

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 5 JULY 1922

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

WEDNESDAY, 5 JULY, 1922.

The SPEAKER (Hon. W. Bertram. *Marcel*) took the chair at half-past 3 o'clock.

PAPERS.

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

Regulations, dated 8th February and 16th March, 1922, under the Land Acts, 1910 to 1920.

Regulations, dated 24th February, 1922, under the Discharged Soldiers' Settlement Acts, 1917 to 1920.

QUESTIONS.

DAY LABOUR OR PIECEWORK ON GOVERNMENT WORKS.

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mirani*) asked the Secretary for Public Works—

"1. In connection with the list of public works mentioned by His Excellency the Governor when opening Parliament as being part of the programme to be dealt with during this session, is it the Government's intention to carry them out under the system of day work now prevailing on Government jobs, or will they introduce a system of piece or contract work, where conditions are favourable for it?"

"2. If the former, is he aware of the excessive cost of our railways and other public works, brought about by construction under this method of late years, and the huge load of unproductive indebtedness already piled up thereby, to be a heavy burden of indebtedness in years to come upon our producers?"

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH (*Mackay*) replied—

"1. (a) yes; (b) no.

"2. The question is based on wrong premises, is inaccurate, and misleading."

TRANSFER OF GOVERNMENT BANKING IN LONDON; CONTROL OF IMMIGRATION.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*) asked the Premier—

"1. Has the banking business of the Government in London, referred to in the memorandum of agreement made on the 1st April, 1922, yet been transferred from the Bank of England to the Commonwealth Bank; if so, from what date?"

"2. Has the Commonwealth Government full control of immigration overseas; if so, on or about what date did the arrangement commence?"

"3. Has he any knowledge that an immigration consultative committee, composed of Agents-General of the several Australian States, has been formed in London? Has he seen any reports of such meetings, and are they available to members? How often has this State been represented at such meetings by the Queensland Agent-General personally?"

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

"1. No.

"2. Yes, from the 1st March, 1921; but the States are consulted as to the number of immigrants they can satisfactorily absorb.

"3. No."

DISBURSEMENTS FROM WOUNDED AND MAIMED SOLDIERS FUND.

Mr. KERR asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

“Will he lay on the table of the House a statement of receipts and disbursements from 1st July, 1920, to 30th June, 1921, connected with the wounded and maimed soldiers fund, such account being apparently omitted in the Auditor-General's annual report for that year?”

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

“Yes. I lay a certified statement of receipts and disbursements on the table.”
Whereupon, Mr. Coyne laid on the table the information asked for.

COMPENSATION TO SOLDIER SETTLERS IN HIGHLANDS SETTLEMENT.

Mr. SIZER (*Nandah*) asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

“In view of the disastrous losses entailed by certain soldier settlers on the Highlands Settlement owing to their banana crops being ruined by frost, is it intended to grant those settlers any monetary compensation, in addition to the arrangement made to rehabilitate them on virgin Crown land in the Mary Valley district?”

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS replied—

“The settlers affected have been relieved of all loan expenditure in respect of the blocks vacated, and will be eligible to again receive loan advances up to the limit of £625. It has also been approved to make available to such settlers certain additional amounts in view of improvements effected by them on their vacated blocks. These payments will not be charged to the settler's loan account, and will be made as soon as work in addition to that which is being provided for from loan account has been carried out by the settler on the new holding to the value of the amount approved in each case.”

GAZETTED HOLIDAYS.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowoong*) asked the Home Secretary—

“How many, and what, holidays have been gazetted throughout the State from 30th June, 1921, to 30th June, 1922?”

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. W. McCormack, *Cairns*) replied—

“No holidays were gazetted throughout the State in the period mentioned.”

PURCHASE OF MUNGANA MINES.

Mr. MAXWELL asked the Secretary for Mines—

“Will he inform the House from whom and when the Mungana mines were purchased, and what amount of money was paid for them by the Government?”

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. A. J. Jones, *Pudington*) replied—

“From Fredrick Reid for and on behalf of himself and Mungana Mines, Limited. On 18th January, 1921, the general manager, Chillagoe State Smelters, by agreement with the owner of Mungana Mines, undertook to work the

mines on tribute on a royalty basis with the right of purchase. On the 25th March, 1922, the option was exercised on the following terms and conditions:—£10,000 cash, less royalty and less the amount advanced by Mines Department for developmental work, and the balance, £30,000, to be paid by way of royalty as the ore is produced at the rate of 4 per cent. on the gross value of metal contents of ore up to £5 per ton, and 5 per cent. (per centum) on ore values which exceeded £5 per ton.”

I take this opportunity of laying on the table the documents in connection with the transaction.

DATE OF DELIVERY OF FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

Mr. FRY (*Kurilpa*) asked the Premier—

“Will he inform the House when the Financial Statement will be presented to Parliament?”

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

“I am unable to inform the House of the precise date on which the Financial Statement will be presented, but it will be at an early date.”

UNEMPLOYED REGISTERED AT TOOWOOMBA LABOUR BUREAU.

Mr. T. R. ROBERTS (*East Toowoomba*) asked the Secretary for Public Works—

“1. What number were registered as unemployed at the Toowoomba Labour Bureau on Thursday, the 4th January, 1922?”

“2. What number were on register on 4th February, 4th March, 4th April, 4th May, 3rd June, 3rd July?”

“3. What number of persons so registered were sent to employment through the agency of the bureau—(a) private; (b) Government work?”

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH replied—

“1. 146. (2nd January, 1922.)

“2. Number of unemployed on register on 1st February, 1922, 262; 1st March, 1922, 123; 1st April, 1922, 157; 1st May, 1922, 131; 1st June, 1922, 123; 1st July, 1922; 90.

“3. Number sent to employment through agency of the bureau—private work—January, 84; February, 94; March, 65; April, 20; May, 44; June, 49, total, 356. Government work—January, 45; February, 12; March, 13; April, 19; May, 34; June, 22; total, 150.”

MAPS OF ELECTORATES IN ELECTORAL ROLLS.

Mr. T. R. ROBERTS asked the Attorney-General—

“Will he arrange with the Chief Electoral Registrar to insert a map of the electorates in copies of electoral rolls as provided prior to alteration of boundaries of electorates?”

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Flinders*) replied—

“It was found that the maps previously inserted in the electoral rolls were of little practical use, and larger maps showing more details of the respective electoral districts have been prepared and have been to-day supplied to hon. members.”

STANDING ORDERS.

PRESENTATION OF REPORT FROM COMMITTEE.

The PREMIER, on behalf of Mr. Speaker, as Chairman, laid on the table the report of the Standing Orders Committee recommending certain alterations in and additions to the Standing Orders, and moved—

“That the report be printed.”

Question put and passed.

PRIMARY PRODUCERS' ORGANISATION BILL.

INITIATION.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. W. N. GILLIES, *Eacham*) moved—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirability of introducing a Bill to promote the agricultural and rural industries by the organisation of the primary producers of Queensland in a completely unified national organisation and for other incidental purposes.”

Question put and passed.

TRADE UNIONS (PROPERTY) BILL.

INITIATION.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Flinders*) moved—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirability of introducing a Bill to amend in a certain particular the Real Property Act of 1877 and the Trade Union Act of 1915.”

Question put and passed.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Flinders*) moved—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirability of introducing a Bill to abolish capital punishment and to amend the Criminal Code and other enactments accordingly.”

Question put and passed.

SITTING DAYS.

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

“That, unless otherwise ordered, the House will meet for the despatch of business at 3 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday in each week, and that on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Friday, and after 7 o'clock p.m. on Thursday, Government business do take precedence of all other business.”

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): I called “Not formal” to this motion, because it is not part of the usual method of procedure to ask hon. members to sit on Friday. It has been the custom in the past to make Friday a sitting day after Parliament has been sitting some little while. It is an innovation to ask hon.

members who have come here at the opening of a session, without notice, to sit on Fridays.

The PREMIER: They have not come here without notice.

Mr. VOWLES: Without notice to sit on Fridays. I would like the Premier to take into consideration the fact that we on this side are just as desirous as hon. members opposite of completing the business of the House as quickly as possible, provided due consideration is given to all the matters brought before us, but we do not want to be rushed—more particularly under the altered conditions of the House. We are going to have measures put before us, I suppose, like we had last session. We want time for reflection. We say that there should be plenty of breathing space given to hon. members to study Bills, more particularly in the Committee stages, so that we can bring forward amendments and intelligently consider the matters brought forward. If we are to start off with a rush, and—as was done last session—to have the most important business introduced at a late hour on Friday night, when hon. members are tired and country members on both sides of the Chamber are desirous of getting to their homes, it is not likely to bring about the good legislation we would all like to see. I offer the suggestion to the Premier that, instead of sitting on Friday night, which will deprive many hon. members who live in the West and on the North Coast from getting to their homes, we should start on Friday morning at, say, 10 o'clock, and finish our business at 6 o'clock in the evening, so that we could all get away to our homes.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. VOWLES: There are certain Northern members who visit their electorate once a year, when they go round in a car with a Minister and have their expenses paid.

Mr. COLLINS: That is not true. The hon. member for Townsville is looking at you.

Mr. VOWLES: I know that these gentlemen do go round with Ministers on these departmental tours, and do their electioneering.

Mr. PEASE: Why don't you shift your business down here?

Mr. VOWLES: We like to go back to our homes, which should be studied to a certain extent, and that can be done by permitting us to sit in the morning, as we did last session, and adjourn at 6 o'clock in the evening. I commend that suggestion to the Premier, and I think it would be agreeable to both sides of the House. I know that there are hon. members sitting behind the Government who are as anxious to get to their homes as members of the Opposition are.

Mr. MORGAN (*Marilla*): I would like to support the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition. As one who represents a Western electorate, I think it would be much better if we met at 10 o'clock in the morning. Country members have to travel considerable distances, and we would be content if the Premier would agree to meet at 10 o'clock on Friday mornings, and adjourn the House at 6 o'clock in the evening. We would get through the work just as quickly by that method. That would be very convenient to those hon. members who have not become, what I may term, professional

politicians. There are some who have become professional politicians, and who live on the game.

Mr. KIRWAN: What is the objection to professional politicians? You have just had a lot to say about studying Bills. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. MORGAN: I trust that the Premier will give this matter consideration, as it will be a great convenience to country members, and nothing will be lost from a Government point of view.

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): I would like to support the remarks of the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Murrumbidgee in connection with this matter. I think the suggestion put forward that we should meet at 10 o'clock in the morning each Friday, and adjourn at 6 o'clock, is a very reasonable request indeed. The country members have to travel long distances to come here at the commencement of the week, and it is a difficult matter for some of them to get to their homes on Saturday, if they have to sit here on Friday night. I take it that the country members want to keep in touch with their electorates as much as possible, in order to find out the particular requirements of their constituents, and it is necessary for them to go home every week-end. It is all very well for members who represent city electorates, and who live in the city. We can stop here till half-past 10 on Friday night without any inconvenience, but it is different with country members. Seeing that the request is such a reasonable one, the Premier might very well give it his favourable consideration. Nothing can be lost by adopting the proposal put forward by the leader of the Opposition. In fact, I think it would be a good thing if we knocked off at 6 o'clock every night in the week. (Hear, hear!) We would do better business, and I am pretty certain that we would save the country a considerable amount of money if we knocked off at 6 o'clock every night in the week. I hope the Premier will give the matter his favourable consideration. Seeing that the Premier has introduced his motion in the first week of the session, I ask him to exempt Friday night of this week from his proposal, so as to give the country members a chance to get home.

The PREMIER (Hon. E. G. Theodore, *Chillagoe*): In reply to the suggestion put forward by hon. members opposite, I regret that the suggestion made is not a practicable one, because Ministers have to attend to their departments in the morning.

Mr. MORGAN: It is only one day in the week.

The PREMIER: Ministers are already engaged on duties which keep them away from their departments a sufficient length of time, and, if we held the sittings of Parliament in the mornings, it would become very embarrassing to Ministers to have to attend to their departments and to the House as well, and it would be difficult for Ministers to keep up the work of their departments.

Mr. FLETCHER: You did it last session.

The PREMIER: Yes, we did it last session. That is why we are anxious to sit four days a week in the early part of the session, so as to avoid, if possible, morning sessions later on. We had morning sittings last session, and it caused great inconvenience to our departments.

Mr. MORGAN: The Federal Parliament sits in the daytime.

The PREMIER: The Federal Parliament has such unimportant things to attend to that Ministers can allow their officers to run their departments. In Queensland the departments are run by the Ministers, and we have to attend to them. I quite realise that there is a certain amount of inconvenience to country members who desire to return to their districts at the end of the week, when they are asked to sit on Friday night. That can be easily understood, and, as far as it is practicable to do it, I will endeavour to make an arrangement with the leader of the Opposition to allow those members who must get away at the week-end to be absent when only unimportant business is being dealt with in the Chamber. I will try to make that arrangement.

Mr. TAYLOR: Why not exempt the first Friday?

The PREMIER: I will talk the matter over with the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mirani*): It looks as if the interests of the country are being sacrificed for the sake of party. Why should we not follow the usual practice and start with three days a week. There is only one House now, and we should be allowed more time for deliberation, so that we can get the fullest information regarding all legislation brought before us. We have no Upper House now to correct our mistakes, and that is why we should be more careful. I well remember when the present Government were in Opposition. They always insisted that the House should sit for four or five months, so that they would have ample time to do the work of Parliament. They always contended that Parliament should be called together earlier in the year, but of late years we find that Parliament is called together and the business rushed through in a few weeks. Hon. members opposite, when in Opposition, held that five months was a proper [4 p.m.] time in which two Houses might do the work of the country; now that one House is doing that work, it is all the more necessary that the fullest time should be given to it. Why all this haste about a few weeks? Why can we not sit longer and do the work properly? It is impossible for members of the Opposition to do justice to it, and discharge their duties under such a motion, and I make a strong protest against it.

Question put and passed.

OFFICIALS IN PARLIAMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Flinders*) 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 Amend the Constitution of Queensland by further amending the Officials in Parliament Act of 1896 in certain particulars.”

Mr. T. R. ROBERTS (*East Toowoomba*): I called “Not formal” to this motion because I am distinctly opposed to it, and it affords one of the first opportunities to carry into effect the suggestion made by the Premier a few days ago when he pointed to the very straitened financial condition of the country and the need for a saving in expenditure. In addition to that, I notice that two hon. members on this side have, by notice of motion and question, directed attention to

Mr. T. R. Roberts.]

the need for reducing expenditure so far as this House itself is concerned—that is, in the salaries of Ministers and members. We must recognise that it was believed that under Federation Queensland and the other States would be able to reduce the cost of government.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will remember that last session I pointed out that this was not a stage at which a Bill could be discussed. The opportunity to do that will come to the hon. member later on.

Mr. T. R. ROBERTS: Then I shall content myself at this stage with saying that I intend to oppose the Bill. It gives us a means by which we can save one Minister's salary.

Mr. VOWLES (*Daibly*): I did not call "Not formal" to the motion, Mr. Speaker, in view of your ruling of last session. I understood that no debate would be permitted at this stage.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

(Question put and passed.)

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE (*Oxley*): I would, first of all, like to express to the leader of the Opposition my appreciation of his giving me the honour of being the first on this side to discuss this motion. Secondly, I wish to express my sincere sympathy with the two hon. members who yesterday did their best to bolster up a losing cause. I am sure that we all appreciate the fact that they were doing their very utmost for the Government they represent, but I am equally sure that, when they sat down, they wondered what it was all about. If they voice the opinions of the present Government for the coming session, then the duty of the Opposition will be a very simple one.

I wish to take great exception to one statement which the hon. member for Leichhardt made, which I consider to be quite heartless, and, in fact, unnecessary. He taunted Queensland with being the only country in the world that had had Labour in power for three successive Parliaments. There is no need to remind us of that. One has only to walk down the streets of Brisbane and other cities in the State and count the unemployed in their thousands—(Government laughter)—and note the stagnation that exists in order to find all the evidence that is necessary without the hon. member for Leichhardt talking about that obvious fact.

According to the hon. member, the Governor's Speech was a courageous effort. I call it a colourless effusion. The outstanding thing which should have appeared in it is a reference to the adoption by the Labour party of this communistic doctrine that they have swallowed, lock, stock, and barrel—according to the Premier—this doctrine which has been endorsed in all parts of Australia by the party to which they are attached. Yet it is of such vast importance and so whets the appetites of hon. members opposite that they pass through the first Governor's Speech presented to any Parliament since it was made law in Labour ranks without a single reference to it! What is the deduction? It simply shows that hon. members are dishonest to the cause they represent or that they are out on an expedition to gull the public and draw their attention from this

[Mr. T. R. Roberts.

doctrine, which is to be dished up on a more auspicious occasion. It is astounding that no reference is made in the Speech to this feature, which, as we know, has been engaging the attention of Labour representatives throughout Australia during the last few months.

I wish, however, to congratulate the Government on one thing—that is, their discovery that Queensland's great need is a proper attention to the lot and requirements of the primary producers. (Government laughter.) We are delighted to see that, after seven years' occupancy of the Treasury benches, these gentlemen are at last waking up to the fact that the primary producer is the backbone of Queensland. Rather will I say this, that hon. members opposite who hold that belief would be very much more honest and honourable in their actions if they would do as I did—come over here and join the party which represents him. (Government laughter.)

Mr. BRENNAN: You have ratted, all right.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: There is no question that the primary producer in Queensland needs some proper sympathy and attention at this present moment. He needs some scientific advice to help in the growing of his crops; some business guidance in their marketing; and some relief from the overburdening rates, taxes, and other impositions which are put upon him by Brisbane and other centres. I am delighted that hon. gentlemen opposite—that all sections of this House, one can safely say—to-day are alive to his interests.

The PREMIER: The Nationalists also.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Yes.

The PREMIER: Then why did you leave them?

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: I do not wish to deprive the Nationalists of the credit of any sincere desire in that direction, as I believe they are honourable and sincere also in what they state in that regard. (Interruption.)

Mr. POLLOCK: Why did you rat on them?

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Certain hon. gentlemen opposite—I say certain of them, because they do not all mean it—are sincerely desirous of doing the right thing. Why do they not, then, come over here and support that party which stands for the primary producers' interests primarily? Instead of doing so, they are acting as whitened sepulchres, knowing all the time they are committed to a policy which means the extermination of the farmer. These gentlemen, having lost the interest and the support of their town constituencies, and knowing that their day of defeat is dawning, are looking round for further opportunities of extending their lease of life. They see that the primary producer is starting to come into his own, and therefore they search for knowledge and information—stealing wherever they can and usurping it from others—and put forward a policy which is going to save the primary producer. All I can say is, good luck to the primary producer. Our advice to him is to take all he can get. But we wish to assure him—and we believe he is alive to it now—that these gentlemen are only making hollow-sounding promises. How can a party which is absolutely committed to a policy of extermination of all private ownership and every personal achievement, with the same voice

say it is going to assist the primary producer to acquire his rights? These people are out to exterminate what is now his own. The Premier, at that historical conference which took place in Brisbane last October, said, "Where does the farmer come in in this communistic stunt?" or words to the effect. The hon. gentleman knows where he comes in. He comes in by being pushed out; by being deprived of his personal liberties and robbed of the ownership of all that he holds dear to himself and his family. Yet these hon. gentlemen say no one must breathe a word about this being a political move—They say, that that is not intended; that it is a self-sacrificing stunt on the part of the Government! They say they are out to assist the primary producer, thinking they are going to get his support. I hope the hon. gentlemen are sincere in their intention to assist the primary producer. We will do all we can to assist him and to assist them to live up to their word.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: But, all the time we know, and the primary producer knows, that theirs is the hand which is going to strike him. There is no supposition in that. What is the resolution which was passed at this Labour Parliament in Melbourne quite recently? I am going to read it to the House, because it must be preached from the housetops in order to let the people see where these gentlemen stand at the present moment. It reads—

"That this congress, desiring a united working class front in this country, reaffirms the industrial and political policy adopted by the June Congress of 1921, and endorses, as far as it is consistent with this motion, the work of the Brisbane Convention of October, 1921, and urges the State branches of the Australian Labour party and other working class parties and groups to forthwith fall into line so that a uniform political policy may be presented throughout Australia, and calls upon the Australian Labour party to make provision along the lines of the British and New Zealand Labour parties for the incorporation of all schools of genuine labour thought and activity, with freedom of propaganda and organisation, while at the same time requiring a loyal acceptance of the decisions of the representative conferences."

