those ships with foreign crews are moving round Australia and we know nothing of them. But, perhaps, they are phantom ships that keep on sailing and stop nowhere. Isn't it strange—so much concern for a line so recently boycotted by the same shipping circle? The steamship owners who boycotted the Commonwealth Government's line of steamers are now throwing the responsibility for what has occurred on the seamen of Australia. With regard to the conveyance of foodstuffs to the people of the North, I am very pleased that the hon. member for Windsor alluded to the "Allinga." The Government of this State endeavoured to get ships to take food to North Queensland, but owing to the action of the Comptroller of Shipping they were prevented from getting ships for that purpose. With reference to the hold-up of the "Allinga" by the Adelaide Steamship Company, I would point out that although the "Allinga" was chartered by the State Government, the vessel was managed by the Adelaide Steamship Company, and that a dispute arose between the crew and the

Adelaide Steamship Company—not between the crew and the Government. That dispute concerned a steward with whom some of the crew refused to sail. The Adelaide Steamship Company, instead of removing that steward, preferred to allow hundreds of women and children in North Queensland to starve through the vessel's not sailing. I have made inquiries regarding the dispute between the steward and the rest of the crew, and those inquiries reveal the fact that the refusal of the crew to sail on the "Allinga" was due entirely to the chief steward—Loughlin is his name—and his action in refusing to supply the usual stores and necessary food equal in quantity and quality to the amount allowed on all coastal vessels. The record of this steward is an unenviable one, and wherever he has been employed there has been trouble as a result of his methods in half-starving the crew. Prior to being appointed to the s.s. "Allinga" he was employed on one of the boats of the North Coast Company, and, strange to say, the crew refused to sail with him on the second trip, making a similar complaint to that made by the crew of the s.s. "Allinga," with the result that the company, to save further trouble, put him ashore. He was also employed on the s.s. "Urilla," and similar trouble resulted on this boat. He was then appointed to the s.s. "Allinga," with the result that the crew had to complain of insufficient food. When the crew worked overtime he refused to supply the usual supper which is the customary allowance on all coasting boats, but on an appeal to the chief engineer the men secured justice. He also refused to supply the usual "black pan," which, in seafaring language, is a meal supplied to men who happened to be working during the meal hour, and are compelled to wait until they are relieved to have their meals. He also refused to supply the usual allowance of butter, but on the complaint of the crew this was allowed. It is a well-known fact that he never took aboard the s.s. "Allinga" the usual amount of stores that are generally allowed for a crew of the number manning the boat in question. The hon. member for Mirani a few nights ago complained that the Government were not securing ships to go to the North.

Mr. SWAYNE: I said they might send a great many more ships than they were doing.

Mr. D. RYAN: The hon. member accused the Government of neglect, and complained that ships were not being sent to the North. At the time he was reminded that he had asked for machinery to be sent in one of the boats which was conveying foodstuffs to the North, but the hon. member did not say anything about the boats of profiteers being chartered for conveying something else besides foodstuffs to the North. In order to throw some light on this matter I shall quote an extract from the "Daily Standard" of the 15th of the present month. It reads as follows:—

"BEER FIRST.

"THE STARVING NORTH.

"Flour a Mere Detail.

"From to-day the people of Townsville are without flour. They are virtually living on starvation rations, and famine literally stares them in the face. The State Government has made splendid efforts to relieve the situation, but for

Mr. D. Ryan.]

some time past the 25,000 people in Townsville have been living from hand to mouth. Now all flour supplies are exhausted, the people are without the staff of life, and as in all acute food shortages there is a tendency for them to become panicky.

"In this alarming state of affairs, with the shipping strike still continuing and no immediate prospect of relief for Townsville, it will surely come as a great shock to the people of Queensland to learn that a small trading vessel named the 'Maroro,' usually plying between Sydney and New Zealand, is at present loading at John Burke's wharf, South Brisbane, hundreds of casks of beer for the starving population of the North!

"She is certainly carrying some general cargo, but on the wharf there was a long vista of beer barrels. The whole wharf seemed to be covered with casks of the precious liquor, and presented an appearance of the morning after the night before on a glorious and exaggerated scale.

"An occasional sack of flour was being loaded in, as if it had no right to be there. There were also some tons of empty bags, ostensibly for the sugar mills, but probably to collect the 'dead marines' after the North has recovered. Some condensed milk, potatoes, and onions appeared to complete the shipment. The vessel leaves to-day, apparently to relieve the unreported beer famine, instead of taking a full cargo of foodstuffs.

"There was once a time when the people asked for bread and were given a stone. In these modern days they are asking for bread and are given beer.

"In this connection Alderman Burke, of the South Brisbane Council, under whose aegis the boat has been loading, naively remarked, when approached by a representative of the 'Daily Standard,' that beer was food! The vessel is going direct to Cairns—perhaps she will drop overboard a couple of casks of liquid food as she passes Townsville."

Commenting on that, a bright little paper called "The Strength of Empire" states—

"The Daily Standard's disclosure of Saturday last that private enterprise, as instanced in the case of the 'Maroro,' was sending beer to feed the starving thousands of the North, has caused general amazement. The matter was referred to by the Premier in Parliament last night, and some strong references have been made to the matter in the form of resolutions passed by various temperance bodies.

"But this journal is now in a position to state that the 'Maroro' is not the only beer ship which has left under the aegis of private enterprise. Recently another boat, the 'Porpoise,' left for Mackay laden with almost a full cargo of the precious liquid, and it is stated that other and larger vessels have also carried the same form of 'food.' And in the meantime the people beyond Rockhampton are without bread and flour."

Yesterday we read in the newspapers that

[*Mr. D. Ryan.*]

some attempt had been made to damage the "Porpoise," and it was said that she was engaged in carrying foodstuffs to the North, and had made several trips with foodstuffs for the starving people of the North. That is what "Strength of Empire" says—that the "Porpoise" was engaged in carrying liquor.

Mr. COLLINS: Where to?

Mr. D. RYAN: To the North—to Mackay.

Mr. SWAYNE: Tell us how the State hotel at Babinda got its beer.

Mr. FRY: They got it on the "Porpoise" that they are talking about.

Mr. D. RYAN: I was drawing attention to the indignant wrath of the hon. member for Mirani in denouncing the Government for not sending food North and having some few tons of pipes in a boat for ballast, when at the same time he did not denounce the private companies who were carrying liquor and not foodstuffs. We hear a very great deal about the North—its affairs, its people, and its troubles. It is quite a fashionable subject of discussion down here, particularly Townsville. "What is wrong with Townsville?" people are asking. It is not a question of what is wrong with Townsville, but "What is wrong with the world?" There is nothing more wrong with Townsville than there was at Merivale street, nothing more wrong with Townsville than there was in Melbourne, where the Premier of the State of Victoria stopped an ink bottle. There is nothing more wrong with Townsville than there was with Perth.

Mr. COLLINS: Or Fremantle.

Mr. D. RYAN: Or Fremantle. There is nothing more wrong with Townsville than there was with Sydney a couple of years ago when the military were called out; nothing more wrong with Townsville than at Hughenden, where the squatters ran amok.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: It has advanced since then.

Mr. D. RYAN: Yes, it has. It has advanced till it is the second port in the Commonwealth. Townsville is a large seaport town, a port of exchange for North Australia. People are always going through, and consequently there is a great number of strangers there, just as in other shipping towns, but there has been no more trouble in Townsville than there has been anywhere else, not a bit more trouble. The people of Townsville are just as orderly as any other Australians; they are just as industrious as any other Australians; they are just as loyal as any other Australians, and they are just as courageous as any other Australians, and they are prepared to fight for their rights and stand up for what they want in Townsville just the same as in other parts of Australia.

Mr. GUNN: No other part of Australia has got the "Tree of Knowledge."