It says there must be a loyal acceptance of these decisions. What were those decisions?—socialisation of industry, production, and exchange—socialisation, which is going to make every man a vassal of the State. Yet they go to the farmer and say he is entitled to the full product of his labour. At the very first opportunity, when they have received a new lease of life, they will take from that man all he possesses and make him a vassal of the State.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: No!

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Hon. members opposite say "No!" What does the "socialisation of industry, production, and exchange" mean? It is time this hypocrisy was exposed.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: It is time this country was awakened to a realisation of the menace which is at its doorstep—which, as the hon. member for Leichhardt says,

has been endured in Queensland for three consecutive Parliaments. As though we did not know it! There was no necessity for the hon. member to call attention to what is so obvious a fact.

I am going to deal with a few points which were raised by the hon. member for Leichhardt. If he is the mouthpiece for the party he represents, he has a very limited knowledge of the economic circumstances existing at the present time. The hon. member referred to bankruptcy on the other side of the world. The deduction to be drawn, evidently, was that this is a prosperous State. The only countries in other parts of the world that are bankrupt are those which have adopted the communistic doctrine for which hon. gentlemen opposite stand.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Great Britain, the seat of the British Empire, not only stands very high financially, but she is paying off by tens of millions per annum her public debt, whereas in Queensland we are increasing it by millions per annum. Where is there confirmation of the hon. member's remarks?

He also said that the old order had been replaced by the new. If he meant that the prosperity of the present day is endangered, that unemployment is rampant in our midst, that every man is losing his desire to work and to achieve anything, I quite agree with him that the old order has been exchanged for the new. Is that a source of gratification? Is it not rather a matter to be deplored than to be boasted about—as the hon. gentleman evidently did yesterday?

The hon. gentleman also referred to settlers and investors being encouraged. That is precisely what we have contended should be done. But how can you expect to encourage settlers and investors to come to Queensland when all you desire is to get as many people and as much property into the State only in order that you may put into operation your communistic doctrine—after the next election, as you hope—and you will have more material to play with, more property to assist you? How can you expect men to come from other parts of the world where they live in freedom, with encouragement to progress and become industrious, and throw themselves into a community of men such as hon. gentlemen opposite, who are bound to the doctrine of the extermination of all property and all individual effort? The hon. member also made reference to the public indebtedness of those resident in Queensland. He mentioned, if I heard him correctly, that it amounted to £141 per capita. I would remind him that that is not correct. The actual public debt of the State is £182 per capita, £75 of which is Commonwealth and £107 of which is State public debt. I make that correction, because the public debt of Queensland is becoming quite a serious matter, and we have to bear it in mind when arranging for further loans which are going to increase our indebtedness per capita.

The hon. member referred to new loans, land settlement, and railways. I want to remind him that, as business men who have an eye to the lot of the taxpayer and those who are directly or indirectly affected by high taxation, we must look at the public debt and see where we stand at the present moment. Does the hon. gentleman appreciate the fact

Mr. Elphinstone.

that last year we paid in interest on the public debt £3,236,000, whilst, when his Government came into power in 1915, the total interest paid on the public debt was only £1,975,000? There is an increase in seven years of £1,311,000, equivalent to an increase of 65 per cent. Yet the hon. gentleman talks fluently and easily of greater expenditure in this direction and that, forgetting altogether that the day of reckoning must come round, and that in the meantime the taxpayers and those who are indirectly affected are called upon to meet greater exactions every year. I also want to remind the hon. gentleman that there are £26,000,000 falling due for renewal between now and 1925, a great amount of which falls due for renewal or redemption in the present year, which almost inevitably means greater interest. I would remind him also that a large amount of that money is invested in our railways costing £4 3s. 2d. per cent., and yet, as a result of the hon. gentleman or his party's administration of those railways last year they actually earned only 9s. 9d. per cent. to meet that interest debt of £4 3s. 2d. The hon. gentleman and his party talk easily and airily of greater expenditure in this direction and that, forgetting altogether the economic effect it is going to have, which effect is visible throughout this State at the present moment.

The hon. gentleman also referred to interstate immigration, as he called it. This is the first time that I have heard of a man coming across the border of New South Wales into Queensland being called an immigrant. However, that is the position. I would remind the hon. gentleman that that influx of population is not due to Queensland's prosperity, but because the flotsam and jetsam of labour find that Queensland presents a haven of rest and feeds them, and almost clothes and houses them, without asking them to perform any duty in exchange. What else could you expect? Any man who is tired of work in other parts of Australia to-day naturally comes to Queensland to live on the Government and upon the taxpayer, as is happening at the present moment, and instead of getting solace and satisfaction from that fact, it is something that is seriously to be deplored.

The hon. gentleman referred to a thousand millions of people living in the Pacific, who should be customers of Queensland. I should very much like to see even a fraction of those people customers of Queensland. But I would remind the hon. gentleman and the party opposite that the only way you can get these people to become customers is by producing an article that you can sell to them in competition with other countries. That is the trouble we are up against now. Owing to the methods that the party opposite have introduced into the industries of Queensland, the cost of production is so great that you have little or no chance of competing with other countries in supplying these one thousand millions of people in the Pacific. If we desire to find an outlet for our products in the Pacific Isles and the East generally, we have to face the situation; and the cost of production and the cost at which you can sell your products are essential features in these days when the trade competition is alive throughout the world.

The hon. gentleman also made reference to deficits, pointing out that the accumulated

[*Mr. Elphinstone.*

deficit of Queensland was something which compared very favourably with the deficits of other States. He made reference to Victoria, saying that hon. members on this side quote Victoria as an example to them at every opportunity. I want to remind that hon. member that during the last four years the aggregate surpluses in Victoria have been £1,000,000, and that without increasing taxation during that period. Here is the State which he holds up as one that is unfavourable compared with Queensland, and yet it has carried on operations during war and during the aftermath of war, and has accumulated surpluses amounting to £1,000,000 without increasing taxation. For that hon. gentleman's edification, I want to call attention to the taxation per head in the various States, so that he can ascertain what virtue there is attached to the Queensland Government for ending up the year with a deficit of only £188,000. In 1916, taxation per head in Victoria was 29s. 3d., and in 1921, it was 50s. In 1916, in Queensland, the taxation per head was 42s. 9d., whereas in 1921 it was 95s. 10d.—more than double what it was in 1916, and very nearly double what it is in Victoria. Where is the gratification, therefore, in having what the hon. member called a comparatively small deficit, seeing the Government have been extracting from the overburdened taxpayer these enormous sums of money which are represented by that per capita taxation?

Mr. COLLINS: Taxation of the wealthy.

Mr. FOLEY: Who paid those taxes?

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: You and the people you represent. That is one of the things to which the hon. gentlemen opposite are blind, or have not the comprehension to understand. If these gentlemen think that the taxpayer is the last man to be affected by the taxes which they are called upon to pay, they have not a very clear conception of the situation, and I am surprised that the hon. member for Bowen, who has been so long in this House, should every session, parrot-like, contend that the effect of taxation rests on and is confined to the taxpayer. If he goes among his own electors, and is sincerely sympathetic to their interests, he will find that one of the burdens that his constituents are suffering from to-day is this taxation, which is passed on and which must be passed on.

The PREMIER: No. If it were, you would not be crying out now.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: The hon. gentleman has said so himself in that document that he set his signature to in 1915, where he clearly states that it is the producer who suffers and the worker who prays. Hon. members opposite shake their heads like automata, because it does not pay them to agree to that deduction at the present stage. It is true, no less.

The PREMIER: You would not be in such a state of excitement if that were so.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Passing on to another phase of the criticism of the hon. member for Leichhardt, he finds comfort from the fact that the wages in Queensland are higher and the hours less than in other States. I quite agree; but what is the result of that? If he only studies his "Knibbs," he will see that it has affected

industry, and, as the hon. gentleman has evidently not taken the trouble of finding it out for himself, I am going to read it for him. He will find it in his last quarterly "Knibbs." The increase in the number of factory hands in the different States during the last six years are—

New South Wales	... 28,630
Victoria	... 26,909
South Australia	... 4,934
Western Australia	... 2,433
Queensland	... 1,117

Queensland is at the bottom of the list. The increases in the number of factories in operation during the same period are—

New South Wales	... 558
Victoria	... 1,119
South Australia	... 172
Western Australia	... 115
Queensland	... 20

This is the effect of high wages and shorter hours. The highest rates of pay prevail in Queensland, clearly showing that we cannot compete in production with other States. This is an unnatural and unnecessary burden placed upon industry.

Mr. PEASE: Quite wrong.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Let me make my position clear so that I shall not be misinterpreted. Personally, I do not stand for any reduction in the standard of living in Queensland, providing a man gives sufficient production for the salary which he enjoys to enable the employer to recoup himself. Production must be increased, and the only way it can be increased without loss to the worker is by increasing the hours which he can work. I stand for a 48-hour week, and there are ways and means whereby the worker, who really works, can actually increase his standard of living and standard of pay if he is given the necessary encouragement and the opportunity to do so. If the hon. gentleman can find comfort in the fact that we are paying a higher rate of wages and that men work less hours in Queensland, unmindful of the rate of production, it shows his limited vision in regard to the economic situation.

The hon. member also pointed out platitudes which we very frequently hear from hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to Savings Bank deposits being higher per capita in Queensland than in any other State. In a State like Queensland, the Government Savings Bank is not the proper absorbing custodian for the people's savings. Industry should be the custodian of the people's savings, so that we can develop our resources and reverse this practical decrease in factories that is going on. The mere fact of people going to the Savings Bank and to other banks to deposit their money is clear evidence that they have no confidence in the country so far as industrial development is concerned; and I should be very much more satisfied if I saw those deposits decreasing, so long as we saw that natural increase in industry and development which we are so anxious to encourage and cultivate.

Mr. KIRWAN: What about the great bank smash in 1893? There was no Labour Government in power then.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: The hon. member also referred to taxation. He found comfort in the fact that in Queensland a man in receipt of an income of £200 per annum—he should have said £208 per annum—

Mr. FOLEY: £4 a week.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Pays 5s. per annum in income tax, and the hon. member compared it with Victoria, where the same man pays 17s. 6d. per annum in income tax. Why did he not study the table which the Premier took great pains to introduce into "Hansard" in the last session of Parliament, and this is what he would have found—

that a man in receipt of £234 [4.30 p.m.] per annum pays his 21s. 10d. income tax in Queensland, and 21s. in Victoria; a man in receipt of £250 per annum pays 32s. 11d. in Queensland, and 25s. in Victoria; a man in receipt of £260 per annum pays 40s. 3d. in Queensland, and 27s. 6d. in Victoria; a man in receipt of £286 per annum pays 59s. 2d. in Queensland, and 34s. in Victoria; a man in receipt of £300 per annum pays 70s. 3d. in Queensland, and 37s. 6d. in Victoria? That is another of those illustrations that we get so tired of where these gentlemen just pick out one isolated instance which they dish up to the people, and then say what a wonderful Government this Labour Government is, and they omit a true description of the position, or a general comparison, which they know in the long run must be against their arguments. There is one thing that the hon. member absolutely omitted to mention, and that is that there is a poll tax upon all unionists. Although these men are charged 5s. per head on an income of £208, they have to pay a poll tax of 10s. per annum to maintain and establish some Labour literature by which these gentlemen hope to reach their Utopia of unionism and socialism throughout the world. The poor workers whom these hon. members opposite protest they are so anxious to assist are made to contribute 10s. per head to some Labour literature before they are permitted to work in the state of freedom for which the hon. gentleman stands. That is a deplorable and dastardly state of affairs, and yet the hon. gentleman does not say anything about it.

Mr. DASH: You don't like it.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: The best propaganda we have to-day is the Labour literature. We have only to encourage our friends to digest Labour literature, and they begin to understand—not what hon. gentlemen opposite protest and try to place before the people, but what they actually stand for. To-day the Labour machine seems to be at variance with the Labour Press. The Labour organisations preach one thing—socialisation—and the Labour politician preaches another thing. He knows that it is not politic to put in the window the articles they have for sale. They therefore put in some innocent looking piece of goods which they expect will attract the people to their Labour shops. Why? Because their jobs are dependent on it. They know quite well, as was stated frequently in the conference discussions at Sydney and Melbourne, that, if they allowed it to be known to the world that Labour stands for this extreme socialism, their "cake is dough." So it is dough, and we are going to see that it is kept dough.

Another point, and then I have finished with the hon. member for Leichhardt, who made quite a temperate and pleasing speech. He said that population was increasing in Queensland. So it is in the parts that this Government stand for; that is, the towns in Queensland. How, where, and why?

Mr. Elphinstone. |

Simply because of the unpopularity of primary production; simply because the man on the land is not given a chance, and his sons and daughters are driven to centres where comfort awaits them without effort, where relief can be given them whether they work or not, and where all kinds of devices which play upon human susceptibilities, such as Golden Caskets and Liberty Fairs, are available. Races every day in the week. Everything which panders to the weaknesses of humanity is encouraged, and finds a place in the administration by hon. members opposite. That is the fact in regard to the population of Queensland—a decrease in the country, and an increase in the towns and cities. I fail to see, in that regard, where we can find encouragement or satisfaction.

I want to refer now to one or two passages in the Governor's Speech, and I am distinctly amused at the anxiety which the hon. members opposite show for the meat industry at the present moment. They say the conditions in the pastoral industry are a source of grave anxiety to them, and they show their anxiety so pronouncedly, that they are not prepared to give one ounce of relief or sympathy to the man from whom they are extracting, by means of repudiatory legislation, retrospective rents for eight, nine, or more years. That is their anxiety. Most people's anxiety is indicated in some practical way, but all their concern is in extracting from these poor harassed people every pound they can get out of them, for the purpose of bolstering up their socialistic doctrines, and their losing State enterprises. We will have a great deal more to say on this meat question before the session ends, and there will be those on the Opposition side who can deal with it more effectively and more intimately than I can; nevertheless, there is the outstanding fact that their anxiety is such that they are not prepared to give these men one ounce of relief when it comes to finance.

Mr. STOPFORD: They got a 20 per cent. reduction in railway freights.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Will the hon. member for Mount Morgan argue that that 20 per cent. reduction is actually relief? Where is the economic soundness, and where is the business in simply reducing the railway freights for the benefit of an oppressed class, and making another section of the community pay? That may afford temporary relief; but to give rebates in railway freights to an oppressed industry is not a wise or brave thing when the railways are a heavily losing proposition, and the position will become a very serious one before we have gone very far.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: What do you suggest?

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Our railways are already a losing concern.

Mr. PEASE: Is the rebate not a good thing?

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: As a temporary palliative, yes; but it is not good finance; it is not a statesmanlike method of dealing with the situation.

The State Insurance Office is again paraded as being the one pet lamb which hon. gentlemen opposite can advance as an indication of the success of State enterprise. Just before commencing this speech I was reading the remarks of the Premier at that famous Brisbane conference, when he stated that, if the socialisation of industry was to be

brought about, it means that our State Insurance Office would be run for the benefit of those who are engaged in it. That is exactly the position. Here is this pet lamb that they talk so much of going to be sacrificed shortly to the demands and exigencies of the socialistic doctrine. Let me remind hon. members opposite once more that where you make insurance compulsory, and where you give a monopoly to the State, it cannot possibly refrain from paying. Why do they not give greater publicity to those other State enterprises which are conveniently eliminated from the Governor's Speech? Why not make reference to the State cattle stations, and those other enterprises in which there is over £1,000,000 of the State's money invested? No reference is made to them at all. Why? Because they know they are a colossal failure, and they simply seize hold of this one little State enterprise which, as I say, is a monopoly, and which is compulsory, and what else can you expect from a position like that?

Mr. RYAN: Station owners are giving cows and calves away up North.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: I must take up that interjection. Why are they giving away calves?

Mr. RYAN: They are giving both cows and calves away.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: It is simply to evade the extortionate taxation imposed upon them at the present moment by hon. gentlemen opposite. It simply shows once more what a poor conception these hon. gentlemen have of the economic situation.

I will pass on to the American loans, which figure somewhat largely in the Speech. We have had two of those loans during the last year. I want to point out the deduction which can be drawn from those loans, if you study the price at which they stand at the present moment. The first loan carried interest at 7 per cent., and was issued at the price of £99. That loan is standing in the market at the present day of £10 premium, clearly showing that we paid too high a price for it. It should not be standing at £10 premium when so short a time has elapsed since it was borrowed. Had we exercised business acumen at that stage, we should have been able to launch that loan at a much more favourable rate than was the case, because the market price of the loan should not stand at £110 only a few months after it is issued. The second loan was floated at 6 per cent. at the issue price of 96½, and, when it is actually only a few months old, it stands at a premium of 3½ per cent. That clearly shows that hon. gentlemen opposite were not so wise as they imagined in rushing in to borrow money from that part of the world, when it is clearly indicated by the price at which the loans stand to-day that they could have made a very much better arrangement even with these people in America.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You were not very wise in trying to block us from getting it from another part of the world.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: I want to read to the House an extract from a circular which the Metropolitan Water and Sewerage Board here received from an American broker in regard to a loan, which shows the view of the American moneyed people so far as Queensland is concerned, and the intimate knowledge

[Mr. Elphinstone.]

which hon. gentlemen opposite argued they had about conditions here.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Where does that appear?

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: It appeared in the Brisbane "Courier," and the records are to be found in the Metropolitan Water and Sewerage Board files, if the hon. gentleman cares to read them. The circular states—

"Well over 30 per cent. of the board's sterling issue in London is held in the United States for investment. Through the issue of the dollar loans here of the State of Queensland the sound conditions and high standing of Queensland have been impressed on the serious investors in this country, and the brilliant success of the Metropolitan Water and Sewerage Board finds on all sides most complimentary expression."

We can well understand that, if the American investor is satisfied with the brilliant success of the Metropolitan Water and Sewerage Board, he is quite satisfied with the Labour Government, because they are both very costly experiments to Queensland. The statement that these hon. gentlemen in America are obsessed with this valuable security in Queensland is not only depreciated by this extract I have read, but it is denied by the rate at which these loans are quoted at the present moment. It shows that the security is not so much appreciated, otherwise we should have got a much more favourable rate on the issue of the loans.