Mr. D. RYAN: A little knowledge might be a dangerous thing to the hon. member. It might be well if he went to Townsville, and got a little more. "Drink deep, or touch not the Pierian spring." In Queensland we have the American beef trust, and wherever the American beef trust makes its home

there is to be found a trouble with the workers. A great deal of criticism has been levelled at the men in the meatworks. Those men are just as good as any other men in Australia. They come from all parts of Australia, and they come from various occupations. They fill various other positions when they are not there, if they can get work in the off season. There are seasonal occupations in Townsville, and a great many men are thrown out of employment when those occupations cease. Many find work at the meatworks. Those men have to contend with the Yankee beef trust. We know that in America, the great home of the Yankee beef trust, it is not a case of direct action on the part of the men in order to get their rights. There is no question of arbitration. When the men of the Yankee beef trust assert their rights they are shot down by gunmen and others hired for the purpose—which the law permits—and that is one of the reasons why we find that wherever the Yankee beef trust makes its home there is trouble between them and the workers of Australia. Another charge levelled against Townsville is that it is the asylum of foreigners, of Russians, Greeks, Italians, and others, but that statement is no more true of Townsville than of Brisbane and some other parts of Australia. Who is responsible for bringing to Queensland these foreigners who are so much denounced at the present time? Quite recently the Italians were our honoured allies. We gave them important places in our processions and pageants, and yet the other day in Western Australia we find the temper of the people had so much changed that they tried to drive the Italians there out of the State. The same thing happened with regard to the Russians in Brisbane. We had an attempt to drive them out of Brisbane. Who brought them to Brisbane? The riot called the Merivale-street battle, was a display of loyalty; in Melbourne a similar thing was mob rule; in Perth it was something else; and in Townsville it is a riot. We are told that the Government are keeping those Russians in employment at the Ipswich workshops. It would be very interesting to turn up the papers of admission of those Russians into the Ipswich workshops and find who recommended them.

Mr. GLEDSON: Not who recommended them, but who ordered them to be put on.

Mr. D. RYAN: It will be found that none of those men has been taken on since the Labour Government came into office. I would like to quote an extract I have here from a letter which appeared in the "Daily Mail" of the 12th April of this year from M. Zadorsky. The Russian writer says—

"They only came here between the years 1909 and 1914."

That was before the war, and before the present Government took office. The writer goes on—

"How did they get here? They came on the trust that the people of Queensland, as represented by their intelligence and emigration bureaux, were honest. In 1909, staying in Japan on my way to Canada, and studying English, I accidentally secured pamphlets of the Queensland Government Intelligence Bureau. I

got into rapture myself, and caused others to become likewise by translating the most glowing accounts of Queensland resources and opportunities, and publishing them in the Harbin papers. In consequence, a number of emigrants going to America turned their footsteps to Queensland. On arrival they proved themselves so good, hard-working people that in the railway cuttings, in the canefields, and on farms the native-born Australian, English, and Irish were often sacked to give place to the Russians, who proved to be the 'rushing ones.'

"Mr. Denham was so pleased with their record that he placed an agent at Dairen, in Manchuria, to intercept all the Russians, who passed that port on their way to Hawaii, and he paid £1 per head for every 'dirty, greasy moujik' (so I was told in Harbin six months ago). In this way about 6,000 men, women, and children landed in Australia in five years, all paying their own passages. They wanted to go on the land, and Mr. Denham, who was usually very good to Russian immigrants, set apart a piece of country for them—the man-and-God-forsaken prickly-pear selections on the south side of Wallumbilla."

Again, the "Daily Mail" of the 19th of the same month, published an article by Mr. H. A. Tardent—a very able and well-written article. Mr. Tardent, speaking of the Russians being compelled to leave Russia, says—

"Some of the best elements of the Russian nation were imprisoned, exiled to Siberia, hanged or shot in thousands. Two of those persecuted patriots succeeded in escaping from Siberia to Japan. But it seemed to them that they could never be far enough from their persecutors. As a Japanese liner was just then sailing for Australia, they booked their passage for Sydney, the only Australian city of which they had heard.

"At Thursday Island that Japanese liner was boarded by the late Mr. J. T. Bell, who was then, I think, Minister for Lands, and whose great hobby was the introduction of immigrants from Europe.

"Hearing of those two Russians on the boat, he made their acquaintance, and persuaded them that they would have much better prospects in Queensland than in Sydney. He promised to help them to find employment on their arrival."

On 1st March of the present year the "Courier" published an article dealing with foreigners whom the party opposite are now so eager to drive out, or deport, or something else. The article says—

"I have seldom met with any lawless element amongst the Italian labourers, but they sometimes get gay on lager beer, none of the cheap wines of their own country being available. In the cyclone, both at Innisfail and Babinda last year, there was a lawless element present, and it was composed of foreigners—Russians, Spaniards, Maltese, and Greeks, who had come from Port Darwin tainted with confiscatory ideas.

Mr. D. Ryan.]

There was an attempt at Innisfail to do some looting, egged on by some of our own countrymen who were out for fun!"

The writer mentions Greeks. On the 23rd of the same month the "Daily Mail" published a telegram with the black-letter heading, "A shipload of Greeks," and the telegram read—

"Darwin, Tuesday.—Strikes are still the order of the day, and their frequent occurrence is having a bad effect on the town. . . . The steamer 'Kuinana' arrived here a week ago, and brought in a consignment of sixty Greeks."

This shipload of sixty Greeks was brought to break the strike. That is how they use these people. Dealing with the Italians, whom the Western Australian people are so eager to get rid of, the writer in the "Courier" whom I have just quoted made this statement—

"The Colonial Sugar Refining Company has given the Italian farmers every assistance possible, both financially and with the service of their cane inspectors; but, of course, as I said in a previous article, it has always been the custom of this company to assist those who desire to get on. On the Herbert the Italians have liberally availed themselves of that assistance, so that they practically cultivate half the land producing cane for Macnade and Victoria. The subjoined tables show the land available for sugar cultivation, between Mackay and Mossman, the number of farmers, number of Italian farmers, and the areas being cultivated by them. These figures show that in many cases a large proportion of the land available for sugar production is not being utilised to its full extent—

	No. of Farmers.	Area available for Cultivation.	Italian Owners and Areas Cultivated.	No. Acres.
MACKAY DISTRICT.				
Cattle Creek ...	100	2,174	17	2,178
Cattle Creek ...	100	3,174	7	239
Farleigh ...	163	7,125	19	617
Homebush ...	117	4,074	6	112
Marian ...	157	3,302	4	84
North Eton ...	76	5,575	2	137
Plane Creek ...	168	7,681	3	81
Pleystowe ...	173	4,823	14	352
Racecourse ...	114	4,596	1	43
	1,068	40,250	56	1,665

*The area actually cut for the last year figures available was 25,959 acres.

BURDEKIN AND BOWEN.				
Inkerman ...	246	7,684	31	1,258
Kalamia ...	90	3,672	3	150
Pioneer ...	158	6,783	6	486
Proserpine ...	226	5,464	6	147
	720	23,603	46	2,041
Actual area cut, 10,645 acres.				

HERBERT RIVER.				
Macnade ...	119	5,960	71	3,720
Victoria ...	149	6,873	60	2,560
	268	12,833	131	6,280

[Mr. D. Ryan.

	No. of Farmers.	Area available for Cultivation.	Italian Owners and Areas Cultivated.	No. Acres.
JOHNSTONE RIVER.				
South Johnstone	182	5,189	83	3,880
Mourilyan ...	78	8,082	46	3,680
Goondi ...	101	5,296	10	450
	361	18,467	130	8,010

Total area Herbert River, Johnstone River districts, 31,300 acres; available actually cut, 23,689; Italian grown, 14,290 acres.

FAIR NORTHERN.				
Babinda ...	148	6,898	43	1,600
Mulgrave ...	73	4,622	1	68
Hambledon ...	96	4,458	7	210
Mossman ...	95	4,437	13	610
	412	20,415	64	2,488

Area actually cut, 17,720 acres.

These people are all law-abiding producers, and yet we are now told that they are making riots which are not equalled anywhere else.

Mr. BRENNAN: Have you ever seen the "Weekly Gazette" showing the mortgagees who lend money to these people.

Mr. D. RYAN: No. While listening to my friend, the hon. member for Windsor, who dealt so elaborately with the theory of supply and demand, I noticed that he forgot to tell us about the great amount of meat in cold storage in Melbourne, and which has been there for a considerable time. According to the doctrine of supply and demand, the price of meat should have been much lower in Melbourne, or in Victoria, seeing there was such a supply to meet the demand, but the hon. member for Windsor was silent as to how the law of supply and demand had failed to operate in that case. Another thing the hon. member spoke very largely about was the deportation of Germans, and he quoted very largely from the Federal "Hansard" concerning the Germans. We have heard a very great deal about the Germans from our friends opposite, not only this session so far, but in previous sessions; but it is very hard to find out what the policy of the Opposition is with regard to Germans. How do they really stand with regard to the Germans? Do they love the Germans? Are they in favour of the Germans? Do they wish to hunt them out of the country, or do they wish to persecute them after they have brought them here? Why do they pursue the Germans one moment, and why do they approve of them at another moment?