Reference is also made in the Speech to the Inkerman irrigation scheme, given, no doubt, as an example of what the Government intend to do with regard to water conservation. It is once more necessary to dwell on the facts of this first enterprise of the Government in regard to irrigation. Here is a scheme which at its inception was estimated to cost £131,000. The figures, which will no doubt shortly be placed before us, will indicate that this scheme has cost nearer £500,000, or nearly four times the estimated cost.

Mr. COLLINS: That is not true. Stick to the truth.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: What is the effect upon the farmer—the man who has to shoulder the burden in regard to this irrigation scheme? For every 50 acres which he has under cultivation he is to be called upon to pay £366 per annum. Now what farmer can or will pay that sum for just getting a certain amount of water for a few days? There are only 130 wells in the whole scheme, and, therefore, I argue with some experience of the matter.

Mr. COLLINS: Experience!

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: If £1,000 had been placed at the disposal of each of these farmers to create his own irrigation scheme, he would have had a more efficient one, at a cost of £60 per annum in interest and redemption, whereas he is now called upon to pay £366 per annum for a scheme the efficiency of which has yet to be proved. The hon. member for Bowen is pleased and gratified with this wonderful exhibition of business inefficiency. No doubt the hon. member can tell us more about this later on. I may say that since last session I have had the privilege of going over that area and know a great deal more about it, and I am simply talking of the position not only as I found it, but as

I know it to exist from the reports furnished to us by the Auditor-General.

Mr. PEASE: What do you think of it?

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: I have already said what I think of it, and, if the hon. member is not able to follow my remarks, I cannot help it.

I am sorry to see the Public Works Commission resuscitated. Evidently, there are certain hon. members opposite who have been putting the screw on because they have not been getting sufficient jobs lately. We see that the fiat has gone forth that the salaries and wages of public servants are to be reduced, but the Public Works Commission is revived, and hon. gentlemen start off in their wanderings through Queensland at an additional expense to the taxpayer. What is the use of our perpetuating this drain on our resources? We are given reports regarding works which are not necessary at the present moment. I want to point out to these gentlemen that the interest on the public debt in 1921 was £2,930,000, and of that amount we only received back from the directions where the money was invested, £812,000, representing a loss to the taxpayers of £2,100,000. Compare that with the situation in 1915, when a Liberal Government was in charge of the Treasury benches. From an interest bill of £1,975,000, no less than £1,707,000 was drawn as income from directions in which those loan moneys were invested. Yet hon. members opposite are still wandering about the country, drawing their £2 2s. per day, to find more undertakings for public money to be sunk in.

At 4.48 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Mr. Kirwan, Brisbane) relieved the Speaker in the chair.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: There are some serious omissions from the Speech to which I have to call attention. One is the social evils which are permeating our community in regard to gambling and racing. Hon. gentlemen opposite, and every man with a conscience, must be convinced that these two evils are eating into the vitals of Queensland at the present moment. Yet, what do these gentlemen do? Unmindful of the dignity of the Government—if it possesses any at the present moment—they have caused the whole of the people of Queensland to be subjected to the indignity of being refused a further license to sell gambling tickets in the State of New South Wales. Instead of taking that rebuff like men, and admitting that a mistake had been made, they issued insidious circulars advising the people of New South Wales to evade the law of the land, and to send their applications direct to Queensland, because we cannot afford to do without that income which is derived from the gambling instincts of the people. That is a most dastardly position. This Government will be known in the future, if for no other feature, as one that has undermined the morals of the people more than any other Government in this country. The pity of it is that the hon. member for Leichhardt unkindly reminded us that this is the third Parliament in which this Government has been imposed on Queensland, consisting, as it does, of gentlemen committed to doctrines of that description. We were assured by hon. gentlemen opposite last session that legislation would be introduced for the control of racing. In fact, a Bill was prepared, yet we find no reference to it in

Mr. Elphinstone.]

the Speech read by His Excellency at the opening of this session. A Bill was drawn up and was ready for submission last session, but it is a significant fact that as soon as the Speech from the Throne was issued, in which no reference was made to racing and gambling, Mr. John Wren leaves by the mail train this morning for the South.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: We know how that gentleman is wrapped up in proprietary racing, and we also know to our cost the terrible effect that this increase in proprietary racing is having in Queensland. Yet hon. members opposite talk about standing up for the working class. They talk about uplifting the masses, but instead of doing that, they are practically dragging them into the gutter, so to speak, by their encouragement of these vicious practices.

I want to deal with the question of education, which is only just briefly touched upon in the Speech from the Throne. I have nothing vicious to say in this regard. All that I have to say is in sorrow, because our schools are being starved from one end of Queensland to the other. In my own electorate, just as in the case of many other schools in Queensland, the buildings are overcrowded, and the children are being taught under great inconvenience to themselves. The children are not given the facilities to which they are entitled, just because this Government have not got at their disposal for the advancement of education sufficient money to look after the welfare of the coming generation. The money which is being spent by the Government on education works is expended in such a manner that they are only getting half the returns from it, compared with what the Government got some years ago.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Do you object to the teachers being well paid?

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: I will deal with that interjection later. The Government, by sticking to the day-labour system in the construction of schools and public buildings, are paying twice as much as was paid some years ago. The result is that the children of Queensland are suffering. At the present time you will see children being taught in the open. In the cold weather, when the westerly winds are blowing, I have seen the children myself with hands and feet almost blue with cold. Many of the children are barefooted and have to stand on the cold concrete floors just because there is not sufficient accommodation for them in the school buildings. How is it possible to instil into their minds their duties as the coming citizens of Queensland when they are being taught under such conditions as that? The Government have got money to waste on their ridiculous State enterprises, but the education of the children evidently is a secondary consideration. I am surprised that hon. members opposite tolerate that sort of thing for one moment. The Minister asked me just now if I objected to the teachers being well paid. I defy him to point to one single speech from this side of the House where any member ever suggested that the teachers should be underpaid.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: If we are to get the best out of our schools, then we must have well paid and experienced teachers; but what is the use of paying the teachers well

to instil education into the minds of the children when they are handicapped in the way they are at the present time? The Secretary for Public Instruction, instead of interjecting, should direct his careful attention to these matters and see if he cannot remedy them. I can tell him that the Opposition are not satisfied, and we are going to demand—I say demand—careful attention to this matter. This is a matter that affects every party. It not only affects the Government party, but it affects the party on this side of the House. Their children suffer as well as ours; and this is a matter on which hon. members opposite should rise to a sense of their responsibilities.

Mr. POLLOCK: We only spend £1,000,000 a year more than your crowd spent on education.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: No one will ever question the ability of hon. members opposite to spend. (Opposition laughter.) Hon. members opposite have a special record for Queensland so far as spending is concerned. If the money was spent to the advantage of the children it would be all right, but it is not spent to the best advantage of the children at all. All hon. members opposite think about is how to spend money. Money must be found for the Public Works Commission to travel around the country, and money must be found to give additional jobs for Ministers. There is no doubt that members opposite can spend the money, but whether it is to the advantage of the children or not is another question altogether.

Mr. POLLOCK: Look at the number of new schools.

At 4.56 p.m.,

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: I cannot close my remarks without reference to our new branch of primary production. It is, I think, paramount in all our minds to-day that there is in our primary production in Queensland a new star to which we can look with enthusiasm, and that is in connection with the growth of cotton. We are assured that we can grow cotton successfully in Queensland. We are also assured of the fact that in other parts of the world they are gradually finding themselves less and less able to supply the world's demand for cotton. We are also finding that the cost of growing cotton in other parts of the world is coming in close proximity to the cost of growing and picking it in Queensland. We are pleased to see an extension of the cotton growing areas in Queensland; but there is one point that we as business men will have to face without delay. I was privileged to be present at the opening of the Whinstanes Ginnery a week or two ago, and I am sure that every one of us who attended was interested in what we saw. I happened to be accompanied by a gentleman from Lancashire who is an expert cotton manufacturer. He is associated with big cotton interests in Lancashire, and has been for decades past. He took up a handful of cotton, and he asked one of the attendants how many different samples of cotton were in that handful. He ascertained that there were seven or eight different lengths of staple in it. Now, if that sort of thing is continued, it is going to be disastrous to cotton growing in Queensland. It is a good thing to encourage people to go in for cotton growing, and I know that number

[Mr. Elphinstone.]

think that they are going to get relief from their present depression by growing cotton, but at the same time we must standardise our cotton if we are going to succeed. I do not know if any hon. member opposite has ever visited the Lancashire mills, but I can tell this House that the manufacturers as a rule each handle one length of staple in the process of manufacture. All their looms and machinery are set to handle that particular staple, and they will not buy any cotton that does not come up to that standard; so that growers of cotton must be educated to grow a particular standard, otherwise they will find that the bales of cotton they send away will be cast aside as practically valueless. What we have got to do to-day is to see that the primary producers of Queensland engaged in growing cotton are taught to place the growing of cotton on a sound, scientific, and economic basis. It is no use letting these men go

on planting cotton seed indiscriminately, on the basis of a guarantee which expires on the 30th June next; and it is no use encouraging them to imagine that they are going to have a definite 5s. per lb. indefinitely. What we should instil into their minds, and what we should do our best to assist them to achieve, is to let Queensland cotton stand on its merits, just as Queensland wool stands on its merits. There is no need to bolster up Queensland's wool; it is an article the standard and quality of which are known. It is quite possible for us to do exactly the same with cotton, but not on the lines along which we are proceeding at the present moment. It is essential that each one should direct his mind to this important point. There is an opportunity in our hands to do wonders with this State of Queensland, if we keep before us that it is unsound to depend upon the artificial bolstering up of industry, and if we keep prominently before the producer the scientific tackling of this question of quality which is so essential in the markets of the world.

There is one other point with which I wish to deal briefly before resuming my seat, that is, taxation. I want to impress on hon. members the need for facing this situation in an immediate and an effective manner. Queensland industries and individuals are staggering under a load which they are less and less able to bear. I could give the House illustrations of men who have had to borrow from their bankers to pay their income tax. There are innumerable examples which one could put before the House to show the deplorable effect which this onerous burden is having on industry in Queensland. It is simply having upon the producer or the industrial employer the same result as is being applied to the worker at the present moment. As the standardisation of wages which does not permit him to enjoy any benefit from the quality of his work or the application which he puts into it has had the effect of reducing all men to a common level of enterprise, so this taxation levy is having the effect of depriving employers of that incentive which is so necessary if they are to tackle successfully the problems before the industrial community to-day. I put this before the Government in all sincerity and with all the force I can command—that we must do something to alleviate the distress which the burdens of income tax are imposing on the people to-day. We may derive some immediate benefit from it, but the

ultimate effect will be that our factories will diminish still more, our factory hands will be fewer and fewer, and industries will be driven out of the State. If I were only free to tell this House of actual illustrations of industries which have been closed, of industries which have gone to other States, and of industries which have been discouraged from starting in Queensland because of the onerous burdens of taxation, I am sure hon. members opposite would view the matter with that seriousness which the situation demands. I commend it to them. This is not a party question. It is a question of the welfare of Queensland, and it demands the most serious consideration of every member of this House.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. PEASE (*Herbert*): The hon. member for Fassifern-Oxley has shown that he does not understand his new book. He has lately left Nationalism to take on the case of the primary producer, and he has certainly shown to-day that he does not understand his needs.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I think he has shown that he does.

Mr. PEASE: I am going to show that he does not. In his concluding remarks he referred to the cotton ginners at Whinstanes. Previously, he had spoken on the question of labour in Queensland, and had he attended the opening ceremony at that ginners and taken note of the speeches made, he would have been struck by the remarks of Mr. Watson, of the Chamber of Manufacturers, whose address was, to my mind, one of the finest compliments paid to Queensland. He quoted figures and facts, and distinctly showed that Queensland's manufactures were on one of the best wickets in the Commonwealth.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. PEASE: Mr. Watson's remarks were one of the finest compliments that could be paid to the Labour Government for their developmental work; and Mr. Vaughan, who has had such a wide experience, pointed out that the cotton industry in Queensland was going to be something to marvel at. He touched on the labour question, and he distinctly stated that the opening of the cotton industry in Queensland was sound, and that it was not undertaken without due consideration. Right through those speeches the finest compliments were paid to the Labour Government that I have listened to in the last few years.

The hon. member also referred to the speech of the hon. member for Leichhardt, in regard, particularly, to bad times. He would have us believe that Queensland is in the throes of a depression. Because the member for Leichhardt quoted comparisons with other countries, the member for Oxley-Fassifern—out to decry Queensland—was not satisfied. Fortunately, I happen to have some cuttings from financial newspapers which show that in the first two months of this year there were no fewer than 1,160 bankruptcies in Great Britain—a record. The cutting goes on to say—

“Every kind of business has been hit by the commercial depression—insurance, textiles, rubber, oil, stock brokerage, provision merchants, farmers, builders, liquor dealers, confectioners, and shipping firms.”

Mr. Pease.

It also deals with Britain's unemployed, and says that in reply to a deputation, Mr Macnamara, the Minister for Labour, made the following statement:—

"The total unemployment benefit paid since November, 1920, amounted to £85,000,000. Provision had been made for the possibility of the payment of a further £51,000,000 between now and July, 1923. He pointed out that at present there were 1,440,000 wholly unemployed and 100,000 on short time, as compared with 1,800,000 and 300,000 respectively at the beginning of the year."

I think that deals with the statements of the hon. member as to conditions in Queensland.

I am reminded that last year the Auditor-General took the hon. member to task for making inaccurate statements. On the first page of his report there is a reference to the hon. member for Oxley, who had made an assertion which the Auditor-General could not allow to go unchallenged, which goes to show that the hon. member is out to say anything that he may think will bolster up his case against the Government. During last year several members of the Opposition were out on a campaign against the Government, as they thought, and they made a lot of misstatements which were not good for Queensland and I think we should take advantage of this opportunity to show the people that their statements were incorrect. The first thing they talked about was the Auditor-General's report. Now, I notice that, when hon. members got the Auditor-General's report, they did not quote from it. When they see in it a good deal of matter to the credit of the Government they calmly drop it.

Mr. J. JONES: Gag!

Mr. PEASE: There was no "gag" about the Auditor-General's report. They could have made all their speeches on it, but once they saw that statements were made to the credit of the Government, it was calmly dropped. I am going to quote some figures from the report, which I think the people should have before them. First of all, some comparisons—

"Percentage increases in 1920-21 as compared with 1916-17—

Population	...	10.3 per cent.
Receipts	...	59.9 per cent.
Expenditure	...	54.8 per cent.

"Railways—

Receipts	...	39.0 per cent.
Expenditure	...	63.0 per cent.

"Interest on public debt, 23.6 per cent.

"Expenditure for Benefit of Returned Sailors and Soldiers—

	£
1916-17	25,993
1917-18	200,877
1918-19	259,271
1919-20	1,074,193
1920-21	1,066,742

"Increased Expenditure, 1920-21, as compared with 1919-20—

	£
Hospital and Charitable Institutions	61,178
Insanity	21,943
Outdoor Relief	41,650
Police	70,911
State Children	22,767

The Public Works expenditure was—1919-1920, £394,553; 1920-1921, £534,950.

[Mr. Pease.

The hon. member for Oxley referred to the expenditure on State schools. As far as concerns the electorate I have the honour to represent, we have every reason to be grateful to the Government, because not one request has been turned down where the number of children has warranted it. I take this opportunity of thanking the Government for the manner in which they have looked after the children in the far North of Queensland.

In the cashing of war gratuity bonds, the payments to 30th June, 1921, were £53,918.

I would like hon. members to take notice of the figures I am now going to quote, because we are twitted with the charge that the new agricultural policy of the Premier has been thought out merely as a catch cry, in view of an election. Hon. members on the other side say, "What have you done before for the farmers?" Here is something we have done; the total amount owing by farmers at 30th June, 1921, on the wheat and fodder account, was £45,398; on the wheat and barley account, £3,521; on the seed-wheat and fodder account, £11,418; while the debit balance at 30th June, 1921, on the stock diseases fund was £52,775.

Then we come to this new industry of cotton. The advances made in 1920 totalled £955; in 1921, £13,466.

In regard to the Co-operative Agricultural Production and Advances to Farmers Act, in 1919-1920 there were thirteen advances, totalling £1,964; while in 1920-1921 there were 163 advances, totalling £22,575.

I have taken out those figures just to show that this policy of the Government is no new thing. I claim to represent as many farmers as anybody in this House. The Premier, in his recent trip through my electorate, was received by those farmers in the way in which he should be—as their friend. Not one request that could be granted was turned down. We have in the Herbert electorate farmers who are real working farmers. One statement made by the hon. member for Oxley I challenge. That hon. member would lead this House to believe that the people are leaving the country because they are not being treated fairly, and that having a Labour Government in power means distress to the farmers. I know that that is absolutely incorrect, because the Herbert electorate had the record increase in population in Queensland.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: All sugar.

Mr. PEASE: That industry has been bolstered up by this Government.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No.

Mr. PEASE: It is our railway development policy that has made that increase in the population of the Herbert.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear!

Mr. PEASE: From one end of the Herbert to the other, the Premier advocated the policy of the Government, under which tracts which a few years ago were undeveloped country are now flourishing farms.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: Who built the South Johnstone Mill?

Mr. PEASE: Why did you not put it in the right place? The farmers of the Herbert realise that this Government have done more than any other Government that has existed in Queensland. At the reception tendered to the Premier in Innisfail, farmers who previously were not supporters of this Government stated publicly that it had done

more for the settlers of the Herbert district than any Government that had been in power in Queensland. The farmers throughout the district are responding to the treatment, and are going ahead. I hope that, when the railway development policy has been completed, another sugar-mill will be established, and then some hundreds of farmers will be settled and making a prosperous living.

I will deal now with the Department of Public Instruction. In 1919-1920, £1,013,582 was spent; in 1920-1921, the expenditure was £1,239,303.

In the railways, during the five years 1916 to 1921, the earnings increased by 40.96 per cent., while the expenditure increased by 33.91 per cent. I want hon. members to understand that this increased expenditure has been due chiefly to increased wages, and has not been the fault of the Government. The wages had to be increased. The fact that we have shown such a return indicates that the management is in capable hands. When conditions are normal, and the new Northern railways are opened up, the expenditure will be more nearly equal to the revenue.

We have heard a good deal about the Chillagoe mines lately. The Auditor-General stated there were 510 men on the pay-sheets, and 500 men firewood-getting, etc. The mines paid State insurance amounting to £4,825; and paid in railway freights, £26,493. The Auditor-General sums up his remarks by stating that "these factors merit consideration when dealing with the financial aspect of this undertaking." I ask members of the Opposition to bear that in mind. In the closing days of the last session attacks were made on the State enterprises, including the Chillagoe mines. No one on the other side took into consideration these factors mentioned by the Auditor-General.

According to the Auditor-General, in 1911-1912, the State expenditure was £5,965,692, or £8 17s. 4d. per head of population; and the revenue was equal to £8 17s. 6d. per head of population. In 1920-1921, the expenditure was £12,591,201, or £17 1s. 1d. per head of population; and the revenue was £17 1s. 3d. per head. It will be seen that the difference between the revenue and expenditure is practically the same in both cases, and the increase has been due to the conditions existing. It is not a question of this Government getting money and throwing it away.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: Reckless expenditure.