At thirty minutes past 8 o'clock p.m.,

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

Mr. D. RYAN (continuing): I have a few extracts here of statements made on the public platform during the election campaign last year. Here is a statement made at Boonah on 10th March, 1918, by the hon. member for Dalby—

"He directed attention to the fact that the original measure for the disfranchisement of those of German birth or parentage was passed by the Federal Labour party before the Nationalist

party held office, and he also cited instances of the harsh treatment by the present State Government of persons of German origin. He stated that the only organisation which had protested against the disfranchisement of Australian-born Germans was the Queensland Farmers' Union, of which body Mr. Bell was the endorsed candidate."

I took that from the "Courier" of the 11th March last year. In one voice Mr. Vowles, the hon. member for Dalby, blames the Federal Labour party for the disfranchisement of the Germans and in the next breath he blames the Queensland Labour party for supporting the Germans. Which side is he on? Then again, I have a quotation here from a speech made by Mr. W. F. R. Boyce. We all know who Mr. Boyce is. This is an extract from the "Courier" of 15th March, 1918, and is an extract from a speech delivered by Mr. Boyce in the Mount Alford School of Arts, Boonah, on the 13th March—speaking in favour of the Nationalist candidate for Fassifern (Mr. E. T. Bell)—

"The Labour party was the first to disfranchise citizens of alien birth, and the present caucus Government had shown its hostility towards them and their descendants by numberless acts, but had suddenly discovered an amazing friendship for them now, when an election was pending."

"Codlin is your friend, not Short." Then again from the "Courier" of 12th March, 1918, I have an extract from a speech by Mr. T. R. Roberts, Nationalist candidate for East Toowoomba—

"Touching on the matter of the German vote, Mr. Roberts contrasted the action of the Ryan Government in 1915-16, when special instructions were issued that German or Austrian persons should not be employed in Government works, and quoted a definite interpretation that this was to apply not only to German or Austrian born, but Australians also. He cited definite occasions where Australian-born of German parents were refused employment, notwithstanding they had qualified for such positions. Further, this order was continued until April, 1917, when it occurred to the Government that it would be to its advantage, seeing that the Commonwealth elections were then pending, to cancel the order previously issued, which was done."

Mr. ROBERTS: You don't say that is not true?

Mr. D. RYAN: I quite believe you said so. (Laughter.)

Mr. PAYNE: There is not a particle of truth in it.

Mr. D. RYAN: I wish to compliment the hon. member for East Toowoomba on straddling the rails so well. I have very little further to say in this debate. On looking through the Governor's Speech I see that it refers to a policy of main roads. So far as main roads are concerned, I believe in main roads. I believe that the farmer should have good roads to enable him to get his produce to the railway. But I do not believe, as a leading metropolitan journal had advocated immediately the main roads question was mentioned in this House, that we want the

Kedron road made up or any roads to large cities. That was not in my mind when I supported good roads. My idea was that the settlers should get the benefits of the good roads. With regard to the Police superannuation fund, I believe in legislation for the benefit of the police. I take this opportunity of congratulating the police on the wonderful heroism and patience they showed in Merivale street against great odds, but I am sorry that I cannot say the same for the police in Townsville who fired on an unarmed mob. The Governor's Speech contains a reference to an Unemployed Workers' Bill. Previous Governors' Speeches have frequently made reference to the condition of the unemployed, and one Prime Minister went so far as to say that God Almighty could not settle the unemployed question. But this is the first time in Queensland, in fact the first time in Australia, that the Government has had the courage to place in the Governor's Speech a proposal to make provision for the introduction of a Bill dealing with the unemployed question. I hope that the Bill will successfully solve the difficulty of unemployed workers. There are a number of other measures here which I can heartily support. I hope they will get through this session, particularly the Bill relating to the abolition of the Legislative Council, because while that Council lasts I do not think there is much occasion for us to be here. No matter what legislation we pass or what we do for democracy in this Chamber, it is passed down the staircase when it gets to the other Chamber. I hope that when the people are called upon again to express an opinion on this question that they will see the futility of keeping that House here. I hope they will rise to the occasion and assist the Government, the choice of the democracy, a Government that have proved their democratic instincts, who have proved their ability to govern, and who have proved also that they are anxious to legislate so that the prosperity of the people may increase, and so that the people may come into their own. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. G. P. BARNES (Warwick): I am not one of those who think that the time taken in discussing the Address in Reply to the Governor's Speech is waste time.

Mr. COLLINS: Sit down if you think that.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I am saying that I do not think it is waste time, and I will give my reasons before I sit down. Anyhow, my sitting down will be at my own convenience and not at the convenience of the hon. gentleman. I take it that this year in particular there is need and room for the fullest discussion, not only on matters which have been included in the Governor's Speech, but on matters which have not been included. In a general sense the year has been an eventful one. Whilst the intentions of the Government as regards the future are outlined before us they form room for criticism, and in that criticism one is not likely to agree with the hon. member who has just resumed his seat, and has claimed for the gentlemen who conduct the affairs of the country just now a degree of praise, but rather must regret the policy observed in the management of the country's affairs that it has been the unfortunate lot of the people of Queensland to witness.

Mr. HARTLEY: None of them are crying except you.

Mr. G. P. Barnes.]

Mr. G. P. BARNES: So far as the future is concerned we will simply measure the Government by their deeds of the past. (Hear, hear!) Never has there been a time when so many pressing matters confront the State than we have confronting us to-day.

Mr. HARTLEY: You have a capable Government to handle them.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: The hon. gentleman says something about the Government being handled, but it is about time they woke up and proved themselves able to handle and not to be governed by the forces here, there, and everywhere.

Mr. COLLINS: What forces do you mean? The unseen? The spiritual?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: The hon. member is a bit of a prophet. He posed as a prophet the other evening. I am not a spiritualist, but we may very easily sum him up in that direction after the speech he delivered this evening. The peace declaration of all matters certainly takes first place, and then, so far as we are concerned as a State, I take it, there comes along the administration—no matter how you may term it—of the Government of the day, coupled especially with their financial administration. Then, if there were nothing else to talk about there is the industrial unrest which has ruled largely in this State during the term of service of the present Government. We have another great matter—the expansion of our industries. All these matters, I take it, provide ample food for criticism and for review. There are clauses in the Speech itself that all can or should subscribe to, such as those referring to the ending of the war with victory for the side that stood for freedom, justice, and civilisation, as against a formidable enemy. It rejoices in the peace secured, it expresses sorrow for the aggrieved and stricken, it speaks loyally of the glorious part played by Queenslanders, and generally applauds them; it speaks appreciatingly of the men who risked their lives and everything they had for our freedom and the freedom of the Empire, and it speaks of the obligation which we as Queenslanders, and the country generally, are under to the men who served at the front. In matters of this kind, members on this side are heart and soul with the expressions in the Speech, but it seems to me that the Speech in this direction by no means went as far as it should have gone. There are outstanding facts which should have been referred to in addition to the other glowing tributes which were made. Why was no reference made to the magnificent part played by the old land in connection with this war? Why were not joy and satisfaction expressed in the spectacle afforded by the unity of the Empire—every part of the Empire standing shoulder to shoulder in the time of the world's stress? Why were there no references of that kind, when they might have been brought in with very great advantage? Why was there no reference to the sacrifices that were made by the Empire and her allies or to the victories achieved by them? Surely those things might have been referred to in the outburst of appreciation. It behoves the Government in power to recognise the part played, not only by Queensland, but by Australia. How is it that the whole thing was not surveyed and reference made to the great and wonderful part that Andrew Fisher took at the outset, when he spontaneously offered 20,000 men, and everything we

[Mr. G. P. Barnes.]

possessed, to the Empire? Surely there was an opportunity to trace the history of this great war! I do think that a charge should be laid against the Government for not referring to the wonderful part the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth has played. You can travel in no train in Queensland—you can meet no man in the street who is not acclaiming Mr. Hughes, the Prime Minister of Australia; who is not according to him ceaseless praise and the highest admiration. It would have been a fitting thing, it would have been a righteous thing, to have made some reference to the work that Mr. Hughes has achieved and to the pleasure his homecoming has given to Australia.

Mr. KIRWAN: Why, the British Press referred to him as a windbag and a nuisance.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: He, in any case, has fought for Australia's rights as no man we might name could have done. And when every member of this House is dead and gone, the work done by Mr. Hughes will live, and it would have been the right thing to have made reference in the Speech to the work he has performed. It will be seen that not only do I heartily concur with the part of the Speech I have referred to, but that if it had been in my power, I would have made many more remarks in that direction. The regrettable fact is, that we have here some men who do not fully subscribe even to the sentiments expressed in the Speech, and, indeed, in another place the gentleman who seconded the Address in Reply went so far as to make references that were highly antagonistic to those sentiments in the Speech. So far as the Speech refers to those matters, it will be found that this side are distinctly more in accord with those sentiments than many hon. members on the opposite side. Then, I think, surely there is room to condemn the attitude of some hon. members in regard to the final piece of machinery that has been evolved. Surely the legal covenant which has been brought about might have received more praise and given greater pleasure to hon. members than has been the case.

Mr. KIRWAN: You might read what Mr. Hughes said about it. That might be interesting.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Have you read what he said to-day? If you have, you will find that he is highly satisfied. The contract entered into is about the greatest event in history, and I am more than surprised with hon. members opposite who agree with conciliation and arbitration—I cannot understand or conceive how it is that they have been so slow to accord their meed of praise and to exult in that wonderful achievement. For the first time in the history of mankind humanity has sought to be bound together by a sacred contract organised on a basis of honour, common interest, obligation, and of destiny. That being so, there was room for words of commendation and expressions of high pleasure at the achievement.

Mr. JAMES: Certainly, as far as it goes.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Knowing what the hon. gentleman has done, I thought we would have heard from him a little more on this particular subject than we did the other evening. The world has the very rich opportunity of knowing that it cannot go to war as readily as it did before.

Mr. KIRWAN: They are going to war as fast as they can in Europe to-day.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: The league will exist as a kind of watchdog for the world's peace. It makes nations interdependent. On the other hand all nations can claim that they will be in the hands of the league, and will receive essential justice. The great things which will claim our attention to-day and for some time to come are matters of finance. The Speech makes no reference whatever to the condition of the State. This is possibly due to the realisation that the downgrade of things is in a chronically bad way. The facts are so outstanding that no one can attempt to dispute that our position financially is pretty well a hopeless one, in so far as the Treasurer or the Government are unable to lay hands on things and steady them.

Mr. KIRWAN: We have not had the 1893 bank smash over again.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: The Government are utterly unconcerned. They seem to realise no inconvenience at the state of the country's finances. Nothing troubles them in that particular direction, and whether we are a million to the bad or five millions it does not in any way worry them. Even if the railways are not paying, we are told "Why should the railways pay?" We have no right to expect the railways to pay! There is an utter sense of irresponsibility regarding whether things come out right or wrong. It is a matter of no concern. That is the kind of irresponsible spirit which is found occupying the Treasury benches to-day. It seems to me that, in making particular statements of this kind, it is very much better to back them up with a few figures which will at once prove not only the inability but the incapacity of the Government of to-day to manage successfully the finances of the State. The position is realised if we look at four years of this Government's administration, compared with four years under Liberal administration. The receipts by the Liberal Government for the four years ended 1915 totalled £26,543,476. The present Government, in the four years ended 1919, have received £33,494,283—a total increase in receipts of £6,950,807. The Liberal expenditure for their four years was £26,499,704. The Labour expenditure was £34,294,425—a total increase in expenditure under Labour administration of £7,794,221.

Mr. BRENNAN: Who got that money?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I am afraid the hon. gentleman got some of it.

Mr. BRENNAN: Barnes and Company, of Warwick, got some thousands of pounds.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I hope the hon. gentleman will hold his tongue, or I may give him a full chapter of something which he will not like.

Mr. KIRWAN: Let us have it.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: The hon. gentleman would not like it. The increased receipts of £6,950,807 are made up as follows—and I want the House, and the country particularly, to know this:—£4,116,399 is due to extra taxation. In extra revenue they received £2,834,504. Notwithstanding this huge excess in income over that of their predecessors, received by whatsoever means you like, they end their four years' service with a deficiency of another £800,933; and to this must be added almost a month's expenditure which this Government have established the rule of passing on to a new year. There

has also been the additional amount levied through the railways, as well as the lesser amount paid on account of works out of revenue. One way and another it is clear that it cost the country, on account of the privilege of having a Labour Government in power, not less than £2,000,000 more a year to run it than it cost their predecessors. The Liberal administration ended their four years with a surplus of £43,772, whilst Labour ended their four years with a deficiency of £300,933. This is certainly the worst chapter in our financial life. Direct taxation in the last year of Liberal administration totalled £954,457, and in the last year of the present Government's administration it ran up to £2,772,268. No language is strong enough to denounce the incapacity and the unwisdom of a Government who taxed the people to that undue extent.

Mr. KIRWAN: Nothing will compare with the profiteers' taxation.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: The worst feature is that the £4,000,000 odd added to the extra taxation means that this amount is lost to enterprise and employment. There is little doubt that had that amount been held by the people who at one time possessed it—in a way it would not have been held, because the very individuals who might possess it are the people who go in for enterprises, for developmental work. In consequence, the great bulk of that sum—and probably a good deal more added to it—would have gone to the workers, instead of having men groping about the streets with their fingers in their mouths, and Queensland having to boast that she has more unemployed than any other State in the Commonwealth. If that money had been allowed to flow into its right channels these men would have been in receipt of employment and a decent wage. It is time that the responsibility attaching to the financial position of the State should weigh with the Cabinet and its followers. One important matter which should claim our attention is the frequency of the strikes which are occurring again and again. We are altogether ahead of other places. Of course, strikes are general all over the world, but in Queensland we are having more than our share, and it is our duty to make inquiries as to how all this comes about. There is but one answer to the question, and that is that the workers have been aware that they have a sympathetic Government with them. The fact is that the Government have no authority or standing—they can take no firm stand.

Mr. COLLINS: It must be so in the Mother of Parliaments.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: They are utterly incapable of ruling these men. Although makers of the law, they have stood by men when they wanted to be a law unto themselves. How could the present Government control men who had decided to strike, when the members of it sympathised and aided strikes, such as the Brisbane tramways strike in 1912? Then, again, when the workers on the Metropolitan Water and Sewerage Board struck, there was no law capable of satisfying them, and the Government brought down a law to fit the case, legalising the action of the men who had struck. Those men should have gone to the Arbitration Court. Now that the Government are in office, they are altogether incompetent to take a firm stand in connection

Mr. G. P. Barnes.]

with strike matters. Since they came into office we have seen their sympathies expressed. We remember the Southern Railway strike, in connection with which this Government were extremely sympathetic. Certain persons connected with certain organisations—and the Government were cognisant of the action—stepped in at Wallangarra and Toowoomba and controlled the traffic. I have a recollection of a man called Eastercabb who gave directions at that time. In the Northern strike, although the Government possessed a court temperamentally fitted to deal with men, and to arbitrate, the court was passed over and a New Zealand judge sought after. All these attempts to obtain super-arbitration have made the Government altogether incompetent and unable to rule and govern men.

Mr. FRY: It has been one of the principal factors in destroying arbitration.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: No Government can blow hot and cold. I am entirely in favour of arbitration and conciliation. We should exhaust all the means in our power to adjust matters; having done that, there is a clear course open to every Government in dealing with strike matters, but the men are out of hand all round. Only on 15th instant, the following telegram was sent from Cairns:—

“To Messrs. W. McCormack, E. G. Theodore, W. N. Gillies, David Riordan, and Harry Ryan: ‘Meeting Queensland Railway Union held here yesterday, representing 500 members this district. Resolution carried unanimously protesting against treatment meted those employees recently reduced for refusal man police special, and urge you use every effort have them immediately reinstated unconditionally. Their loyalty and adherence to instruction of their organisation meets with full approval of comrades here. My organisation desires an expression of opinion of your approval or otherwise of treatment of these men.’”