Mr. PEASE: The ex-Treasurer knows that the Premier, the Treasurer, or any member of the Government cannot dip his hands into the cashbox and spend as he pleases. Every item of expenditure has to be certified to in a proper way. I would like hon. members to understand, too, that Parliament has voted, and must accept responsibility for, this expenditure. Ever since I have been in this Parliament I have taken particular notice that when the Estimates have been before the House not one hon. member opposite has in any case attempted to do anything to lessen the expenditure. As a matter of fact, they cavilled because we cut out the Upper House, which certainly lessened the expenditure. They did not like it. Hon. members opposite now get up and take up the attitude, "Why do you not increase the expenditure on the schools?" I challenge the Opposition to show one item of expenditure which has been

criticised by them in any Estimate which has gone through during the last two years.

Mr. KERR: £200,000 on relief work.

Mr. PEASE: That is the only one. Increases are due principally to wages and better conditions, not only in this respect, but in regard to the increased amount voted for relief about which the hon. member has interjected. It is very significant that a week or so ago the new Government in New South Wales had to appropriate £100,000 for relief. New South Wales found out just the same as this State found out—that it was necessary. It does not matter what Government is in power to-day, you will have to deal with this question of providing relief for people who are unemployed. We find that this attack on expenditure is general, and not only on this Government. Dr. Eagle Page, commenting on the Federal Budget for 1921-1922, in the Federal Parliament stated that there was an increase of £1,000,000 for ordinary services, and that salaries estimated to cost the Commonwealth £75,000 now cost millions. The High Commissioner's Office in London, cost £50,000 annually, and the Prime Minister's Department cost in 1917-18 £238,000, and in 1921 £412,000. The appropriation for expenses of Government in America in 1912 was 11 dollars per capita of population, and in 1920 225 dollars per capita of population. In England the ordinary expenses of Government were £200,000,000 in 1915, and £700,000,000 in 1919.

Mr. KERR: There was a war there.

Mr. PEASE: The war was on in Queensland just the same. This Government has to find the increased expenditure due to the war, and Queensland compares well with other States with regard to the administration of expenditure. The Federal Treasurer on 20th October, 1921 as appears in Federal "Hansard," page 12069, quoted an official return showing the comparative expenditure from revenue by the States during the last three financial years, and showed the percentage of increase in 1921 as compared with 1917-1918, as follows:—

New South Wales	... 60.2
Tasmania	... 49.9
Victoria	... 45.4
Queensland	... 41.5
Western Australia	... 40.3
South Australia	... 37.1

This shows that this Government have handled the affairs of the country in such a way that the expenditure is less in proportion than in New South Wales, Tasmania, or Victoria. The question of taxation is universal to meet the conditions arising from the war. I quote the following comparison of Federal taxation figures:—

Year.	Total Taxation.	Taxation per Capita.
	£	£ s. d.
1914-15	16,970,596	3 8 2
1915-16	23,533,529	4 15 5
1916-17	24,527,040	5 0 7
1917-18	24,673,733	4 19 9
1918-19	32,884,186	6 10 8
1919-20	41,817,690	7 19 6
1920-21 (approx.)	53,000,000	9 13 8

I will now give an example of taxation in England. A case was quoted where an estate of 20,000 acres, at an annual rental of £1 per acre, paid 11s. 6d. in the £1 for income

[Mr. Pease.]

and super-tax, 5s. in the £1 for rates under schedule A and B on all rented lands, 1s. 6d. in the £1 for land tax, and 2s. in the £1 for tithes, absorbing a total of 20s. in the £1, leaving undeveloped land duty, estate charges, upkeep, etc., a total loss. It will be remembered that when Sir Archibald Weigall, Governor of South Australia, had to resign, he stated that the reason for his resignation was simply a matter of finance and British taxation. He had to leave his position in South Australia to go over to England to get rid of his estate, because he was being ruined by the taxation. Again, Mr. Hughes, on his return from England, in September, 1921, stated that the taxation on big incomes in England ranged up to 16s. in the £1. In 1914 the direct and indirect taxation in the United Kingdom from persons in receipt of less than £3 weekly equalled £6, and in 1920 it equalled £13. The amount received in 1914 was £54,500,000, and in 1919 £116,500,000. The standard rate of income tax in 1914 was 1s. 3d. in the £1, and in 1920 6s. in the £1. The average for all States in Australia in 1914-15 was £1 8s. 5d. per head, and in 1920-21 £3 6s. 9d. per head. The Western Australian Railways for the September quarter last year showed a deficit of £168,337; the Victorian Railways for the month of October, 1921, showed a decrease of £31,541; and the deficit for the year ended June, 1921, on the railways was £651,635. In England and Scotland the private companies who control the railways have issued orders for a ten-hour working day for all employees and a reduction of wages of 5s. weekly. Of course, private enterprise! In New Zealand the average daily loss on the railways was £4,700, and the Premier proposed to reduce all salaries above £200 per year by 10 per cent. It is quite unfair to compare the State of Queensland with the State of Victoria, because Queensland has an area of 670,500 square miles and a population of 757,634, whereas Victoria has an area of only 87,884 square miles and a population of 1,531,529. Queensland has 1,471 more miles of railway than Victoria. The number of passengers carried in Victoria for the year ended 30th June, 1921, was 134,000,000, and in Queensland only 28,000,000. How on earth could it be expected that a Government which has a disadvantage such as that could compete with Victoria? The gross revenue from the Victorian railways is over £2,000,000 per annum more than the railway revenue in Queensland. The percentage of area alienated to the area of the State is 58.47 in Victoria, and in Queensland 5.98. How could it be expected that undeveloped country which has under 6 per cent. of its country alienated could be compared with a State like Victoria, which has almost 59 per cent. of its country alienated?

I am very pleased indeed that the Premier, during his trip North, received many deputations. I would like to let hon. members opposite know—and the whole of the people in the North, right from one end of the Herbert to the southern end, are agreed on this—that the Premier was deputationalised by every section of the community to complete the railways in the North. The completion of these railways will mean the expenditure of £500,000; and will hon. members opposite say that the Government should not expend that money? It has been said by hon. members opposite that, while the present state of the finances continues, we should

[*Mr. Pease.*

not build one more inch of railway, or spend any more money. It has been stated that the funds of the Treasury should not be spent on railways, yet we have the whole of the people in North Queensland crying out for these railways to be completed. I am very pleased indeed that the Premier has decided that they shall be completed, because it is going to make conditions far more equitable, and is going to largely increase that 6 per cent. of alienated country.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: How can it do so?

Mr. PEASE: The railways are going to be the means of giving to this country of Queensland practically another State. The Commonwealth Statistician shows that for the last nine months of 1921 [5.30 p.m.] Queensland received as new arrivals 9,107 persons, as against Victoria's four. The hon. member for Oxley criticised that statement made by the hon. member for Leichhardt, but those are the actual figures—that Queensland in nine months gained over 9,000 new arrivals, as against Victoria's four.

A question was asked by a member of the Country party in regard to the influx of Italians into North Queensland, and I want hon. members of this House to understand what that means. It means that Queensland—and North Queensland in particular—under a Labour Government is in such favour at the other side of the world that, without the expenditure of one penny piece of State funds, and without sending home Mr. Barwell and all the other satellites to try and induce people to come to this country, we have people coming here at their own expense from far-away Italy, and taking up land because their compatriots, who have settled here in the past, have been able to make such a vast amount of money under this Government. There is no parallel to such a position in any of the other States. There is no other State in Australia that has gained, without spending one penny piece, the increased population that Queensland has gained. That is because there is a Labour Government in power in Queensland. These Italians are quite satisfied that under a Government such as we have in Queensland they are going to get a fair deal. I suppose more Italians come to my electorate than to any other district in Queensland, and they are opening up the land without one penny piece of help from the Government. We have a Country party which say they are out to assist the man on the land. Then why should they be against Italians coming here? They should be proud to think that anyone should go to North Queensland or anywhere else and develop the State without assistance from the Government. They talk of nothing but doles. These people do not want doles. They settle straight on the land without assistance from the Government, and they should not receive carping criticism from people who say they are the Country party. I consider that to be the finest advertisement that the Labour Government of Queensland have had as regards their agricultural policy. If these Italians are able to make the money that they are making, and are able to send to Italy and bring thousands of their countrymen here, then our own people are doing the same. It shows that this Government have got an agricultural policy, and that they are developing the State; and, instead of carping criticism coming from the so-called Country party, they should be patting the Government on

the back. That is what the Government of Queensland are doing. The results are quite apparent to everybody. A few years ago the Herbert was practically undeveloped, while to-day there are thousands of people there earning satisfactory money. Those Italians have told me that in five years they are able to make £6,000 or £7,000, and they are paying taxes. Every Italian, as well as everyone else in the North, is paying his share of the burden of taxation, and I am quite satisfied that every fair-minded man will take the stand I am taking up. Queensland is the only State in the Commonwealth which is attracting people to its shores without the expenditure of public money. You have Mr. Barwell going home and getting boys to come out to Australia by misleading them. I have seen articles in the Press in regard to those boys. It is said they are sending out the dregs of London. We do not want the dregs of London in Queensland. It is said those immigrants conducted themselves abominably on the boats when coming out. These are the kind of immigrants that the Opposition stand for. We do not want people of that sort. We want people to come here of their own free will, and we are getting them. That is the finest advertisement that this Labour Government have ever had. It certainly must be quite apparent to any fair-minded man that any Government which is able to attract immigrants from overseas, as well as people from the other States, must certainly be doing something to develop the State.

"Smith's Weekly," of 4th March last, points out that a considerable amount of Melbourne money has been invested in Queensland Government stock. People here tell us that we are not to be compared to Victoria, and yet we have the moneyed people of Melbourne coming here and buying up our stock.

The hon. member for Oxley said something about American finance. Certain American financiers think so much of our stock that they have bought all the available Queensland stock on the London market.

The PREMIER: During the last two or three weeks Victorian investors have been wanting to invest hundreds of thousands in Queensland stock.

Mr. PEASE: I pointed out last session that the conditions of the people of Victoria were bad. I then quoted some figures, and now I will quote some more. At the coroner's inquiry into the Macedon railway smash, Driver Garland stated that the track was bad. Also that the engines were defective and breakaways were frequent. That led to the disaster. The housing conditions also are bad. Take one house in Collingwood of six rooms. One room was occupied by a woman and one child. Two rooms were occupied by a man, wife, and seven children. Another two rooms were occupied by a family of eight, and another room by a man and his wife, while a shed in the yard was occupied by a woman, making a total of twenty-one persons for the one house. That is an instance of the housing conditions in Victoria. The Victorian Government treat their employees very badly. This is what they do: They charge £3 ls. per month rental for a house costing £100. They have increased the railway men's rentals from 13s. to £2 8s. 10d.; from 17s. to £2 16s. 3d.; from £1 ls. 10d. to £3 2s. 8d.

I want to show also how the producer is treated in Victoria under a Government such

as the Opposition represent. The primary producer is not protected as we are trying to protect him. The Melbourne "Age" quoted the case of a Croydon (near Melbourne) fruitgrower, who got 7s. for twenty-one cases of pears, or 4d. a case (!), whilst these pears were sold to the consumer at 4d. a lb. The pears, for which the farmer got 7s., returned to somebody else £11 16s. 3d. Taking a fair average, the public paid 4d. per lb. The grower got 4d. for 45 lb. Who stood in the middle and made all the money? asks the "Age," and it proceeds: "If such examples are typical, it is not surprising that the grower writes plaintively: 'How are we to keep going with such treatment? The grower is being starved and pushed off the land, while a hive of middlemen grow rich—and the public pays.'" I quote these few examples to show the conditions under which the people in Victoria are living; and that is the State which the Opposition are everlastingly holding up as the State we should try to emulate. We are not going to do so. We do not want any Gun Alley murders here.

During the recess a vile attack was levelled at the State enterprises, and I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Oxley quote similar remarks to those that appeared in the London magazines some time ago. I happened to be reading those articles as he was speaking. The hon. member told us that the Labour party were endeavouring to bring about the socialisation of industry. It is remarkable that a circular issued by the Northern Country party—which is the camouflaged Country party—which recently came into my hand, stated that they were devoting a considerable amount of money to a Press campaign, and they are certainly doing it. This is a sample of the sort of Press campaign they are indulging in. I am satisfied that every member of the Opposition when he hears what I am going to read will be astounded at the sort of dope which is machined out in other parts of the world to try and injure Queensland. The following is an extract from an article entitled "The Great Labour Bubble—How it has Burst in Australia" by Thomas J. McMahon, in the "London" magazine—

"In Queensland industrial legislation has brought the Government to bankruptcy. They are actually considering the seizing of private estates to balance Government losses.

"The people of the cities of the State were actually suffering a meat famine on account of a general strike by the butchers' union.

"The nationalised meat shops of Queensland have never paid—so palpable a failure have they been that no other State intends to follow in the enterprise.

"In mining, grocers' assistants, barbers, shop assistants, wharf labourers, etc., were enlisted in the working of Government mines and paid high rates of wages.

"The efforts of nationalisation have not lengthened railways by one inch, and population, as in North Queensland, has dropped by thousands a year."

Mr. McMahon is a liar—to put it mildly—because the population in North Queensland has increased in a higher ratio than any other part of Queensland. Mr. McMahon goes on to say—

"The formation of One Big Union
Mr. Pease.]

with the object of seizing the remnants of whatever money power and prosperity remain, before the probable dissolution of commercial and industrial Australia."

I ask if that is the sort of thing which any fair-minded Queenslander would like to see in a paper such as the "London" magazine? I would like to know if members of the Opposition are responsible for that sort of stuff—if that is the kind of propaganda the Northern Country party, as well as the other section of the Country party, are putting up twice a week. Fortunately, this attack on the State enterprises was seen by the Commonwealth Government. It was felt that this attack was likely to have a serious effect, and that the credit not only of Queensland but of Australia was concerned. The result was that a Commonwealth Government official was deputed to deal with the attack. In the next issue of the "London" magazine, an article headed "Sowing Seeds of Success" appeared, showing how Australia's State enterprises are developing the Island Continent. Strange to say, the illustration in this article showed the magnificent harbour of Brisbane. (Opposition laughter.) The article was written by a member of the Federal Government, controlled by Mr. Hughes, who does not profess to be a friend of this party. This is what he says—

"Mr. T. J. McMahon would convey the highly misleading impression that Australia was going to the dogs industrially, and that her downfall was mainly due to the State enterprise and the nationalisation of certain activities.

"Had it been left to private enterprise to construct railways in Australia, the Commonwealth would to-day only have railway transport in the more populous districts.

"The Australian States were compelled to build a large number of railways in advance of profitable traffic.

"What private company would have dared to build Australia's 1,000 miles of transcontinental line? A private firm would give consideration only to the payment of immediate dividends. Surely State enterprise is not to be blamed for farsighted expenditure of public money, even though the immediate result be an addition to the national debt. These new lines which the State and Commonwealth are building develop vast tracts of country."

He goes on to say—

"An incorrect statement by Mr. McMahon is that nationalisation—the balm and hope of the workers—has been in force in Australia for many years, and not one industry with its army of national officers has paid nor shows the least hope of ever paying."

He then says—

"Against this, quote the Commonwealth Bank, established in 1913, without any capital, and guaranteed by the Commonwealth Government (and a Labour Government at that).

"Since initiation, assets have risen to value of £70,000,000, accumulated profits, 1920, £2,500,000, and in addition, all initial expenses have been paid out of profits. If this is not a success, it is difficult to imagine the definition of the word."

[Mr. Pease.

The official in his article then deals with Commonwealth shipping, and points out that the Governments of Canada and Africa propose to follow Australia's example. He points out that the South Australian Government Produce Department made a profit in 1917-1918 of £14,825, after providing interest, working expenses, and maintenance. He then goes on to quote the example of the State Government Insurance Office of Queensland, and says—

"It was established by grant from Parliament of £100,000, but instead of having to draw upon that fund it has uninterruptedly earned good profits and to date of article has invested £185,000 in Government securities, besides paying out thousands of pounds as compassionate grants to workers disabled by miners' phthisis and who were not within the Act."

The writer then sums up, and says—

"Australia's experiments made by both Federal and State Governments in the very difficult business of conducting undertakings on a commercial basis disproved the hoary contentions of the hide-bound as regards 'impossibility.' It is clear that these things can be done. What is wanted is a will to do against a will to frustrate."

The Opposition object to State enterprises, which do not suit the people who find the funds for their operations. The people who find funds for the Opposition are out to destroy Labour Government, and stand for private enterprise. They know that the biggest bar to their success in Queensland is the State enterprises. The writer goes on to say—

"It is nothing to the point that all public enterprise attempted in different States has not been uniformly successful."

The State Produce Agency has been referred to, and it will certainly have its ups and downs, as every other business has. I will mention a few private enterprises. Samuel Allen and Sons, in connection with their Townsville Brewery, have lost thousands of pounds. Burns, Philp, and Company, in connection with the floating of cedar logs over the Barron Falls, lost thousands of pounds. The North Broken Hill, Limited, mines lost £52,242 for the year ended June, 1921, but has kept going on previous profits. In 1913 the company's profits were £347,000. The New Zealand and Australian Company, Limited, balance-sheet showed a loss on last year's transactions of £87,259. The Stanmore Preserving Company, in Sydney, showed a loss in seven months of £103,000. Cockatoo Preserves, Melbourne, showed a loss in nine months of £100,000. The South Australian Fruit Growers had a loss of £25,000. The Yanco Cannery, in New South Wales, lost £145,000 in 1921. Preserves Manufacturing Limited, in England, in fifteen months lost £257,982.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Are you taking the figures for all over the world?

Mr. PEASE: Yes, just to show that the "dope" which is given out in Queensland is going out to all parts of the world, and doing incalculable harm.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Who is responsible?

Mr. PEASE: It is your people who are doing it. The Bank of New South Wales

made an advance on which there was a loss of £100,000. The bank did not shut up over that, but sacked the officer who made the advance. The Merchants' Bank, in Canada, collapsed with losses in regard to loans of £2,500,000. The Claude Lefontains Banking Company, in Paris, failed with losses on advances amounting to £300,000. The Dunlop Rubber Company failed the other day, with a loss of £3,000,000. The chairman of directors received £12,000 a year. The Columbia Graphophone Company failed with losses amounting to £1,500,000. In New York twenty-five broker houses failed in two months, from 21st December to 22nd June; the losses were over £2,000,000. Wilcox and Moffin, dealing in pastoral products, on 30th June, 1920, showed a profit of £143,665, while on 30th June, 1921, there was a loss of £23,875. There are dozens of other pastoral companies showing similar losses. What I am trying to get at is that State enterprises are subject to the same fluctuations as private businesses. The Minister for State Enterprises, when making his last speech, pointed out that every successful business had to be built up; that you never made the same mistake twice; and I agree with that. Everyone who has been in business knows that there are lean times and fat times. I have quoted businesses in every part of the world to show you that the depression is not confined to Queensland because a Labour Government is in power.