They were brought to heel with that.

The TREASURER interjected.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: The hon. gentleman did not reply—he was the only wise man in the group—but he evidently deputed someone else to give certain instructions, and the Cabinet is reported to have given very close consideration to the matter.

The TREASURER: You are basing everything on rumour; you should be more careful.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I am not going to read all the replies, because they have been quoted previously, but these are some of the replies—

“To Mr. Murchison, Cairns: ‘Have already urged Government not to penalise men for obeying their unions. Northern members acted conjointly on this matter; think Government be persuaded take more lenient view shortly. (Signed) MCCORMACK.’”

Then there is one signed by H. J. Ryan—

“To Mr. Murchison, Cairns: ‘Approve railway workers’ action, and think as unionists they could not do otherwise. Urging Cabinet to reinstate. (Signed) H. J. RYAN.’”

[Mr. G. P. Barnes.

Then we have another one—

‘To Mr. Murchison, Cairns: ‘Thanks your action regarding comrades. Trades Hall Council and unions’ delegation to Premier is being arranged. In the meantime I think it advisable to refrain from making any announcement. Matter of retrospective pay is in hand. (Signed) RYMER, Northern organiser.’”

So that there is some other little matter to be dug up. I was nearly omitting to read the following very important telegram:—

“To the secretary of the union at Cairns: ‘Your wire received. This matter is under consideration by the Cabinet. (Signed) GILLIES.’”

Mr. FRY: The Minister for Justice.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Quite so; we know him full well. A Government who could act like that have no influence, and as long as they are a Ministry they will be unable to take a firm stand and will have to yield on every occasion, as there are indications they have yielded on this and every other occasion.

Mr. POLLOCK: You would tell them to go to the devil?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: No; I would use all the means in my power under the Arbitration Act to bring about a settlement; I would do everything I could to conciliate, and if I failed in that, only one course would be open.

Mr. POLLOCK: What other course was open in this case?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Mr. Fuller’s course. Give the men every opportunity to return to work—try to conciliate or arbitrate under the Arbitration Act, and if that fails, give the men an opportunity to return to work by a given date, and if they do not return, then let their places be filled by other men. Even in connection with the transcontinental railway, when 1,450 men were thrown out of employment by a strike, we know that when a firm stand was taken the men soon came to their senses and fell back upon the provisions of the Arbitration Act. We know, too, that when the police strike happened in London, the men returned to work after a firm stand was taken by the authorities.

Mr. COLLINS: You would govern the world on the lines of the Kaiser, and would lose your head in the long run.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: No, I would not pursue that course, but I say that if you allow yourselves to be squeezed all along the line, you will be squeezed. In Canada they have had just the same trouble as we have had, as is shown by the following extract from an American weekly journal:—

“Early in the year, at a big Labour convention in Calgary, definite plans for the organisation of Canadian Labour in ‘One Big Union’ were presented by the extremists among Canadian Labour leaders and adopted in spite of considerable opposition. In the weeks that followed the idea was adopted by many of the Labour unions, although it meant severing connections with the international organisations of which Canadian trade unions have long been members. The saner elements in Canadian Labour, conspicuous among which were the Railway Brotherhoods and the Typographical

Union, held aloof, but the movement spread rapidly, nevertheless. Trouble started in Winnipeg, where the 'One Big Union' leaders, through a committee, made demands on behalf of the metal workers. The employers were prepared to recognise the regularly constituted unions, but they refused to negotiate with this new committee; whereupon a general strike was ordered by the 'One Big Union' leaders, and the life of the city was paralysed for a time.

"The stubborn resistance of the citizens of Winnipeg, fortified by the firm attitude of the Dominion Government towards the striking postal employees, broke the strike where it began; and, once broken in Winnipeg, the movement soon died out elsewhere. A committee of 1,000 Winnipeg citizens undertook the operation of the more essential of the public utilities. The Government announced that striking postal employees would be discharged if they did not return to work immediately. Various corporations made similar announcements, and thousands of trade union men, who found that they had been deceived by their new leaders, returned to their work. The strike leaders were broken and discredited. Canada is not Russia; Canada will not tolerate Bolshevism; Canadian trade union men will not tolerate Bolshevism; but thousands were misled for a time by the appeals of the men who were trying to work revolution.

"The truth is that the great majority of the strikers had dropped their tools against their own better judgment. As often happens, the inarticulate majority were overruled and bullied by a noisy and headstrong minority."

That is exactly what is taking place in our land. When a strike occurs, the men are really bullied to take a step which is altogether contrary to their own ideas.

Mr. COLLINS: What paper have you been quoting from?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: My friend, the hon. member for Dalby, reminds me that that is exactly what the Northern railway men have said. Those men have been forced—actually terrorised—into taking the stand they did.

Mr. SMITH: What paper did you quote from?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I was reading from the "Outlook" for 18th June.

Mr. COLLINS: You are taking up a very unchristian attitude.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: No; I am for peace in our time, and not for war. Here is another extract from the same article—

"The Hon. G. H. Robertson, Canadian Minister of Labour, is himself a Labour leader who has long been prominent in Labour circles in the Dominion. Quite naturally, his sympathies are with Labour in all its worthy attempts to better its conditions.

"Before leaving for Ottawa, at a time when the result of the strike was no longer in doubt, he gave an interview to the 'Manitoba Free Press,' which in the interval had been able to resume publication.

"The promoters of the Winnipeg strike, he said, now sit in the ashes of their folly."

Just as the men in connection with the shipping strike are now sitting in their folly after they have lost millions of money. Mr. Robertson went on to say—

"Labour leaders who advocate that only might is right, who hold that law, justice, and honour should be discarded at will, merit and receive the condemnation of all good citizens. Sympathetic strikes must always fail. Socialism has chosen the 'One Big Union' idea as a popular primrose path along which to lead the trade unionist, urging him to discard his honourable obligations and join the big show.

"The Winnipeg strike is the first rehearsal of the play written at Calgary. The Winnipeg rehearsal has cost, approximately, 2,000,000 dollars in wages lost in Western Canada alone, and has proved the play to have been badly written and unpopular with both the public and most of the performers."

That communication is signed "Frank Maitland." That is the only successful way in which matters of that nature can be dealt with.

Mr. COLLINS: You believe in the doctrine of force?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: No; my idea is to uphold arbitration—do your best to conciliate, and if you fail in that there is only one course open to you, and that is a course similar to the one I have indicated.

Mr. POLLOCK: I should like to hear your opinion of arbitration in fixing the price of your commodities when that state of affairs arrives.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I should like to hear what the people have to say regarding the fixing of the prices of the commodities of the hon. gentleman and his comrades. The hon. member the other evening laid himself out, and in a logical way from his standpoint, to advocate increased pay to members of Parliament. I think myself it would be better for the people to decide that matter. The people are the tribunal to whom I would refer the hon. member.

Mr. WHITFORD: Do you believe in the Dickson award?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: No, and no sane man in this country, or any other country, would believe in the absurd Dickson award, which has been the cause of half our troubles in Queensland. If I remember rightly, it was the Treasurer who made reference in this House to his feeling that the award was something beyond the powers of that particular industry. Everything that I have said seems to prove that the reason why we have so much industrial unrest in Queensland is because of the Government we have in power. Men take advantage of it. They think that the Government are sympathetic, that they will not stand by their own laws, they know that they will yield, and consequently the number of strikes is increased, and the men in the end, I am sorry to say, are the losers.

Mr. MULLAN: How do you account for the strikes in Great Britain?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I am talking about Queensland, and I am asking how it is that

Mr. G. P. Barnes.]

where there is a sympathetic Labour Government there are more strikes than in any of the other States, how it is there are more unemployed, how it is that the cost of living is higher, how it is that our deficits are greater here than in any of the other States? All these matters go hand in hand.

Undoubtedly one of the greatest questions of the hour, so far as we are concerned, is the matter of increased production. I find that the Premier when in England was entertained in London, and is reported to have made these remarks—

“Mr. Ryan said that the various parts of the Empire should not embarrass one another in their reconstructive effort. The difficulties were too great. The Dominions would assist in all possible directions. One urgent problem was to bring industrial and political movements together as one machine. He hoped that the League of Nations would not interfere with the domestic affairs of the nations. Such questions as those of a white Australia and tariffs could only be decided by Australia. Queensland hoped for great agricultural development, and would welcome no immigrants more than those from the United Kingdom.”

We have in the Governor's Speech this one bare reference to the matter of the extension of our industries, after all the talk on the other side of the world—

“In order to facilitate land settlement and increased production, it is the intention of my advisers to introduce measures having for their objects the encouraging of dairying and its allied industries, by providing for greater financial assistance to enable co-operative societies to be formed, and by making provision for assisting selectors to procure dairy stock.”

Even since his arrival in Australia the Premier is reported to have said—

“The burden of Australia's war expenditure can be borne only by adopting and carrying out a developmental policy which will increase the number of shareholders capable of bearing taxation.”

That is all very well, and we heartily agree with him, but statements of that kind are worthless unless you have fair execution, unless there is going to be some attempt indeed to expand our industries. Why is there before the House that one bare reference to the expansion of our industries, whilst the great and pressing problem of the world to-day is to secure an ample food supply? On the other side of the world agricultural settlement and that kind of thing is referred to, but when it comes to meeting his people in Australia the Premier sums up the whole of his good intentions in the few sentences I have quoted from the Speech. The Government so far have done little or nothing to help, and they are not likely to do anything to help. What have they done to help the primary producers?

Mr. COLLINS: Passed the Regulation of Sugar Cane Prices Act.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Apart altogether from the establishment of State enterprises they have done nothing to encourage one single individual.

Mr. COLLINS: That is not true.

[Mr. G. P. Barnes.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I sat at the dinner table the other night and heard several gentlemen enter who were discussing such matters, and they summed up the position in this way. “Queensland as regards new enterprises is a place to be avoided.”

Mr. SMITH: Who said that?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: They sat beside me at the table, and they were evidently travellers from abroad.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: What did you say about Queensland when they made that statement?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: It was not my place to interfere—they were strangers to me—but I was only too sorry to have to agree that their conclusions were only too true. The Government helped the primary producer, I think, between July of 1915 and of May, 1916, by commandeering his butter at a price that averaged 1½d. per lb. less than he could have got if he had been allowed to place his goods in the best markets, and the sum he lost amounted to no less than £148,000.

Mr. RIORDAN: What were your profits in Warwick during the last four years?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: That is a downright impertinent question—(laughter)—but I have no objection to taking the hon. member into my confidence if he will come along with me and give me notice.

Mr. RIORDAN: It would not be much use to me unless I could use it publicly. (Laughter.)

Mr. G. P. BARNES: If he is of an inquiring turn of mind, why not let me have it? He would be astonished more than one would imagine. I can tell the House that the bare percentage that remains to a man on his turnover is not very much.

Mr. MULLAN: I will make you a sporting offer for the balance.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: They helped the primary producer by confiscating his property. Witness what is going on in the North of Queensland. They encouraged the primary producer by commandeering his cattle. They imposed a tax that brought in £40,000 that prevented men from finding a market for their cattle over the border. All along the border on the Downs small graziers wanted to get to the market in New South Wales with their stock, or to save them from starving; and the Government imposed on them the tax that I have mentioned. They have a backhanded way of doing business. They helped production to expand by their land tax. If you were to go to the Commissioner of Taxation to-day he would tell you that what I have said is correct. They have succeeded by their land tax in reducing the value of country properties to the extent of from 33 per cent. to 50 per cent.

Mr. SMITH: Farmers only pay 9 per cent. of the land tax.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: But the farmers are not 9 per cent. of the population. The men on the land are a mere fraction of the total population; and, if they pay 9 per cent., I am sorry to say that they are paying far more than their due in the matter. The hon. member for Normanby the other evening delivered a very fine speech, and I

imagine that the Cabinet and their followers will take considerable notice of what the hon. member said. In referring to taxation, the hon. member said that no nation was ever built on taxes. I imagine that the hon. member for Mackay will be very much in agreement with the hon. member in that. He certainly ought to be.

The HOME SECRETARY: How would you raise the revenue save by taxation?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I would prevent waste, first of all. The hon. gentleman was not in his place in the House when I mentioned that his Government had raised in extra direct taxation £4,200,000, or thereabouts. I maintain that that money should have gone to develop many industries on the land. Instead of that, the Government have been strangling the industries of the country; they have prevented enterprise. There is not a man with a head on his shoulders who would dream of entering upon a new enterprise under the conditions that exist in this State at the present time. We ought to encourage new industries, as they are doing elsewhere. We ought to develop our industries, as the Premier said at home, and as he said in Sydney. The little bit from the Governor's Speech which I quoted is perfectly right so far as it goes. The war has ended; we have been saved from militarism and from bondage by the sacrifice of hundreds of thousands of the bravest men in the world. It would appear now from the pleadings of every nation that a saved world can only save itself by work—by production. Production above all things will bring the price of commodities down; production alone is going to satisfy the needs of the people. A cable from Paris a few days ago indicated the intensity of the desire of the French people in connection with production. The cable referred to quoted the views of Mr. Herbert Hoover, the American Food Controller, who said—

“Unless productivity is rapidly increased, political, moral, and economic chaos will result, and will finally interpret itself in the loss of life on a scale hitherto undreamed of. The entire surplus productivity of America is totally incapable of meeting the European deficiency. No economic policy will bring food to the stomach which does not secure maximum production.”

The SPEAKER: The hon. member has exhausted the time allowed by the Standing Orders.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. Huxham, *Buranda*): There is only one matter to which I wish to refer, and that is the remarks made by the hon. member for Nundah in connection with the administration of the Department of Public Health. Of course, no one can take exception to an hon. member bringing a case before this House with a view to securing redress; but the least the hon. member might have done, instead of bringing ex parte statements and letters from Dr. Bradley before the House, was to have first endeavoured to satisfy himself as to the accuracy of the statements by making inquiries at the Home Department. He was desirous of springing a surprise, not on me, but against the officers of my department. Now, I am not going to allow the officers of my department to be

attacked without defending them. The hon. member knows very well that, in attacking the Commissioner for Public Health, he was identifying himself with a feud on the part of Dr. Bradley, Dr. Wilson, and Mr. Greer, against the Commissioner. This trio laid themselves out to make the position of the Commissioner for Public Health in the department unbearable. The hon. member brought forward certain documents, which were documents belonging to the department or else copies of such documents. When the hon. member for Flinders quoted a certain document the other day which was marked “private and confidential,” he was condemned by hon. members on the other side. Why should not we utter the same condemnation against a man who has left a department and who supplies himself with departmental papers and hands them to a member of Parliament to make use of in this Chamber? I know quite well where the hon. member got the information from. He got it in the first place from one of his constituents, Dr. Shellshear, of Sandgate, who is a brother-in-law of Dr. Bradley. From his own point of view, the hon. member made out a very fine case, but I have something to say now to the contrary. I do not say that the Health Department is all that it should be; I have made many a move to improve it. I can only say that I had the courage to take action against Dr. Wilson, although he gave notice to resign, and I got rid of Mr. Greer just as summarily. Let me state this much—if any hon. gentleman wants to attack the Health Department he should not come to the House, as the hon. gentleman has done, but he should come to the department and see the papers for himself first. Members of the Opposition have come to the office and looked up papers before mentioning matters in this House. If an hon. gentleman comes there and has anything to say every notice will be taken of what he has to refer to. The hon. gentleman asked a question in the House the other day with reference to certain officers leaving the department. The question was all right so far as the names he mentioned were concerned, but he carefully left out two names, namely, Dr. Wilson and Mr. Greer. Why did he leave those names out? Simply because he knew that it was dangerous ground to tread on. He knew it was dangerous to ask why those men left.

Mr. SIZER: As a matter of fact, that question was prepared for me.

The HOME SECRETARY: Who prepared it for you, might I ask?

Mr. SIZER: It does not matter.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: You give yourself away there. (Government laughter.)

The HOME SECRETARY: The two names I refer to were left out of the question deliberately. When those two names are left out of a question like that, it must be recognised that I deemed it my duty to the Health Department to get rid of them very summarily. If any hon. gentleman will come to my office I shall show him the papers without making an exposure of those two gentlemen in this House. So far as Dr. Bradley is concerned, I can say now that if he had not resigned his position when he did I would have sacked him just as speedily

Hon. J. Huxham.]

as the others. (Hear, hear!) There is no question about that. If I had done so, I should have had good reason for doing it. I may say that from the time Dr. Bradley came to that office first I did everything I possibly could for him. He nominated his own men. Mr. Greer, a young man 19 years of age, was brought there on his own recommendation. He was put there on a salary of £225 a year—a most extraordinary salary for such a young man.