I am quoting these figures to show that the position was created as a result of the conditions brought about by the war. It is really the aftermath of the war. There is no royal road to get over this financial difficulty. Every country is suffering in the same way. No matter where you go, no matter in what part of the world, you will find that the same conditions exist in every country just as we find them existing in Queensland to-day. I am quite satisfied that Queensland stands on its own so far as prosperity is concerned.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEASE: It is only the propaganda of members opposite and their supporters which has done any harm in Queensland. Hon. members opposite have entered on a campaign with the idea of ousting the Government. During the Paddington election all sorts of propaganda work was indulged in by the Opposition in order to defeat the Government candidate. I heard the leader of the Nationalists make a statement during the Paddington election about the Government giving doles to people in Brisbane. Hon. members opposite talk about the unemployed in Queensland, but look at the unemployment they have got in New South Wales at the present time. There is more unemployment in New South Wales to-day than there is in Queensland. So far as unemployment is concerned, we know that the Queensland Government is the only Government which has attempted to do something to relieve the unemployed. (Opposition dissent.) There are over 3,000 men engaged in railway construction in Queensland to-day who were not engaged in January last. That shows what the Government have done to relieve the position. Through the efforts of the Premier and the hon. member for Mount Morgan, the Mount Morgan mine has been reopened, and how many thousands of

men are employed there directly and indirectly? If a Labour Government had not been in power in Queensland to-day the Mount Morgan mine would be closed down; but the Premier and the hon. member for Mount Morgan, by their efforts, were enabled to get the mine at work again. Look at the thousands of workers being absorbed at Mount Morgan now, while there is an increase in the railway traffic which brings revenue to this country. If any fair-minded man looks at the position now and compares it with the position last year, he must admit that the Government are responsible for relieving a lot of the unemployment. I consider that since the beginning of the year the Government have been responsible for putting something like 10,000 men at work. I make that statement knowing what I am talking about. In the electorate I represent there are hundreds of men employed in railway construction, and hundreds of other men have been put in employment through the actions of the Government. The other day no less than seven stowaways were found on board a vessel coming from Newcastle to Queensland. They told the police magistrate they were absolutely starving in New South Wales because there was no work for them to do, and they wanted to come to Queensland because they were told that Queensland was the only State where they could get work. With regard to the statement that we give doles to men out of work, does the leader of the Opposition contend that we ought to let them starve? Perhaps hon. members opposite would like these men to work for 10s. per week? Before I sit down I would like to give some testimonials to the State enterprises introduced by Labour Governments. I have an extract here from a testimonial in the "Brisbane Courier" of the 1st October, 1921, in reference to the Commonwealth Bank. This bank was established by a Labour Government, in spite of great opposition from the party opposite, just as all State enterprises initiated by Labour have been opposed. Just the same howl was set up by the "Courier" and by supporters of the party opposite as hon. members opposite indulge in now in regard to our State enterprises. Look at the howl that was set up when we started our State insurance. Hon. members will remember the famous circular that was issued by the insurance representatives who set out to destroy this Government; but, in spite of that, State insurance has gone ahead by leaps and bounds. This is what the "Courier" said in its issue of the 1st October, 1921—

"The profit and loss account for the half-year ended 30th June, 1921, was £403,041, as against £292,218 on 31st December, 1920. . . . The profit is carried half to reserves and half to redemption, and each account is in credit £1,725,662, or, in all, £3,451,364. . . . This immense reserve (as practically reserve and redemption are the same thing) built up since the establishment of the Commonwealth Bank, illustrates in a measure the power of the institution for service in the country. . . . The day inevitably will come when the question of disposal of the 'accumulated profits' of the Commonwealth Bank will have to be considered."

The Commonwealth Bank was set up in its initial stages by a Labour Government. In fact, it was only a Labour Government that

Mr. Pease.]

could make the Commonwealth Bank possible. That bank has been a great success, and has been able to build up an immense reserve. The "Courier" now says that the day inevitably will come when the question of the disposal of the accumulated profits of the Commonwealth Bank will have to be considered. I wonder what the "Courier" said when the bank was being established? If we look up the files, we will find the "Courier" opposed the establishment of the Commonwealth Bank. I intend to look up the "Courier" files myself, and later on I will give the House the benefit of my research. I might also read a tribute to our State Insurance Department which was paid by the Chillagoe Limited Company as follows:—

"When the State Insurance Commissioner was in Melbourne recently a tribute was paid by the Chillagoe Limited Company as to the efficiency of the Queensland State Insurance Office and by which the company has saved a large sum because of the insurance of its Mount Mulligan employees with the department.

"Before the inception of the Workers' Compensation Acts, 1916 to 1918, in Queensland, workers' compensation policies issued on mining risks by insurance companies contained a provision limiting the liability of such insurance companies for compensation, damages, and costs in respect of injuries or death of one or more workmen at any one time. Such provision, in the insurance world, is known as a disaster limit. Had the State Government Insurance Office, which gives unlimited disaster cover, not been created, and had Chillagoe Limited continued its system of insurance with a private office, it is probable that the disaster limit on its policy would have been £5,000 (it was £1,000 at Mount Mulligan at the date the State took over the insurance, only a small staff being employed at that time). Cover might have been obtained for a disaster limit of £40,000 (the probable cost of compensation insurance in the Mount Mulligan disaster), but the premium would have been almost prohibitive, and is, therefore, outside consideration."

I have got another testimonial from Mr. Frazier Hunt, a leading American journalist, who paid a visit to Queensland. At the conclusion of his visit he gave his opinion as follows regarding Queensland:—

"State enterprises were run carefully and efficiently and were keeping prices down for the benefit of the people."

State enterprises are not expected to pay in proportion to private enterprises, but they pay indirectly. (Opposition dissent.) At any rate, Mr. Frazier Hunt considers that the State enterprises are justified in Queensland because prices are kept down for the benefit of the people. This Government was returned to legislate for the workers of Queensland, and it is pleasing to us to know that the workers are getting the benefit of our legislation. Another tribute to the State enterprises comes from Irvinebank. I have a quotation here which refers to the general slump in mining, and continues—

"One of the great benefits to the people here and district has been dispensed with, namely, the State store, and is regretted, as during its operation it has been the means of saving the people

from being fleeced, as it kept private enterprise from raising the prices, and were able to sell many things at less than at other stores."

The Government were returned to look after the interests of the workers. I claim that, in view of the facts which I have put before the House, we have justified our existence, and that we have carried on the government for the benefit of the people of Queensland.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. TAYLOR (Windsor): I think most of us have read carefully the Governor's Speech, and listened with a considerable amount of interest to the speeches which have been delivered upon it; but, when one comes to analyse it closely, one is driven

[7 p.m.] to the conclusion that it is not so remarkable for what it contains as for what it does not contain. Quite a number of matters have been introduced which in days gone by, if I understand the position rightly, were quite foreign to the present policy of the Government. We find a reference to co-operation, but nothing at all about the socialisation of industry, which is really the main plank in the platform of the Labour Government and the Labour party alike, and has been advocated by the Premier and practically every member on that side ever since they have been connected with the movement. I do not know, I am sure, why it has been left out of their programme now.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER interjected.

Mr. TAYLOR: It hurts some hon. members opposite, because they have changed it or dropped it out—the socialisation of industry and the wiping out of all that is termed by members on the Government side—capitalistic enterprise.

And we do not find any reference in the Speech to one thing which has wrought havoc in Queensland. I refer to racing. We find proprietary and other racing being carried out nearly every day in Brisbane and throughout Queensland; but I challenge any man in this Chamber to tell us that horse-racing, as it is indulged in at the present time, is for the benefit of the State. It is working a tremendous injury and harm. If the money which is being devoted to horse-racing was spent on reproductive and developmental work and the encouragement of industry, I contend that the return we would be getting as a State would be infinitely more than we get from horseracing. We hoped, and a great many people throughout Queensland hoped, that a measure would be proposed to be introduced dealing with proprietary racing.

Mr. BRENNAN: Are you aware the Bill is printed?

Mr. TAYLOR: If it is printed, it would be interesting to know why it is not mentioned in the Speech. I take it we are all very pleased, indeed, to know that the Governor has been taking a very keen interest in the affairs of the State. It is what we expect of him. A Governor should certainly travel throughout the length and breadth of a country, and make himself thoroughly acquainted with the conditions under which the people live. Personal contact with individuals, and personal inspection of the districts of this great State, of course, enable one to form an infinitely better opinion than one is able to form by reading, or from what one may be told. So I take it

[Mr. Pease.

we are all in accord with what His Excellency is doing in that direction. In the remarks which he has made since he has come back from his travels, he is simply, of course, confirming the opinion which every one of us has—that in Queensland a magnificent heritage has been bequeathed to us by those who pioneered this great Commonwealth, and that what is necessary for us—the descendants of those pioneers who came out here sixty or seventy years ago and laid the foundations of this State—is to build a solid and secure superstructure, which will be for the benefit of the whole of the people of Australia. Unfortunately, quite a number of people in Australia to-day would tear up the foundations which have been laid, and destroy the existing institutions, if they had the opportunity. But, if I understand Australia aright, and if I can interpret the position which Australians take towards that attitude, there is little doubt that the great majority are opposed to anything of the kind. At the same time, we have to be careful to see that any section who propose to do such things have no opportunity to gain their ends in Queensland. We claim to be in the front rank of the democracies of the world—and I believe we are—and yet any number of individuals in the community are not satisfied with the freedom which we as Australians and Britishers enjoy in the British Empire, and it should be the concern of every one of us, whether he be Liberal or Labour, or Nationalist, to do all he can to see that any efforts by such persons are not allowed to destroy the free institutions which we have throughout Australia to-day. One could not expect a freer franchise than ours, and all we ask the people of Australia and Queensland to do in the exercise of that franchise is to consider what is best—not in the interests of one section, but in the interests of all sections of the community—and then see that the interests of the whole are absolutely conserved and duly safeguarded.

The Governor referred in his Speech to the isolation and attendant hardships of the people in the outback country. Anyone who has travelled outback realises the truth of that, and I take it that it is the duty of Governments, both State and Commonwealth, to see how far they can go in making that isolation as little as possible, by means of communication in every possible way and the settlement of additional people in those areas. Certainly, during recent years the advent of the motor-car, of the aeroplane, and the telephone has helped to relieve the dreadful monotony of our outback areas. We shall, for a number of years, of course, have these isolated areas. It will be a matter of time before we shall be able to make conditions such as we would all like them to be, so that those people who are living outback may have the reasonable comforts of civilisation which we in the cities and towns enjoy to-day. So far as the Nationalist party and its relation to country interests are concerned, I have said before, and I say again, that we have always been in thorough sympathy with country interests.

The PREMIER: Then why did the hon. member for Oxley desert you? (Laughter.)

Mr. TAYLOR: I cannot answer that. I suggest that the Premier give notice and ask the hon. member for Oxley to-morrow. (Laughter.) We claim that we have been just as zealous with regard to country interests as any man in this Chamber to-day.

We have recognised the fact ever since we have been a party that the man who is working all round the clock in the outback areas is very largely providing the comforts which we in the cities and towns enjoy.

Mr. RYAN: The middlemen could not do without them.

Mr. TAYLOR: There are middlemen and there are tail-end men, and I would soon be a middleman than a tail-end man. Anyone who wishes to see the State develop must have sympathy with agricultural interests and do all he possibly can to see that the primary industries of this great State are maintained in a solid condition so that there will be every possible inducement for the men engaged in those activities to carry on their duties. These men provide, first of all, the freight both ways for our railways, from Monday morning to Saturday night. They are fighting drought, flood, and pestilence of various kinds. They produce the food supplies for the people in the cities and towns, and the products for the manufactures of the cities and towns. Therefore they are deserving of every possible consideration. In the various speeches I have made from time to time in this Chamber I have not failed in any shape or form to advocate that proper consideration be given to the men on the land. Not only have the men on the land to be considered, but there are the women. We should have very little agricultural production, and we should not be in the position we are in to-day were it not for the big-hearted women who go into the isolated areas and assist their husbands to carry on work such as that entailed in the carrying on of the dairying industry.

One matter should claim the attention of the Government. Can we not find some better system of housing a lot of our people in the outback areas, and in the northern parts of Queensland than exists at the present time? Quite a number of people who to-day are engaged in agricultural activities are living in what are practically incubator houses. They have an inadequate water supply, and do not enjoy any of the comforts of civilisation which we enjoy. If we could evolve a suitable, cheap, cool house for those people to live in, we should be doing a very great service.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: When did that strike you?

Mr. TAYLOR: It does not seem ever to have struck the hon. member.

I would like to extend a very hearty welcome to the Secretary for Mines. As the biggest mine-owner, or mine-controller, in Queensland we are very pleased to see him. We have quite a lot of things we want to ask him in connection with those wonderful mines which he is endeavouring to run with signal success in the northern part of Queensland.

In the Governor's Speech, also, we find references to new settlers and to immigration. We want new settlers and we want immigration in order to fill up the empty spaces in Queensland; but we do not want to settle people on the land and let the land settle the people. Unless we are exceptionally careful in the methods we adopt, that is what is going to happen with quite a number of people who are on the land to-day. I do not know of anything more pathetic than the deserted homesteads which we see in

Mr. Taylor.]

travelling about the State. They speak of broken hearts and of empty pockets. Probably, after years of toil, a man with his wife and family has had to get out and find some new occupation with practically no money in his pocket. I was struck with some remarks that were made the other day regarding new settlers. If I am informed correctly, it is practically an impossibility to get people who are farmers in Great Britain to come here and settle on the land, because there is not sufficient inducement. If we go into the history of land settlement in Queensland and Australia, how many men and women will we find who came out with practical knowledge and experience?

The HOME SECRETARY: They cannot get them to settle on the land in England.

Mr. TAYLOR: Probably that is so. If you take the hundreds of thousands of people who are settled on the land throughout Australia to-day, you will find they came out with practically nothing in their pockets. They had big hearts, and a great majority of them have won through.

Mr. KING: They have freeholds.

Mr. TAYLOR: Yes, they have freeholds to-day. Personally, I think that, if the option were given to people coming out to Australia of having freehold or leasehold, freehold would be preferred. A man will put a great deal more work into a piece of land and develop it very much more quickly and more highly when he knows he is getting the freehold title of it, than he would if it were a leasehold. Under leasehold tenure, if he does not get along, he can walk out and leave on the selection the few improvements he has made. If it is a freehold, he will do his utmost and so develop that land, bringing it to such a high state of production, that there will be every possible inducement for him to continue as a producer.

The matter of railway construction also is mentioned in the Speech. A great deal more careful consideration should be given to railway construction than has been given in recent years in Queensland. We cannot go on as we have been doing for years, extending our railways into areas which are not going to make them revenue-producing even after they have been running for forty or fifty years. There is only one section of our railways—that from Northgate to Gympie—which is paying interest and working expenses. That section has to pay the same wages and the same price for materials as every other section has to pay. Yet it is paying its way.

The PREMIER: What does the hon. member suggest?

Mr. TAYLOR: I will come to that in a minute. Why is that railway paying? For the simple reason that there is close settlement along the line. On both sides of that line from Northgate to Gympie, extending probably a distance of ten, fifteen, or twenty miles on either side, we have settlers. There is no other section of our railways paying nearly as well as that particular section. If the Government activities were directed more in the direction of increasing settlement along quite a number of our existing railway lines, and if the Government took in hand the matter of inducing closer settlement within those areas, we should not have the terrible figures that our railways are disclosing to-day. I am quite aware that

[Mr. Taylor.

there are a number of existing lines along which we cannot have closer settlement. In some of the back country we cannot have closer settlement.

The PREMIER: Do you wish us to resume those estates?

Mr. TAYLOR: That should be done in the agricultural areas, where the scheme would not be experimental, and where people would be successful. If hon. members will turn up the last report of the Railway Commissioner, they will find just exactly the same thing as I have said to-night. I certainly think that, if a lot of this American dollar loan money had been expended in that particular direction, it would have been a greater benefit to the State. That is my opinion. Had the money been spent in that particular way, I think that we would have had very much better returns than we are likely to get at the present time.

The PREMIER: Three million pounds will not purchase very much land along the railway line.

Mr. TAYLOR: It will buy a fair amount of very good land, and will settle people practically immediately. It is going to take a very considerable time before we shall be able to settle people on the Burnett lands.

Mr. STOPFORD: Why not make the people work the land they own?

Mr. TAYLOR: Possibly we can make them work it. Something ought to be done with it. It ought to be brought into productive use, and, if that is not done, some system should be adopted in order to bring it into productive use.

Mr. FERRICKS: You are asking for the purchase of freehold land in order to give freehold land away again.

Mr. TAYLOR: It does not matter whether I am advocating the purchase of freehold land or not. I am advocating closer settlement along the existing railways, so that the railways will have a chance of paying. We all know that the cost price of a lot of things has gone up, and it is the boast of the Government that they have not raised railway fares and freights. I repeat that, so far as the metropolitan area and other areas similar to Brisbane are concerned, they are not paying their fair quota to the railways. I am not one to advocate the raising of fares and freights in the country areas, where our producing friends are, but I do contend that the cost of travelling on the railways in the metropolitan area of Queensland is lower than it should be. It will not trouble me very much whether the people of Windsor like it or not. I am here to advocate what I think is right and proper. When I spoke a year or two ago, advocating an increase in fares and freights in a particular direction, within a few weeks the Government raised them in the metropolitan area, and, if they would only do it this time, it would help, perhaps, to bring in a little more railway revenue.

The PREMIER: Do you suggest increasing the fares and freights?

Mr. TAYLOR: In the metropolitan and similar areas. Why should any man in this Chamber be able to ride in a railway train to Sandgate and other watering places, and the people in the country have to pay for him to have the privilege of riding cheaply? If there are any people who deserve cheaper

railway travelling to visit the seaside, it is the people who only see it once in twelve months or once in two or three years. If a freer hand was given to the Railway Commissioner than he has at the present time, and if this infernal political control, which is like a dead hand on the railways and a number of activities of the State, was removed, it would be very much better for the State, for the railways, and for the whole people. We have to bear in mind that, if you have got to tax the people as they have had to be taxed in Queensland in recent years to make up the loss on what we claim to be the finest and best asset in Queensland, and if you have got to bleed the people white in all these areas in order to make up for the deficiency so as to pay the interest bill on the construction of railways in Queensland to-day, you are simply taking away money from industry and manufacturing development. I do not think that anyone can deny that fact. The money could be much better employed, and we would get a much better return for the country than we will by expending it in the way we are at the present time.

Water conservation and irrigation is also touched upon in the Governor's Speech. It is a great pity that greater attention was not given to that question fifteen, twenty, or thirty years ago.

The PREMIER: A Nationalist Government was in office then.

Mr. TAYLOR: If a Nationalist Government failed in its duty in the past, is that any reason why the Government at the present time should fail in their duty?

The PREMIER: No.

Mr. TAYLOR: If the man on the land is going to be charged the enormous amount that the Inkerman farmers will have to be charged to cover interest and redemption on the money expended in the Inkerman irrigation scheme, then, I take it, the scheme will be a failure.

The PREMIER: Does anyone say they will not be able to pay those costs?

Mr. TAYLOR: It has been stated they will not. I only hope they will be able to carry the cost. I am very pleased to see that in connection with their irrigation scheme the Government propose that it should be placed under the control of a committee or board of experts—men with special knowledge, and not members of Parliament who do not know anything at all about it. With all due respect to the present members, the greatest failures on Public Works Commissions, public inquiries, and Royal Commissions are members of Parliament, simply because they have too many people to please outside of Parliament, and have not the freedom of action which independent men have in carrying out such activities as are required to be carried out in connection with a proper system of irrigation or water conservation. If such a system had been introduced and carried out twenty or thirty years ago, I venture to say we would never have had to go to America.

Mr. RYAN: It is not too late now.