Mr. SIZER: He was competent for the position.

The HOME SECRETARY: I am not going to question that. At any rate, I found the department was well rid of him. I wished to give the young students from the University a chance. I believe in giving young fellows who have gone through their course of study at the University every opportunity I can. In deference to Dr. Bradley, I appointed Mr. Greer to that department. Further than that, I gave him an additional medical assistant. Now, it has been recognised that the staff under Dr. Bradley was increased by 50 per cent. as compared with that under Dr. Harris.

Mr. SIZER: Dr. Harris retired because he was overworked.

The HOME SECRETARY: Dr. Harris and I were always on the best of terms whilst he was in that department. As soon as I had an opportunity of discussing his salary, I was quite prepared to give him a rise, but, unfortunately in his case, I did not have the opportunity. It was the same with Mr. Beardmore. When the offer was made it came too late. There was nothing I regretted more than the fact that Dr. Harris did not get a rise. I may say that when Dr. Bradley resigned I endeavoured to get Dr. Harris back to that position and also Mr. Beardmore. I made that offer to Mr. Beardmore when I was in Tasmania. Unfortunately, I could not get them. So far as Dr. Bradley is concerned, never was a man better treated than he was during his time at the department. If he had only done his duty in the way that he should have done it, I am sure we should not have had the trouble we did have.

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

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Mr. SIZER: If he did his duty as you wanted him to, he would have prostituted his science.

The HOME SECRETARY: No, he should have done the duty which he contracted for. When Dr. Bradley was engaged as Director of Microbiology, as a sub-department of the Health Department, he was expected to carry out the duties which he had contracted to carry out. Instead of that, he wanted to do something else. He wanted to use his position for carrying out research work. He owned up to it, because he said to the Commissioner for Health, "I am a research man to my very soul." The essential part and the necessary part of his work in the Health Department was overlooked by him on account of his desire to carry out research work.

Mr. SIZER: His returns show quite the contrary of that. His tests increased tenfold.

The HOME SECRETARY: I say "No." Dr. Bradley, as the head of that department,

[Hon. J. Hucham.

was the most unsatisfactory man one could have in the position. He simply laid himself out to loll about the place holding a cigarette in one hand and letters in the other.

Mr. SIZER: No, that is not correct.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

The HOME SECRETARY: I say it most deliberately. He could have done better work while he was there. I want to probe this matter so that there will be no mistake about it. I found that Dr. Bradley—notwithstanding all that I did to make him feel comfortable—to make him feel that I wished to retain his services—did not appreciate in the least what I had done for him; and it would not have required much to make me do the same with him as I had done with the two other men.

With regard to the hookworm and tropical disease, the Government had been engaged in research work in that matter long before Dr. Bradley came here at all. Dr. Waite came here from America and was inquiring into the hookworm disease, and we voted him the money necessary for him to continue this research work. He did good work and obtained good results. Why then should we want Dr. Bradley to go in for research work so far as the hookworm was concerned? Dr. Bradley had nothing to do with it at all.

Mr. SIZER: It was mentioned by the hon. member for Mackay.

The HOME SECRETARY: You mentioned it.

Mr. SIZER: I said it was a ground for research work.

The HOME SECRETARY: There was no need for Dr. Bradley to deal with tropical diseases, because it was already being dealt with by Dr. Brienl at Townsville. I feel quite satisfied that Dr. Brienl wants no instructions and no assistance on that score. Then, with regard to the diphtheria examinations. Here was work of a very high character and numerous cases came there. We were handling the diphtheria tests before Dr. Bradley came, and we received the commendations of the medical profession and everyone who knew the hard work that Dr. Harris was undertaking in that direction. As I said before, my appreciation of Dr. Harris resulted from the self-sacrifice he showed in undertaking that work. Unfortunately, it was not until after he left that I was able to find out that he was overworked. If he had only had the same conditions in his time that Dr. Bradley had when he was there I am quite sure that we should have had him there now. (Hear, hear!)

Now, as far as the electric light is concerned, let me explain that the reason why it was inefficient was because of the change of the laboratory from College road to the Health Department. When Dr. Harris left, I admit things were in confusion, but immediately Dr. Bradley came here we made alterations to suit him costing £266—a large part of which was spent in connection with the electric lighting. Was that neglect so far as Dr. Bradley was concerned? All he had to do was to say the word and the money was spent for him, yet Dr. Bradley is complaining that he was not getting sufficient

light to do the work. The hon. member ought to be perfectly satisfied with that explanation. At any rate, if he is not satisfied, he can get confirmation from my own papers or from the Home Department.

As far as procuring human serum for special work was concerned, it was not necessary in Dr. Harris's time. He found he could get all he needed from the local hospital, and I think Dr. Bradley could have got it in the same way had he chosen. I have got testimony that the serum could easily have been obtained from the laboratory in connection with the Agricultural Department at Yeerongpilly, so that there was no need whatever for him to ask that the assistants should be drained of their blood on that score.

Mr. SIZER: Why was not that pointed out when he asked for it?

The HOME SECRETARY: If I had listened to all Dr. Bradley wanted there we would have had a complete zoological gardens. The man wanted 100 monkeys and a couple of horses. We would have had a complete menagerie there.

Mr. SIZER: You would have had an up-to-date department.

The HOME SECRETARY: While the hon. member was speaking I indicated that he did not know what he was talking about, because those monkeys were wanted for research work. That was not Dr. Bradley's function. His function was health matters and not research matters.

Mr. SIZER: My contention is that the department is not fulfilling its proper function.

The HOME SECRETARY: Then all I can do is to ask Parliament to vote money for research purposes, and make it absolutely distinct from the Health Department.

In regard to the increased staff under Dr. Bradley, as I stated, he had additional medical assistance, he had Mr Greer, and, altogether the staff was increased 50 per cent. beyond what it was under Dr. Harris, and yet he wanted 50 per cent. more. Dr. Harris, during the seven years he was with us performed the work of the medical profession and of the general public in a manner that no one could take exception to. In fact, if Dr. Bradley was there for ten years instead of ten months, I feel perfectly satisfied he would not have brought about anything like the same satisfaction.

Mr. SIZER: What did the medical men say when Dr. Bradley left?

The HOME SECRETARY: The medical men were not pestered by Dr. Bradley as I was.

Mr. SIZER: They showed their disapproval by not sending in tests to the department, because they realised it would be useless.

The HOME SECRETARY: When Dr. Bradley left the influenza epidemic was coming on. Medical men were scarce and the only assistants we had at that time were Dr. Wilson and Mr. Greer and two other assistants. We could not get a medical man until later, when we got Dr. Dean, and in the meantime we had to get our tests made by one of the local doctors who helped us in special work. That was the only reason.

The tests were not sent to us, but they did as they did in days gone by—sent to Sydney or else got a local pathologist to do the work for them. A comparison of the work done by Dr. Harris and Dr. Bradley is immeasurably in favour of Dr. Harris.

Now, the question of malignant cancer was referred to. The hon. member made a great deal of that, but, notwithstanding what he said, let me point out that in the interregnum between Dr. Harris leaving and Dr. Bradley coming, there was some delay, and yet at the same time how comes it that it took Dr. Bradley seventeen days after he arrived to bring about the result of that test? He does not say anything about that, but that is a fact, and I think, before the hon. member is so strong in his condemnation it would be just as well to judge for himself and explain why the test in this very case was not produced until seventeen days afterwards.

Mr. SIZER: For the simple reason that there was an accumulation of work.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes, but considering he had assistants of his own selection, he should have got through all that work easily enough.

Mr. SIZER: He did not have that assistance immediately he took over the department.

The HOME SECRETARY: As soon as Dr. Bradley was appointed he was given assistance.

Mr. SIZER: He did not have that immediately he took over the department.

The HOME SECRETARY: The test was received between the time Dr. Harris left and Dr. Bradley arrived.

Mr. SIZER: It was there long before Dr. Harris left.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot allow this cross-examination to continue. The hon. member for Nundah has made his speech, and the Home Secretary is replying. I cannot allow this to continue.

Mr. MACARTNEY: The Home Secretary is doing the cross-examining.

Further interjections following,

The SPEAKER: The Home Secretary has the floor. I ask the Home Secretary not to reply to interjections.

The HOME SECRETARY: I thank you, Mr. Speaker. I shall try and keep within limits. I now come to the question of venereal disease. The venereal disease trouble—as was well known to Dr. Bradley—needed prompt attention. Every Wednesday at 11 o'clock the tests were sent to him and he was asked to furnish results at 3.30 p.m. to enable the cases proved "positive" to appear before the court the following week. On the average all we had was twenty tests, and he had five assistants. Surely if one is asked at 11 o'clock on Wednesday to have same completed by 3.30 the same day it was not very much to ask—particularly as it was not an elaborate test! It was a simple question of a positive or negative—a "yea" or "nay"—and that was the test Dr. Harris applied in those cases and which had been accepted as sufficient.

Mr. SIZER: That needs a thorough examination.

The HOME SECRETARY: No, it does not. As far as venereal disease is concerned

Hon. J. Huxham.]

—especially gonorrhoea—it is one of the simplest tests you can possibly have as far as the bacteriological examination is concerned. Anyhow, a five minutes' test was quite sufficient to have proven whether the case was one to bring before the court or not. Dr. Bradley put that aside, notwithstanding the fact that at the present time there is a public agitation in connection with this venereal disease. There is a book published by Dr. Cumpston which states that out of 450,000 men who went to the front, 55,000 were affected by venereal disease—12 per cent.

Mr. VOWLES: Did you see what the "Bulletin" said about that? One man may represent seven of those cases.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

The HOME SECRETARY: Anyhow, the very fact that this is a vital question shows that it should not have been put aside under any circumstances. These girls, if they were not properly tested, would run [10 p.m.] riot all over the place affecting men, and the men would re-affect women, until we cannot imagine the extent to which the ravage would extend. When Dr. Bradley allows these twenty cases to go about the place—

Mr. BRENNAN: He should have been put in gaol.

The HOME SECRETARY: And affecting the community, one cannot but conceive that he was neglecting his duty in not grappling with this question straight away; and further, he was disobeying the head of his department—the Commissioner of Health—in not carrying out his instructions. That was the attitude of Dr. Bradley towards Dr. Moore throughout the whole of the piece. He would not obey instructions, but followed his own sweet will. As far as diphtheria is concerned, no one can say it is not detrimental and should be grappled with, but when there was ample time, with the assistants Dr. Bradley had he ought not to have neglected the very vital question of venereal disease.

Mr. SIZER: You were asking the man to do double the work done in New South Wales, with half the staff.

The HOME SECRETARY: I am not troubling about what they are doing in New South Wales. I am dealing with what they are doing in Queensland.

Mr. SIZER: What they are not doing in Queensland.

The HOME SECRETARY: What was done by Dr. Harris. What is being done by Dr. Dean at the present time. I do not suppose anybody can take exception to Dr. Dean. He is a young doctor, twenty-eight years of age, and won his M.D. degree in the Sydney University. If Dr. Dean can do it, surely Dr. Bradley—who had twice as many actual assistants as Dr. Dean has—could have done the work efficiently. That is the present state of affairs. Now, I come to the allegation of sweating. I say that Dr. Bradley was not sweated. Dr. Bradley could have had ample time to do research work with the assistants he had. He neglected his health work, and he could not complain of being overworked. There is one point on which I want to dwell, and that is the question of refusing journals.

[Hon. J. Huxham.

In Dr. Harris's time we had some twenty-five journals on research and other health work. They were ample for Dr. Harris, and they should have been ample for Dr. Bradley, even with his staff, to get information, without asking for further journals. He asked for ten more, two of which were German publications which were not procurable during the war. He also asked that all arrears as far as these journals were concerned should be secured from 1914.

Mr. SIZER: He waived that.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes, because I asked him to do it. He certainly asked for them, and it would have been a waste of public money for us to have obtained them, because it would have involved an expenditure of somewhere near £100. Dr. Bradley could not digest the twenty-five journals he had. It was a question of getting these journals, and if he felt inclined to look at them he could do so.

Mr. SIZER: Does it not dawn upon the hon. gentleman that he wanted up-to-date journals?

The HOME SECRETARY: He had twenty-five journals coming in throughout the year—plenty for him to study—up-to-date works.

Mr. SIZER: Those journals have been there ever since the department has been there.

The HOME SECRETARY: I am speaking of journals which came in every month, not those which were out of date. He could have kept them up to date. We agreed to give him three more. They arrived, unfortunately, after Dr. Bradley had left. I do not know that the department would have been any the worse off even had they not arrived. The monkeys I have referred to. (Laughter.) It goes to prove how ridiculous it was for Dr. Bradley to have asked for those monkeys for health work. It was purely for research work—for his own predilections—and not for the needs of the department that he wanted them, because the monkeys were not needed. It is not a research department.

Mr. SIZER: Then it is not a Health Department.

The HOME SECRETARY: I have explained to the hon. gentleman that in New South Wales there are two distinct departments.

Mr. SIZER: They are under one control.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would ask the hon. member to allow the Minister to make his speech. The hon. member has already made his charges, and the hon. gentleman is endeavouring to reply to them, and is not being allowed. The hon. member is disorderly in interrupting.

The HOME SECRETARY: Let me give the hon. gentleman two concrete instances of how far Dr. Bradley overstepped the mark. We had a new microtome, which is an instrument that cuts skin and other specimens into very small sections. It is needed for microscopical work. It had been used under Dr. Harris, and was working very satisfactorily. Dr. Bradley asked for a new one, which was to cost £50. He made the suggestion that New South Wales had a second-hand one which we could get; but what was not good enough for New South Wales was not good enough for us. I was quite prepared to

meet him if our own was not satisfactory. We had had it tested by Dr. Dean, and also by the head lay assistant, and it has been shown to be doing good work. We also had the same report from Dr. Clarkson while he was there. It would have been a waste of public money to have ordered a new microtome which was not needed. Then there was a new paraffin oven for developing the films. When Dr. Dean saw it, he said, "Why, it is big enough for the Sydney University." What I have answers my purpose well." There are two concrete instances where Dr. Bradley thought all he had to do was to come along and ask for the expenditure of public money, and you must not say him nay. Further than that, let me point this out to hon. gentlemen, as a comparison in the cost of the Health Department under Dr. Bradley and Dr. Harris. Under Dr. Harris the expenditure for postage and petty cash, fuel, washing, ice, apparatus, chemicals, office furniture, animals, and fodder amounted in 1915-16 to £322 4s. 4d., and in 1916-17 to £335 12s. 2d. Under Dr. Bradley, in 1917-18 it was £532 15s. 9d., and in 1918-19 it was £839 10s. 10d. You will see it was nearly three times the amount under Dr. Bradley as it was under Dr. Harris.

Mr. SIZER: He was trying to make it efficient.

The HOME SECRETARY: I also want to show how well Dr. Bradley was dealt with here. During the ten months he was here he left no less than four times to go to Sydney. On 19th March he was away for ten days, in August for eleven days, in November for fourteen days, and then again for another eleven days. In fact, he was taking a perpetual holiday, and when he came back he did not make it up by attending to his work; he simply let it drift along to be attended to by other people.

Mr. SIZER: Give the facts as to why he went to Sydney. Did he not on one occasion go to see his father, who was dying?

The HOME SECRETARY: On one occasion, yes. I think, if his father was in such a dangerous state of health, it would have been better for him to have remained in Sydney than to have come here. Then Dr. Bradley, as was usual in such cases, had considerable help afforded to him when coming over here; among other things, in regard to his furniture. The passage of his sister-in-law, Miss Shellshear, was also paid for. It all goes to show that we gave Dr. Bradley all the consideration we could while he was here. And yet he has not a good word to say for the department or the Minister; but that does not trouble me. Dr. Bradley should be careful of his facts, and not try to make capital out of the position when he was treated so well by the department. My statement is perfectly clear, and it proves that Dr. Bradley has no cause to complain. During the ten months he was molly-coddled and made too much of, so that he thought that he could not be dispensed with.

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

Question put and passed.

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

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