Mr. TAYLOR: No, it is never too late. Had this matter had the attention that it should have had many years ago, the tremendous losses which have been incurred throughout Queensland by the loss in stock and crops at various times would not have placed us in the position that we are in

to-day. Anything in the way of a sensible, sound proposal for the conservation of water and for irrigation should not be made a party matter, but should have the attention and interest of every hon. member in the Chamber. I welcome the fact that we are not going to have simply public servants controlling the scheme, but that a board of men having special knowledge of the subject they are dealing with will be appointed. Experts are, generally speaking, disappointing. It is quite a pleasant thing to hear one [7.30 p.m.] expert's opinion of another. If you get a tradesman into your house to do a job, such as altering the water supply or something like that, he will tell you that the other fellow did not know anything at all about it, and that, to a very large extent, is similar to the position which experts take up to-day.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: What is the remedy?

Mr. TAYLOR: I must confess that we are in their hands, and I do not know the remedy. We have simply to exercise the greatest care in the selection of our men, so that we will get as good a return for the expenditure as we can.

Another matter referred to in His Excellency's Speech is the cotton industry. The Government are for ever telling us what a splendid lot of "chaps" they have been; how much they have done for the cotton industry; how they have set it on its legs. It is no credit to any Government to do what they have done in regard to the cotton industry. It is one of the functions of the Government to assist and encourage, as far as they possibly can, every industry in the State; and, if there is one man more than another who deserves special mention in connection with the cotton industry, it is Mr. Crawford Vaughan. His name has not been mentioned in the House in connection with the cotton industry, and yet he has done more in the last twelve months for the industry than this Government or any other Government have done in five years.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Rubbish! The Government guaranteed the price of cotton.

Mr. TAYLOR: I do not claim to possess all the knowledge, like the hon. gentleman interjecting, with regard to this matter, but I do know that twelve months ago there was no cotton grown in Central Queensland, and to-day Queensland cotton is very near the British market for sale.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Why? Because the Government guaranteed a price for raw cotton.

Mr. TAYLOR: I say those responsible for the position more than the Government are Mr. Crawford Vaughan and the British Empire Cotton Growers' Association. Twelve months ago there was practically no cotton in Central Queensland, and there was no ginning plant of any kind, but they brought machinery from America and erected it in Rockhampton, and to-day, as a result of their efforts, our cotton is very near the markets of the world.

The PREMIER: The two ginneries brought out here were the result of orders placed by the Queensland Government, and we entered into an agreement with Mr. Vaughan's company to erect the machinery.

Mr. Taylor.

Mr. TAYLOR: They have half a dozen gineries at work. I have seen them working.

The PREMIER: There are only two gineries in Queensland.

Mr. TAYLOR: The hon. gentleman may be talking of buildings, but I am talking of machines.

The PREMIER: There are two gineries, and all the machinery in them was brought out here as the result of orders placed by the Queensland Government.

Mr. TAYLOR: Placed on order by the Queensland Government probably on account of Mr. Crawford Vaughan.

The PREMIER: No.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: There was no cultivation until the Government guaranteed a price of 5½d. per lb. for seed cotton.

Mr. TAYLOR: I give Mr. Crawford Vaughan credit for the position as it exists in Queensland to-day.

The Speech is not so remarkable for what it says as for what it does not say. There is not a single word in it regarding the manufacture of cotton into fabrics.

Mr. STOPFORD: That is a Federal matter. The Commonwealth controls the tariff.

Mr. TAYLOR: Then we may as well pass over all our industries to the Federal Government. I say it is not a Federal matter. If we want to see that industry solidly established in Queensland, then it is time we got to work to see what we can do about manufacturing cotton into fabrics. We are always complaining about the fact that we send away all our primary products to be made up in other parts of the world, and yet, here, when there is an opportunity of establishing a secondary industry, we do not see one single reference in the Speech to any attempt to promote the manufacture of cotton into fabrics in Rockhampton or anywhere else. So far as secondary industries are concerned, the Speech is lamentably deficient. I cannot see any reference in it which would give us any indication of the Government's sincerity with regard to secondary industries. It is all very well to go on encouraging primary production. We all believe in that, but we know the establishment of secondary industries is absolutely essential for the prosperity of the primary industries. We have in Queensland to-day any amount of unemployed. We have any amount of opportunities to engage in manufacture, and yet we are losing the chance of a lifetime in that regard.

Another matter in connection with the cotton industry which I omitted to mention is this—though I dare say the Government are doing something in the matter. We ought, as soon as ever we possibly can, to get hold of men who have a special knowledge of the cultivation of cotton in the great cotton-growing countries of the world, so that we can protect the cotton from diseases which may attack the plantations. We have been told that one of the reasons for the present high price of cotton is because the cotton plant in America has been attacked by a weevil, which has given the industry in America a setback which it will take years to overcome. Therefore, we want, if at all possible, to keep out these pests. We know that in a climate like Queensland

[Mr. Taylor.

they thrive well once they get a hold. We want to protect the industry and give it a chance to get on its feet.

In the Governor's Speech reference is also made to the sugar industry. We all know how vital that industry is to the prosperity of Queensland. It is more vital to this State than to any other State in the Commonwealth; but how it is that people in the Southern States of Australia are so blind to their own interests as to wish the present agreement cancelled, I fail to understand. Maryborough, Bundaberg, Townsville, Cairns, and other towns along our coast are practically dependent on the sugar industry for their existence, and the greater proportion of the manufactured articles which they consume in those towns comes from the States which are kicking up all this fuss. The people in the South do not seem to realise that those towns in Queensland, which exist as a result of the growing of sugar, really obtain the greater proportion of their goods from the South. Of course, the "white Australia" policy comes into the matter. Because Sir Henry Barwell happened to say certain things with regard to a "white Australia" we are told that the Nationalist party and others on this side of the House are opposed to a white Australia. Men who say that know quite well that it is not true.

Mr. KIRWAN: When did they change?

Mr. TAYLOR: They have never changed.

Mr. GLEDSON: Quite correct! They have never changed from the old kanaka days.

Mr. TAYLOR: It is quite evident that the hon. members who are interjecting do not know the alphabet of the coloured-labour business. Before ever there was a Labour party in Queensland, or in any other State in Australia, men like Sir Samuel Griffith advocated a white Australia and the abolition of coloured labour; and they carried it out.

Mr. KIRWAN: We introduced it.

Mr. TAYLOR: The slogan "White Australia" appealed to the Labour party, and they put it on their platform, but it was never off our platform. We are not so blind to the interests of the State as to wish to see a mongrel population settled in Queensland; we are not so stupidly foolish as that. We know what has happened, and is happening, in America and other parts of the world. We have been able to demonstrate to the whole of the world that it is practicable to grow sugar in the tropical areas of Queensland under white labour conditions, and so far as we are concerned those conditions will continue; but there are quite a lot of things we have to do in the development of a white Australia. In the maintenance of that policy there is a duty thrown upon us in Southern Queensland and Southern Australia to see that the conditions under which the people in tropical Australia are living to-day are such as will amply compensate them for the work they are doing, and enable them to enjoy the comforts to which they are entitled. Although the methods which have been adopted by the Commonwealth Government and other Governments have not satisfactorily settled Darwin and other parts of North Australia, that does not prove that the settlement of those particular parts of Australia cannot be carried out by white men. We shall have to change our methods, and be prepared to pay the price

for making that change. It is not fair to ask men and women to go to the outposts of Australia to rear families of white Australians under the conditions which now exist. The responsibility devolves upon every man and woman in the southern part of the continent to see that those conditions are improved, and that the people there are adequately paid for the work they are doing.

I would like to speak about tropical industries generally. We have proved that we can grow sugar. Last session I quoted the figures given by Mr. Massy Greene in the Federal Parliament when discussing the Federal tariff, in so far as the cocoa bean was concerned in the manufacture of confectionery. The quantity of cocoa beans imported into Australia for the manufacture of confectionery is simply staggering, and I ask the Secretary for Agriculture to find out if we cannot grow the cocoa bean in tropical Queensland. We do not want to be absolutely dependent on the one industry there. We want to find out if we cannot grow other crops besides sugar that will help to develop Northern Queensland.

Mr. FERRICKS: You never took Massy Greene as an authority about the propagation of sugar ratoons.

Mr. TAYLOR: I did not quote Massy Greene as an authority. If the hon. member would listen, he would see that I am simply quoting figures which Mr. Massy Greene quoted when the tariff was being discussed, as to the quantity and value of cocoa beans imported into Australia. Mr. Massy Greene expressed no opinion as to their cultivation in Queensland.

Mr. FERRICKS: He said something about the planting of sugar ratoons.

Mr. TAYLOR: I am simply raising the question as to what might be another profitable industry to establish in Queensland, and I think it is worthy of our consideration. The figures in regard to the importation of cocoa beans are staggering in their magnitude, and one would not have thought that such a tremendous quantity of this commodity was imported into Australia for the manufacture of confectionery. We all know that a magnificent factory is being built in Tasmania by Cadbury's and one or two other British firms associated with the manufacture of sweets. I take it that the reason they have gone to Tasmania is on account of the suitable climatic conditions there and easy access to water. Our Department of Agriculture should see if it is not possible for us to produce sweets commercially, so that they may be manufactured from Queensland-grown cocoa beans. We have just passed through "Australia Week," and it was quite refreshing to see in the various shops in Brisbane the stocks of articles manufactured in Queensland and other parts of Australia. I would like to go one step further. Instead of having only one week every year in which to display the industries and manufactures of Queensland, I would suggest to the Chamber of Manufacturers and the manufacturers of Queensland that they should arrange to have one continuous exhibit of their manufactures in Brisbane, Townsville, Rockhampton, and other principal cities. There should be one in Queen street, in Brisbane. Our people would then be able to see our products, and to put their money into our industries. We talk about economy, but the greatest economy the people of Queensland can practise is to spend all the money they

possibly can on Australian-made goods, and not send so much money out of the Commonwealth, as they are doing at the present time. to bring in articles which we could produce ourselves. If the people would only stand behind the manufacturing interests, greater prosperity would ensue to the State. But it is incumbent on those who are manufacturing goods, as well as on the consumers, to bring before the people the fact that they are providing an article second to none in the Commonwealth. We should thus stimulate our manufactures and make conditions better in every possible direction for the whole of the people of Australia.

I would like now to refer to the Brisbane Tramways Bill. I do not know whether the Government have seen the latest reports on the Newcastle tramways, but if not, the sooner they do so the better. They will get from the reports the experts' opinion with regard to a rigid road tramway, such as exists in Brisbane to-day. Anyone who travels in Australia—probably not so much in Queensland as in other parts of the Commonwealth—must realise the value of good roads and the motor system which is being introduced, more particularly in New South Wales. The good roads and the motor system there are simply ousting the railways. There is a railway line of 50 miles from Tamworth to Barraba, in New South Wales, but a motor service which is running between these towns is simply pushing the railway out of existence.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It is a wonder your party have not adopted a road policy.

Mr. TAYLOR: We have not had a chance so far, but we will have a road policy yet. I support that policy. Anything that is for the benefit of Queensland I will support every time.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Then you support the Labour party?

Mr. TAYLOR: Not on your life. The Government are not prepared to handle the tramways themselves. The Government are proposing to introduce a Bill for the formation of a trust to carry on the tramways in Brisbane. They recognise that it is a "gone" concern, and they do not want the responsibility thrust upon them of making a success of it. The Government know quite well that they could not make a success of the trams, and that is why they are proposing to hand the business over to the local authorities. The local authorities will not make the trams pay either.

Mr. GLEDSON: You are a local authority man.

Mr. TAYLOR: My reasons for saying that are because of the report I read in connection with the Newcastle Tramways, and because of the strides which motor transit is making in the largest cities of the world at the present time. We need not go to the large cities of the world, but we can go to cities in Australia, to see the success of motor transit. You have only to go to Rockhampton, and also to Toowoomba, to see what the motor buses are doing there. You do not want to go to Newcastle or to London, because we have evidence of the success of motor transit at our very doors. Yet, a Bill is going to be introduced to foist the system that exists at the present time on to the local authorities. The Government will say to the local authorities, "Here are the

Mr. Taylor.]

trams. You will have to make a success of them." As soon as the local authorities take them over there will be a rise in the fares. I told the people of Brisbane that, and I guarantee that I am right. They will not run the tramways for twelve months before the fares are up 1d. It would be infinitely better if the Government gave the present owners an extension of the franchise. It would have been better still if the local authorities had accepted the arrangement put before them by the Tramways Company some years ago. The Tramways Company offered the local authorities in the metropolitan area a partnership in the business without asking them to put up any cash at all. If the local authorities were prepared to grant the company an extension of the franchise along their roads, the company was prepared to give them a share in the profits and dividends. It was a profit-making concern then, and it has been a profit-making concern for the last fifteen years.

The PREMIER: The shareholders in the Tramways Company were to be guaranteed their profits for all time.

Mr. TAYLOR: The local authorities would not go into the business on that occasion. If they were not satisfied with the agreement offered them by Mr. Badger, they should have told him that they were not prepared to accept the agreement, and Mr. Badger would have been willing to meet them, and probably would have altered it to suit the local authorities, because, at that time, the Tramways Company were anxious to get an extension of the franchise. I was on a local authority then, and I know that the local authorities would not even discuss the proposal.

Mr. STOFFORD: How did you vote?

Mr. TAYLOR: There was no vote taken, but I supported it, and I would support it again to-morrow, as I was in favour of the local authorities going into partnership with the Tramways Company.

The HOME SECRETARY: Are you sure you supported it?

Mr. TAYLOR: Quite sure. I always reckoned that the local authorities made a great mistake when they turned down that proposal, because every local authority in the metropolitan area would have been in it, and they would have been receiving thousands of pounds in revenue, which it would not have cost them a penny to collect. They would have been assured of getting their profits every year provided they were prepared to give an extension of the franchise to the Tramways Company.

The HOME SECRETARY: Do you really think that Mr. Badger would give anything away for nothing?

Mr. TAYLOR: All I can say in regard to that is, that when the papers were placed before the local authorities, they were shown quite clearly what they could expect in the way of revenue at that particular time.

The PREMIER: That agreement practically guaranteed the shareholders their average profits for all time.

Mr. TAYLOR: And it practically guaranteed to the local authorities that they would get profits for all time.

The HOME SECRETARY: That proposal gave the people of Brisbane the right to hang on to straps in the trams for the rest of their lives.

[Mr. Taylor.

Mr. TAYLOR: We had to sit on the steps in the railway carriage the other day because there was no room inside.

Mr. RYAN: Yet, you complain that the trains are running empty.

Mr. TAYLOR: The hon. member never heard me complain about the trains running empty.

We have now got what is known as the unicameral system. We have wiped out the Upper House, and we are now a single Chamber. If you go through the list of Bills in the Governor's Speech, you will find thirteen or fourteen proposed amending Bills. After all the trouble that was taken here in going through the first, second, and third readings, and Committee stages, and after going through it all again in the Upper House, we find that we have got thirteen or fourteen Acts that require amending.

Mr. FERRICKS: That is why those amendments are necessary—because the Council interfered with the original measures.

Mr. TAYLOR: When this session of Parliament is over—I understand it is only going to last a week or so—(laughter)—and we come back again in the next session of Parliament, there will be some more amending Bills. We shall find, when the next Parliament meets, that there will be an amendment of every Bill that is passed through the Chamber this session. That is my opinion of what is going to happen. To-day, certain questions were asked with regard to reductions in salaries. It is only a fair thing that, if the public servants and other people outside are going to have their salaries reduced, we should start at the top of the tree and reduce the salaries of Ministers and members of Parliament.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. TAYLOR: If the cost of living has gone down for the workers outside, then it has gone down for members of Parliament. (Hear, hear!) It is only a fair thing to use the pruning knife right through. The Premier said during the last few days that the outlook financially is not too good, and he proposes certain economies. Well, the economies should be started in here. Cut out the free railway passes which were given to our wives, and cut out the free railway passes given to men who have been in Parliament for three Parliaments, and also cut out the free passes which were given to the ex-members of the Legislative Council. If the Government are sincere in their desire for economy at all, let them play the game. The Government profess to be the friends of the workers. They say they are the friends of the men who have to work and toil for their living. They are not the friends of the workers at all. If the Government want to show their sincerity, they should start their economies here and let us all suffer a reduction in our salaries.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER (Hon. E. G. Theodore, *Chillagoe*), who was received with Government cheers, said: Two hon. members have spoken on the opposite side of the House, one representing the Country party, and apparently he was delegated to that duty by the leader of the Country party, and the other speaker was the leader of the Nationalist party. Neither of them said anything against the Government. Neither of them dealt in any

effective way, from a critical point of view, at any rate, with the programme placed before them for this session. The hon. member who has just finished his speech hardly referred to the Governor's Speech at all. In fact, he was hard put to it to continue his speech for almost an hour in his attack upon the Government. I will reply to several matters he referred to after I have referred to the remarks of the hon. member for Oxley. The member for Oxley occupied a unique position

this evening in replying to the [8 p.m.] Government programme on behalf of the Country party, and one would have expected to hear from him some constructive suggestion or criticism, if he did not agree with it, in regard to the Government's agricultural policy. The hon. member, I understand, spoke for his full time, and his speech amounted to nothing more nor less than a bitter, vitriolic reactionary attack on the members of the Government. If one went back over the pages of "Hansard" for a few years and sought out speeches of the true representative type of Tory politicians in the old days, when everything that emanated from Labour was anathema in their minds, one could not have got a better speech or one less founded on reason or justification than that of the hon. member to-night. He spoke of the Labour party having stolen the Country party's thunder. He used this phrase, or something like it: that the policy which we are now placing before the country, and the policy on which we are appealing to the farmers for support, is the very policy which the Country party has been advocating for years. Why, he has only been in the Country party a week or two, and I understand that, when he left the Nationalist party the "Courier" referred to it as a "political proselytising stunt" on his part.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: What do you think about it?

The PREMIER: From what I heard of the hon. member's speeches last session and the session before, when he was enunciating the Nationalist party's policy, when he said that the Nationalist party's policy was all that was required to satisfy all section of the people in Queensland, I am driven to think that his action is contemptible, because it was apparently taken to bring about his own personal aggrandisement.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE interjected.

The PREMIER: I have not changed my opinion on that point, I shall read the hon. member's own statement in Melbourne, which he did not think would be reported in print in the local newspapers here. There he made a speech, or gave an interview, to the representative of the Melbourne "Age," and he gave this as the real reason why he dissociated himself from the Nationalist party—

"Mr. Elphinstone explained that, although the Country party was numerically the stronger of the anti-Labour forces, it yet lacked strong leaders. Its members possessed sound knowledge on public questions, but lacked administrative ability. In the case of the Nationalist party the opposite obtained."

Apparently the Nationalists had no sound knowledge on public questions, but they had administrative ability. (Government laughter.)

Mr. T. R. ROBERTS: He is apparently hurting you.

The PREMIER: I am suggesting that he is hurting hon. members. He is evidently hurting the "Courier," to judge from their bitter attacks on him. This is really well worth the notice of the Country party—I continue to quote from the hon. member's remarks to the Melbourne "Age" reporter—

"The Country party recognised this, and it was at their request that he, Mr. Elphinstone, had recently gone over from the Nationalist party, although he had been elected for a town seat."

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: That is exactly what you would like to do, but you have not got the pluck. (Government laughter.) Be a man; come over!

The PREMIER: If I had wished to come over, all I need have done was to accept one of at least half a dozen invitations that you know of. (Government laughter.)

Mr. MORGAN: I do not think there is any truth in that last statement of yours.

The PREMIER: I will reiterate it. At least half a dozen times in the last two years I have been so invited by persons who said they had authority—(Opposition laughter)—I must accept their word, because they represented hon. members on the opposite side—who said they had authority to sound me on the question. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: Name them!

The PREMIER: I could name them. One of them said he was acting for the Northern Country party. (Laughter.) They said they had full authority to conduct negotiations with the idea of my forming a new progressive party in Queensland, which they said would secure from the Opposition the most reasonable men on that side.

Mr. MORGAN: Name one of them.

The PREMIER: The hon. member whose remarks I am criticising adopted the role that he initiated last year, which was quite a change from the attitude he took up when he came here first. Then, it will be remembered, the hon. member was inclined to be somewhat reasonable and rational, and on more than one occasion gave credit to the Government for certain things they did, and to individual Ministers for the course they adopted; but I understand that the hon. member has been told that, if he wants to make any progress in Opposition, he must oppose everything that emanates from the Labour party, denounce the Government on every occasion, and never admit they do anything right.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: I have never found them do anything right yet.

The PREMIER: That seems to sum up the position. One would have expected that the Country party would at least have given its blessing to that part of the Government programme which deals with the reforms for the man on the land, and which is intended to uplift agriculture and place it on a new basis in Queensland. But, instead of this, the hon. member for Oxley indulges in the fault-finding and carping criticism of a man who is opposed to everything that comes from Labour. Even an agricultural newspaper such as the "Producers' Review"—(Opposition laughter)—

Mr. BEBBINGTON: A Labour paper!

Hon. E. G. Theodore.]

The PREMIER: I firmly believe it is becoming a Labour paper, but it is still the official organ of the Queensland Farmers' Union.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: No.

The PREMIER: And the hon. member and others tried to get it displaced.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I did not, but I would do it.

The PREMIER: The "Queensland Producers' Review" is the official organ also of the United Canegrowers' Association.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: Did you not arrange a secret meeting with the editor of the "Producers' Review"?

The PREMIER: And the hon. member for Pittsworth is another who went round among the farmers trying to get it dislodged from its position as the official organ of the Queensland Farmers' Union.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: It will be dislodged; make no mistake about it.

The PREMIER: I do not think it will be dislodged.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: Tell us about some of the secret meetings you had when you went through to Sydney.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: And then, again, did you not send for the editor to help you with your policy?

The PREMIER: The "Producers' Review" is still representing a very large body of farmers in Queensland, and is doing a vast amount of good for the agricultural industry.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: It is a "Producers' Review." If anyone apart from the Government deserves credit for the policy which finds expression in the Speech, it is the "Producers' Review," for it has advocated and pursued a sound policy, and has not been—like hon. members opposite—constitutionally and absolutely opposed to everything Labour, because Labour happens to be in office. It has been able to take a broad view of questions relating to agriculture in Queensland. It is broadminded enough to accept assistance and co-operation in carrying out a policy for the farmers in Queensland, no matter from which quarter that policy emanates, so long as those who advance it are sincere in their desire to carry it out. The hon. member for Pittsworth just now by interjection asked me how it was that I had arranged secret meetings with the editor of the "Producers' Review." In case there may be some misunderstanding, I want to say plainly that I have met Mr. Harrison, the editor. He came down to see me; we discussed matters of policy, and subsequently I asked him to come down and see me again. We have met on many occasions. He also has met the Secretary for Agriculture. I have accepted his advice on some occasions. His knowledge is sound, and his advice always worthy of serious consideration. Why should we not accept that advice? He is editor of the "Producers' Review," which circulates throughout the length and breadth of Queensland, and I think it is the most representative agricultural journal in Queensland to-day.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: No.

The PREMIER: Do hon. members on that side suggest that the editor should not

[Hon. E. G. Theodore.

meet the Premier or a Minister, and that he should not discuss questions of policy which his paper is advocating with those who have the power to put them in operation? That is the suggestion which hon. members opposite make. Talking about sinister influences, let me relate this to the Chamber: Since the "Producers' Review" adopted the line of policy it has followed during the last year or two, since it found that the Government were developing an agricultural policy upon the lines it had been advocating, the hon. member for Pittsworth has tried to "skull-drag" the editor of that journal. The hon. member had special meetings called among branches of the Queensland Farmers' Union to try and displace the editor. When he could not accomplish that, he tried to get the Queensland Farmers' Union to declare the "Producers' Review" not to be the official organ of the Queensland Farmers' Union. He failed in that; and he has used every device, so I understand, to throw discredit upon the "Producers' Review" and upon the editor.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: You "skull-dragged" the Government Printer in the same way that you say I tried to "skull-drag" the editor of the "Producers' Review."

The PREMIER: Hon. members opposite have tried to get the farmers to influence the political policy of the editor of the "Producers' Review," and have pointed out at meetings which have been reported that the "Producers' Review" ought to be squelched, because it was supporting the Labour policy.

Following out the line of policy which Labour has advocated ever since it has been in office—that is, reasonable, fair, and rational treatment for the man on the land—which is represented on the statute-book by 80 or 90 measures dealing with reforms for the man on the land, we further developed our policy this year. I outlined the Government's plans in a speech at Laidley, further at Lowood, and subsequently on the Downs. What did hon. members say after I had made those speeches? They said they were only so many words; they were only speeches intended to tickle the ears of the electors, because we were expecting an early election, and they could expect nothing from this Government.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Except communism.

The PREMIER: To show our bona fides in regard to that matter, we have put our policy, or are putting it now, into operation. It is because we have made such great strides in putting that policy into operation, because the Government are being supported in that policy by the farmers—who will benefit under it—that hon. members opposite find themselves so discomfited to-day. It is quite clear that, to carry out the comprehensive policy outlined, to bring about a real uplifting of agriculture, to give the farmer the status he ought to occupy in the community, to give the man toiling on the land a fair remuneration for his toil—to carry a policy of that kind fully into effect is going to take, not a week, a month, or a year, but a long series of years. But we must start somewhere. It is recognised that under such a policy we will get no great distance unless it is backed up and forced on by the farmers themselves. They must have organisation in order to do that; they must have organisation in order to become articulate, in order to supply the

force to influence Parliament, public opinion, and everything else. An effective basis of organisation has been adopted by the farmers' representatives, and is being put into operation with the assistance of the Government. That organisation is not intended to discomfit hon. members opposite; it is not intended to displace any political organisation which hon. members may desire in country districts. That is entirely apart from the intentions of the Government, which really aim at an uplifting movement amongst the farmers. We want an organisation which must be kept absolutely separate from political factions and political exploitation. That is what hon. members opposite do not like.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Get behind it! It is your only hope.

The PREMIER: The Government have shown their sincerity by assisting the farmers to establish an organisation which will be entirely farmer-controlled, which will not be controlled by politicians, by Governments, or by Parliaments. From the local branches, through the district councils, right up to the council of agriculture, the farmers will be in control of every unit of their organisation. There can be no charge against the Government that we are creating a machine to be used politically. Since the scheme has been outlined and the organisation launched, I have received from every part of Queensland hundreds of letters from men directly concerned—men who will benefit under this scheme, passing encomiums upon the scheme, praising the Government for their efforts, and, generally, offering their support. This is a typical letter addressed to my colleague, the Secretary for Agriculture, by Mr. Harris, who is the Secretary of the Downs Co-operative Dairy Company. This is the reply to an intimation that the Council of Agriculture had made a change in regard to the personnel of the Advisory Board appointed for the dairy industry, and had decided to merge the Advisory Board into the Council of Agriculture. Mr. Harris was a member of the Advisory Board, and was one who was left out when the merging took place. He said—

"I am strictly in accord with the action taken in reducing the number of the members of the Advisory Board and the Agricultural Council, and, to my mind, it is a wise move for the Advisory Board to act as the dairying section on the Agricultural Council; this would have been the correct thing in the first place, but rather unfortunately the conference decided otherwise. I can assure you that I will continue to give my utmost support to bring to a successful issue the scheme outlined by Mr. Theodore and yourself at the dairying conference held in Brisbane on 24th March last, and I will also give my active assistance where necessary, to bring this movement to a successful issue, because, to my mind, it is the most comprehensive and beneficial scheme of organisation yet put before the farming community."

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: There is only one other reference I want to make. There is a reference in that letter to the dairy conference.

Mr. FLETCHER: We do not criticise the scheme; the scheme is good enough.

The PREMIER: The hon. member may not criticise the scheme, but some of his colleagues in the Country party are going round the country trying to torpedo the scheme. The hon. member for Pittsworth, the hon. member for Drayton, and even the hon. member for Nanango have gone round actively trying to undermine the basis of this scheme. (Opposition interruption.)

Mr. EDWARDS (*Nanango*): I rise to a point of order. The statement made by the Premier is absolutely incorrect.

The PREMIER: I drew my deductions from information in regard to the hon. member's attitude—which was given at meetings of farmers in the Nanango district.

Mr. EDWARDS: See how careful you ought to be. You are misled by your own supporters.

The PREMIER: No. If I am misled, I am misled by farmers in the hon. member's district.

Mr. EDWARDS: Your own supporters.

The PREMIER: If they have become our supporters, I am very pleased to hear it. I assure the hon. member that it is from his own district, and from farmers taking an active part in this scheme, that I have learned that he is trying to discourage and undermine the scheme.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is untrue.

The PREMIER: If the hon. member is supporting the scheme, I am very glad to hear it. If hon. members are what they pretend to be, if they represent the farmers and are desirous of getting the greatest good for the man on the land, and for the primary producers of this State, they will get behind this policy to a man, and not cavil against it and go round the country trying to undermine it, but will assist to carry it into effect.

The hon. member for Oxley, in his criticism of the remarks of the hon. member for Leichhardt, referred rather sneeringly to that hon. member's reference to immigration from other States. The hon. member for Oxley is in the habit of adopting a very patronising air, as I have had occasion to mention before. The hon. member spoke sneeringly about the hon. member for Leichhardt's reference to immigration from other States to Queensland. The hon. member stated that that was an incorrect or improper term to use. He ought to criticise the Commonwealth Statistician, for he uses the term. The Commonwealth Statistician publishes statistics, and they are brought up to date in the last quarterly summary, which conveys very significant information when you take into account the constant attack made by gloomy propaganda distributors, such as the hon. member for Oxley and others, as to the progress Queensland is making during Labour administration. The Labour party has been frequently attacked by hon. members opposite for being what they call antagonistic and hostile to immigration; and they refer to what Western Australia is doing in bringing in thousands of immigrants. They also refer to what other States are doing. According to the Commonwealth Statistician, last year, notwithstanding this wonderful immigration policy of Southern Nationalist Governments, Queensland had a greater

Hon. E. G. Theodore.]

excess of immigrants over emigrants than any other State of the Commonwealth.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: How many?

The PREMIER: I will tell you. The excess of immigrants over emigrants, including people who came from other States, is as follows:—New South Wales, 1,546; Victoria, 3,375; Queensland, 4,584; South Australia, 4,434; and Western Australia, which has been bringing in thousands of immigrants, had a net excess of immigrants over emigrants of only twenty-seven.

Mr. FLETCHER: Their scheme has not properly taken effect yet.

The PREMIER: The hon. member for Oxley would brusquely brush that aside by saying that the nomadic nature of the population caused them to come here from other States. That might be all right if these figures only related to a portion of the year, but they relate to the whole twelve months.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Well, you are paying doles for the whole twelve months.

The PREMIER: So do the New South Wales Nationalist Government, and the South Australian Nationalist Government; and even the Victorian Nationalist Government are paying doles to unemployed. These figures show that there are more actual unemployed in Victoria to-day than there are in Queensland.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Whose statistics? Your statistics!

The PREMIER: No, the Commonwealth statistics; so that the hon. member is careless about his facts.

The hon. member for Windsor, the leader of the Nationalist party, has made further reference to the railways, and to what he calls railway inefficiency and railway mismanagement, and the parlous conditions existing in connection with railway finance. In refutation of that, I need do no more than quote the remarks of the Commissioner for Railways himself, and there is no particular reason why he should supply any false information. I have here a voluntary statement made by him at a dairy dinner.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: He might be treated like Cumming was.

The PREMIER: Does the hon. member want to convey by that that Mr. Davidson is manufacturing untruths?

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: No.

The PREMIER: What is the suggestion?

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: If he spoke his mind, he might be treated in the same way as Cumming.

The PREMIER: How has Cumming been treated? Does the hon. member for Oxley suggest that no action should have been taken in that case?

Mr. MORGAN: It was a shame to sack an old man like that. (Government laughter.)

The PREMIER: Mr. Davidson, at the dairy dinner, remarked—

“The railway charges on dairying industry products were much lower in Queensland than in any other State in Australia, and notwithstanding the low freights, only the actual quantity of cream placed in the can was charged for in Queensland, while the full carrying

capacity was charged for in every other State. In the case of butter and cheese, the Queensland schedule rates were also very much lower. He quoted 100 miles, for instance: Queensland, 21s. 10d.; New South Wales, 35s. 5d.; Victoria, 25s. 2d.; South Australia, 38s.; West Australia, 31s. 6d. In addition to the low schedule rates, a further reduction of 20 per cent. had recently been made. Not only were the charges for dairying products much lower in Queensland than in other States, but the railway fares charged to the people engaged in the industry were also considerably lower than in other States.”

Later he says—

“To the casual reader our heavy deficits are apt to be taken as a reflection on the Administration, but I have no hesitation in saying, and it can be borne out by figures, that the service is more efficient to-day than ever it has been, and compares favourably with the railways of other States with upwards of ten times the volume of business per mile of line.”

Again, later—

“Our statistics show that both trains and wagons are now carrying better loads than formerly, and the tonnage hauled per employee is greater than it was five years ago. Had the rates and fares in Queensland been increased to the same extent as in New South Wales, and our tonnage and passenger business grown on the same ratio, the net return last year would have been over 4 per cent. in Queensland, instead of about $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

“The Queensland service, notwithstanding our heavy losses, will hold its own with the railways of other States, and I consider it would be a national calamity with our very light traffic to endeavour to make the branch lines pay 4 per cent. or over at the expense of primary industries.”

That represents the policy of the Government. The Government has no desire to displace or burden the primary producer or the people who have to use the railways. The leader of the Nationalist party advocated an increase in railway fares and freights. Last year the hon. gentleman advocated a general increase in fares and freights, but he has modified it this year by saying that he would only do that for the city of Brisbane and other places similarly situated. It would be a woeful policy to attempt to relieve from taxation those people who are quite able to pay and put the burden upon the producers who must use the railways. Such a policy is contrary to the best interests of Queensland, and is inimical to all progress, and yet the hon. member for Oxley comes along as a kind of new Adam Smith this afternoon and says that direct taxation is not paid by the person who pays the tax, but is paid by the whole community.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: You said the same thing in 1915.

The PREMIER: I said nothing of the kind. If the hon. member wants to go back over my career to find any such foolish statement as that, he would have to go back to the period before I left school. Certainly I have not said it since then. The untenable position that the hon. member takes up—that direct taxation upon net income is

[Hon. E. G. Theodore.

always passed on—is a thing that is too absurd, and should not require any refutation in an assembly of grown men.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: What about the tax on business premises?

The PREMIER: Every economist of modern times, and every financier, and every Treasurer who studies his subject, knows that the fairest burden is a direct tax upon net income. That is the fairest form of taxation. I do not say that none of it can be passed on, but it is too utterly ridiculous [8.30 p.m.] to say that the whole of the burden is passed on to the community. There is no fairer way that can be devised for getting revenue than imposing a direct tax, and it is fair and just, because every individual taxpayer knows how much he has to pay, and everyone else knows how much the individual pays, and it is not covered up as revenues are covered up when they are collected by an indirect means, such as levying upon imports, an excise duty upon manufactures or anything of that kind, or railway freights and fares, which are the most burdensome kind of taxation that can be levied upon the producers.

Mr. J. JONES: What about retrospective increases in pastoral rents?

The PREMIER: I fancy I hear the voice of the hon. member for Kennedy. I must tolerate that hon. member's interjection, because he has one plank in his platform, and he must get an opportunity now and again of interjecting. He is entirely obsessed on the question of the Land Tax Amendment Act of 1920 and the increase of pastoral rents. I do not know what the hon. member would do if, by any chance or mischance, that issue were removed. If it were, the hon. member would be left absolutely poverty-stricken, so far as a policy is concerned.

The leader of the Nationalist party suggested that the Government are not doing what they might do regarding settlement along the existing railway lines. That does raise a question that deserves very serious consideration. It is quite obvious to anyone that there is a lot of land close to the existing railway lines that is not being used that ought to be more closely occupied and brought under production. But this is a problem that cannot be solved by making speeches in this House. If any suggestions are made, the Government will listen to them and give them every consideration. It is a problem that we must all endeavour to solve.

Mr. MORGAN: It is a question of giving land away.

The PREMIER: We cannot give it away, as we do not possess it. The land the hon. gentleman is talking about is mostly freehold land.

Mr. MORGAN: A lot of the land is not freehold.

The PREMIER: Does the hon. member suggest that the land close to the North Coast Railway that is not used is not freehold land?

Mr. MORGAN: Between here and Roma there are thousands of acres of leasehold.

The PREMIER: Does the hon. member refer to the land around Chinchilla?

Mr. MORGAN: I am referring to land between here and Roma.

The PREMIER: Between here and Roma there is a lot of prickly-pear infested areas.

There may be leasehold land there, and we may deal with that; but the land referred to by the hon. member for Windsor is the freehold land that exists along all our southern lines and main railway routes, which is unoccupied and capable of being used for closer settlement. That land ought to be settled, but how to settle it is one of the difficult problems that the Lands Department has to deal with. Practically the whole of it is freehold land; that is the land on the North Coast and South Coast railways, and land between here and Toowoomba and on the various branch lines. For the State to get hold of that land, it must be purchased by the Government, unless it is to be confiscated. That means that it must be purchased at current prices, which means burdening the subsequent settlers with a very heavy charge. What has happened where land was purchased by previous Governments under the Closer Settlement Act? Practically in every case unreasonable burdens have been placed upon the men who settled on these lands, and the Government have had to come to the relief of the settlers by wiping out certain arrears of payments and giving them a clean sheet. That is the problem that is involved in the consideration of this question. It was thought—I say this frankly and freely—it was thought that the operation of the land tax would force more of these estates into occupation than has been the case. Some of the estates certainly have been subdivided, but not so many as we expected.

Mr. MOORE: There are no settlers for them.

The PREMIER: The hon. member, then, opposes the suggestion of the leader of the Nationalist party? The leader of the Nationalist party says that, if that land could be thrown open and settled the railways would pay; but now the hon. member for Aubigny says there are no settlers. The problem is a serious one, and it will have to be tackled by the Government and by this House. Possibly a policy can be formulated that will enable the Government to make that land available without injustice to the present holders, and yet on terms to the incoming settler that will enable him to carry on profitably. These are things that will have to be considered; but it is not a problem that will be solved by making Parliamentary speeches. It requires earnest consideration. The Secretary for Public Lands recently called a conference of land commissioners in those districts where unoccupied freehold land exists close to railways. They were asked to consider this problem and make a recommendation to the Government as to the best way of dealing with the position. They have been considering it—they have not yet completed their labours—and the only suggestion made so far is that the land tax on those estates should be drastically increased in order to force them into occupation.

Mr. MOORE: Just what you would expect from Crown lands rangers.

The PREMIER: Land commissioners. Many of the land commissioners who have been considering this problem were appointed by the previous Administration, and I hope that the hon. member is not making an attack upon them. They are men who ought, because of their careers, to have considerable experience of these matters. They come into

Hon. E. G. Theodore.

contact with the man on the land every day, and to whom can we go for advice if we cannot go to these men? I can assure hon. members that the problem is not being overlooked, but at the same time I admit that it is a very difficult problem to solve.

The leader of the Nationalist party also made a very unfortunate reference, in my opinion, when he used the term "infernal political control of our railways." I do not think that is warranted, and the remarks I quoted from the present Commissioner's address do not give any justification for such an attack. The Commissioner for Railways, under the Railways Act, is given very considerable power in regard to the administration of his department, and I think there is less interference with the Commissioner to-day than there ever has been in Queensland. No man who has administered that department has had a freer hand than Mr. Davidson, and the railways are not in that deplorable condition that hon. members opposite keep asserting they are.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: There is a deficit each year.

The PREMIER: There is a deficit each year because it is the policy of the Government not to burden the settlers on the branch railways. The efficiency of the railways is far greater to-day than ever it has been in the past.

Mr. GREEN: Ask your drivers.

The PREMIER: We do not ask the drivers when we want information. We ask the Commissioner. Perhaps the hon. member has been asking the drivers.

The hon. member, in his remarks in regard to the cotton industry, failed to give any praise to the Government for the present position. He did not acknowledge that the Government have done anything to encourage the cotton industry in Queensland, but, knowing that the cotton industry has prospered in Queensland and is making vast progress, he thought he ought to give praise to someone, and he gave it to Mr. Crawford Vaughan. I do not wish to detract one iota from the credit due to Mr. Crawford Vaughan. He has been a most enthusiastic and very capable investigator in the cotton industry, and he is doing an enormous amount of good to this State; but I cannot allow it to be said that he alone is responsible for the progress of the industry. Mr. Crawford Vaughan came to Australia in connection with cotton for the first time last year. He came here with a commission of inquiry consisting of himself, Mr. Johnstone, a cotton culture expert, and a business man, Mr. Armstrong. They were invited to come here by the Queensland Government, and we gave them every facility to travel through the State. When they came here they were impressed with Queensland as a cotton-growing State because so many farmers were already growing cotton under the Government's guarantee.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Largely because of the efforts of Mr. Daniel Jones.

The PREMIER: No one desires to detract from Mr. Daniel Jones's efforts, because he is entitled to every credit for his enthusiasm and his insistence that Queensland would produce cotton. But Mr. Jones has been enabled to carry on his investigations and carry on his publicity work by the actions of the Queensland

Government. He has been given every encouragement, and he has been practically employed by the Secretary for Agriculture to carry on his publicity, and induce farmers to grow cotton. I do not want to detract from the work done by Mr. Jones. He has done a wonderful amount of work; but, unfortunately, he is not so fully primed on modern cotton culture as an expert advising a large body of farmers in Queensland ought to be, because his experience has been gained chiefly in this State. At the same time, he is entitled to a vast amount of credit. The real encouragement given to cotton growing in Queensland dates from the guarantee given in 1920. When I was in England, after having an interview with the British Cotton Growers' Association—an organisation representing the Lancashire spinners, which the hon. member for Windsor wrongly thinks is the concern with which Mr. Crawford Vaughan is connected—we entered into an agreement with that association, under which they undertook to pay us 1s. 6d. per lb. for clean lint of good quality, landed at Liverpool, but limiting their loss to £10,000. Following on that guarantee which we obtained, my colleagues in Queensland decided to give a guarantee to all growers in Queensland of 5½d. per lb. for seed cotton. That is what gave a fillip to cotton growing in Queensland. I do not say this is the only Government that have acted in that way, but we did that. We did not neglect our opportunity in 1920. That resulted in the Department of Agriculture importing a vast quantity of seed for planting in 1921. A year after that Mr. Crawford Vaughan came here, and after he saw the possibilities, he was quite satisfied to advise his company to establish themselves here. He went back to England. He could not advise us then, but we got advice some time late last year. Meanwhile we had to make some progress towards establishing machines to treat the cotton which was being planted, and we placed with the Agent-General orders for two complete ginning plants. Mr. Crawford Vaughan had then got into touch with the Agent-General, and he cabled to us and said he was prepared to take over those plants and work them if we would agree to have our cotton ginned through his plants. We agreed to that, and that is why the cotton gins arrived so early.

Mr. FLETCHER: Don't you think it is the artificial conditions in America which are responsible for the advancement of cotton growing in Queensland?

The PREMIER: There are many reasons for it, but it is quite obvious to the most casual observer that, without the guarantee, there would not have been one-fourth of the cotton produced that is being produced now.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Have you renewed the guarantee for five years?

The PREMIER: No; the existing guarantee expires next June. We have exhausted the guarantee in England, and the £10,000 limit has been reached. Whatever now happens under the existing guarantee, the whole obligation falls on the Queensland Government. That is one burden we have to bear to organise the industry. The hon. member for Port Curtis said that it was the artificial conditions in America which had led to the growing of cotton here, but I think the hon. member is wrong. I have here an

interesting address by Sir Herbert Dixon, at an International Congress held at Zurich a few months ago, and reported in the "Manchester Guardian." Sir Herbert Dixon said—

"America was so troubled by the boll weevil, the decreasing supply of labour, and, possibly, an insufficient enrichment of the soil in recent years, that its production was declining. At the same time its own consumption was increasing. Unless we realise this, the necessary steps to ensure a sufficient world's supply would not be taken."

The whole object of that International Congress was to get new areas planted with cotton, in order to keep up the world's supply, and the British Cotton Growers' Association, and a later body established by the Imperial Government in connection with Empire cotton-growing, of which Lord Derby is chairman, are making every effort to get the Dominions to grow cotton, and they have approached the Commonwealth Government, knowing that we had asked the Commonwealth Government to get into touch with the Imperial authorities, and ask if they would give a guarantee for cotton grown in Queensland or Australia. We have suggested that 18d. per lb. for lint, c.i.f. Liverpool, will be a remunerative price to growers in Queensland, and I think there is every hope that we can get that carried through successfully.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: I notice that the leader of the Nationalists omitted any reference to the agricultural policy of the Government. I do not know whether he is afraid to commit himself to it. The only allusion he made in his speech was to the alleged fact that Nationalism had always upheld the interests of agricultural producers.

Mr. ROBERTS: That is something you should know.

The PREMIER: I do not know that he could quite demonstrate that, because they are losing their members to the Country party. (Laughter.) I sympathise with the leader of the Nationalists, for I have no time for deserters. I sympathise with him entirely—(laughter)—but I would suggest to the hon. member that he take heart. We also have suffered from the loss of a supporter. (Laughter.) Even the Redeemer, when He was on earth, suffered the loss of one of His supporters. There is no doubt that Nationalism is suffering because it has no policy. It has no policy, at any rate, with which it is prepared to come out into the open. Occasionally we hear an outburst from a true-blue Nationalist like Sir Henry Barwell, who comes out in his true colours. Then there is a great silence of Nationalists in the other States, who think it would be indiscreet to disclose their policy at so unfortunate a time. But the Nationalists in Queensland have formulated no policy. I have tried to discover what it is. Their policy seems to be one of attack upon Labour; that seems to sum up Nationalism. A couple of leading Nationalist newspapers in Australia admit its reactionary policy. The Sydney "Bulletin" says this—

"A would-be defender of English Liberalism once wrote that it wasn't so much a political philosophy as a frame of mind. The trouble with 'Nationalism'

is that it isn't a frame of mind. It is simply a device, worn pretty threadbare."

The Melbourne "Age" had something more striking than that. It said—

"In politics, what damn'd jobbery but some Nationalist patriot will drown the protest with a verse of 'God Save the King!'"

(Government laughter.)

I only want to make one further reference; that is to the position of Queensland in the matter of its credit, or in regard to its status. The hon. member for Oxley, carrying out his line of propaganda, has been denouncing the policy which has been indulged in since Labour has been in office.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Since you preached communism.

The PREMIER: The statement that the Labour policy has had such a detrimental effect on the State deserves to be answered.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: My inquiry about communism wants to be answered, too. The people want it to be answered.

The PREMIER: No doubt, the people will give a very emphatic answer in Oxley at the next poll. The hon. member finds himself so deficient in argument, that he keeps on with the parrot-cry of communism. The hon. member made a suggestion that Queensland has got into an intolerable state under Labour Government.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: No; Communistic Government.

The PREMIER: The hon. member is afraid I want to point out that Queensland does not occupy that deplorable position. Relatively, Queensland is in a good position. There is depression here, as there is depression in every country. There is greater depression in some industries here than there is in some of the industries of the other States, notably in metalliferous mining, because of the collapse of the oversea markets. There is also a big depression in the cattle industry here because of the collapse of the oversea markets.

Mr. MORGAN: What about the increased rents?

The PREMIER: The hon. member is like the hon. member for Kennedy, and other hon. members opposite who repeat with a parrot-like cry the reference to increased rents. When the rents were increased in 1920 the pastoralists were receiving a very high price for their cattle. I have already intimated to hon. members opposite and to others that, if any lessee has any difficulty in meeting his rents, the Government have no desire to grind down anyone, and we will give fair consideration to any man who has a bona fide case in the matter of rents. (Hear, hear!) Queensland occupies a much happier position than hon. members opposite would like it to occupy. In the matter of credit, I have a statement here issued by the National City Company giving the latest quotations on the New York Stock Exchange.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Your American friend.

The PREMIER: Yes, our American friend. It gives the quotations on the New York Stock Exchange. The quotations are given here for forty different Government stocks, and the Queensland stock stands relatively higher than any of the other Government

Hon. E. G. Theodore.]

stocks, with the exception of the Government of the United Kingdom.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Because you pay more interest.

The PREMIER: No, not because we pay more interest. I am speaking about the return which investors receive. Queensland stock is higher than that of any other country quoted on the New York Stock Exchange: with the sole exception of Great Britain. Queensland stock stands higher than that of the French Government, or the Swiss Government, or the kingdom of Norway, or the kingdom of Belgium, or the kingdom of Denmark, or the republic of Chili, or the republic of Uruguay, or the Japanese Government, or the Argentine Government, or the Czecho-Slovakia republic. In fact it is better than a whole host of other countries.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: There is evidently no other British Dominion.

The PREMIER: There is only one other British Government quoted, and that is the Government of the United Kingdom. An investment in the stock of the United Kingdom will yield about 5.25 per cent., while an investment in Queensland stock will yield 5.80 per cent., or a little more. The French Government stock yields about 7.60 per cent.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: You cannot compare France.

The PREMIER: Shall I compare Norway then?

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: No. Give us some other British community.

The PREMIER: The hon. member makes all sorts of statements to discredit and damn the Labour Government, but here are the quotations from the New York Stock Exchange itself. The New York Stock Exchange is not influenced by politics at all, but only by the consideration of the soundness of the investment. In all cases Queensland ranks above all Governments except that of the United Kingdom.

Mr. MORGAN: They are all foreign Governments.

The PREMIER: They are all foreign Governments on the New York Stock Exchange. The hon. member for Oxley made another reference to the unfortunate position of investors in manufactures here. Let me tell the hon. member that the statistics contained in the quarterly review of the Commonwealth Statistician show that, so far as the manufacturing industries are concerned, the margin of profit, after allowing for wages, fuel, and cost of material, was higher in Queensland than in any other State of the Commonwealth.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: I would like to check that.

The PREMIER: You can check it at any time. So far as the manufacturing industries are concerned, the margin of profits after allowing for wages, fuel, and cost of materials for the year 1920-21 shows, in the case of New South Wales, 12.11 per cent., in the case of Victoria, 16.08 per cent., and in the case of Queensland, which is the largest margin of all, it is given as 20.67 per cent. In South Australia the margin is only 10.79 per cent.—only half what it is in Queensland.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: I thought you did not believe in "Knibbs's" statistics.

[Hon. E. G. Theodore.

The PREMIER: Those figures show that not only is the greatest margin of profit returned to the manufacturer in Queensland, but, in addition to that, he has to pay the highest rate of wages for those manufactures, while his employees work the shortest number of hours in the Commonwealth.

I will take another item to show the measure of prosperity which exists in Queensland. What is happening in regard to our oversea exports? As a matter of fact, for the year 1920-21 Queensland is the only State in the Commonwealth which shows an increase in the oversea exports. New South Wales showed a decrease of £2,400,000, and Victoria a decrease of £8,200,000, while for the same period Queensland showed an increase in the oversea exports of £767,962. The decrease in Western Australia was £4,000,000, and in South Australia there was a decrease of £2,700,000 in the oversea exports for the year. How can it be said that, owing to the misdeeds of the Government, the industries of the country are being ruined, when we can show such figures as those?

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: That is primary production. Your figures do not refer to industries at all.

The PREMIER: The hon. gentleman used a lot of figures recklessly because they were ill-considered and not understood. He referred to the loan expenditure in Queensland. The loan expenditure per head of the population in 1920-21 was £7 in New South Wales; £7 5s. per head in Victoria; and only £5 13s. per head in Queensland. What about reckless extravagance? We are told that we had no consideration for the finances of the country, yet in Victoria—which ought to be able to show a good financial position because it is a small, compact State, densely settled—the loan expenditure was much higher than in Queensland. Queensland's figures, in comparison, do not at all show to our discredit.

I regret that there are a number of other things that I wished to refer to, but the time at my disposal will not permit me to do so. The figures I have quoted give an indication of the prosperity of the State. We would not be able to show figures like that if we were guilty of maladministration and the reckless handling of the finances, or if we had driven capital out of the country. I consider that the greatest amount of prosperity in the country is disclosed by the Savings Bank deposits. In Queensland the average amount per depositor in the Savings Bank for 1921 was £57 11s. That is the highest of any State in the Commonwealth. In the other States the average amount per depositor is: New South Wales, £50; Victoria, £44; South Australia, £39; Western Australia, £34; and Tasmania, £34. If one-tenth of the statements made by hon. members about Queensland were true, there would be no deposits in the Savings Bank at all; there would be no return of profits to manufacturers; and there would be no increase in the oversea exports from Queensland; but there would be diminished exports, and the country would be on the verge of ruin. I consider that Queensland is a wonderful country. We have a wonderful heritage, and we ought to develop it as it should be developed. We

should induce people to come here by making the conditions of life such that they will be able to obtain a comfortable living for themselves and their families. That is the policy of the Government. It is not a class policy. When we talk about the workers we do not adopt the narrow conception of that term which is adopted by hon. members on the other side; but we speak of them from the broadest conception. Every man who has to toil, whether he is an employer or an employee, is a worker. It does not matter whether he toils for himself or works for others; it does not matter if he works in the city, or if he is toiling and moiling in the country, he is entitled to get protection and assistance, and this Government is going to ensure that for him.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

At 9 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Mr. Kirwan, *Brisbane*) relieved the Speaker in the chair.

Mr. EDWARDS (*Yvanuigo*): The Premier has seen fit to make his address to the House before I had the privilege of doing so. In the first place, with all due respect to him, things are not as bright and beautiful as he would lead the people to believe, and it is a very wrong idea for the hon. member or any other member of the Government party to say, that members of the Opposition or anyone else, for that matter, living in Queensland, should not make definite statements when they think things are wrong.

I am rather pleased with some of the things in the Governor's Speech. In the first place, I am pleased that after seven years the Government have seen fit to attempt at least to do something in the interests of the primary producers; but I want to ask the Premier why the Government did not adopt the suggestion of the party on this side of the House years ago and try then to do what he is attempting now to do? With other members on the Government benches, he must realise that, if they had assisted primary production some years ago, they would not only have saved the unfortunate persons struggling on the land a very great deal of stress and trouble which they have gone through during the reign of the Labour Government, but they would also have saved thousands upon thousands of men from practically the verge of starvation. I say that, without hesitation. I wish the agricultural policy put forward by the Government the greatest of success, particularly if it is going to be a clear policy of co-operation in the interests of the producers.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I will give you my assurance on that.

Mr. EDWARDS: I would say to the hon. gentleman from the start, "Take the politics out of it." If the Government are going to give the producers a fair "go," they have no right only to receive their suggestions. If the Minister is so satisfied with the policy put forward by the Government, why did he not accept the amendment moved by the hon. member for Drayton in 1919?

Mr. FRY: They had no sympathy with the farmer then.

Mr. EDWARDS: On the Profiteering Prevention Bill the hon. member moved the following amendment:—

"Without prejudice to the last preceding provisions, there shall be constituted

a board of advice consisting of six representatives of the cheese, butter, and bacon industries chosen in the manner and for the term of office prescribed by the regulations of the respective industries as follows:—

Two representatives shall be chosen by the co-operative cheese factories;

Two representatives shall be chosen by the co-operative butter factories;

One representative shall be chosen by the co-operative bacon factories; and

One representative shall be chosen by the proprietary bacon factories.

I claim that that is practically on the same lines as the Government's advisory board.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: It is entirely a different subject.

Mr. EDWARDS: That was three years ago, and the primary producers have gone through a great deal of hardship in the meantime. I want to go just a little bit further and ask what has happened to the Labour Government that they are now prepared to assist the primary producers.

Mr. COLLINS: Are sugar-growers not primary producers?

Mr. EDWARDS: Certainly they are.

Mr. COLLINS: Did we not pass the Regulation of Sugar Cane Prices Act in 1915?

Mr. EDWARDS: Over and over again, practical men on this side of the House who have been through the mill in the dairying and other primary industries have told the Government that they had no right to interfere with the price-fixing of primary producers' products. Over and over again, the Government were told that it was wrong, in the interests of butter production, to allow Mr. Perry to reduce the price of butter from 278s. a cwt. to 234s. a cwt., whereby the dairymen of this State lost no less than £300,000. Moreover, I maintain that many hundreds of settlers were prevented from coming to this State and taking up their work here and becoming taxpayers because of the attitude of the Labour Government on that occasion. That is not the only occasion in respect of which the primary producers will remember the interference of the Government with their butter. In 1915, they seized the butter regardless of the position of big families in the back blocks, and the dairymen lost, without any doubt, £500,000 in the butter grab. As one who believes from the bottom of his heart in co-operation, not only for the primary producer, but also for the industrial worker, I want to say that, if the Government after seven years of doing everything they possibly could against the producer whilst they had a big majority, have now, with a splendid majority of one in the House, seen the error of their ways, it does not matter two straws to me—I am going to give them all the assistance I can to put their scheme into action. The reason I say that is, that nobody realises better than I do what the people in the back-blocks have gone through during the reign of the Government.

There is one matter to which the Government should give very urgent consideration, that is, the unemployment throughout the length and breadth of the State. We have

Mr. Edwards.]

heard statements from practically every member of the Government that, under Labour rule, there would be no unemployment in Queensland. In fact, when the Secretary for Mines was electioneering, he made the statement that in two months no man who cared to take a job would be unemployed. The hon. gentleman slipped badly on that occasion, because to-day there are men walking the length and breadth of this State and collecting doles from the State—able-bodied men at that—who would be only too pleased to have the employment the hon. gentleman mentioned.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: We have 2,500 men engaged on railway construction. We helped to reopen Mount Morgan; we helped to reopen the meat works; and thus have been responsible for the employment of thousands of men.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am very pleased to hear the Secretary for Railways make that statement. I would tell him, though, that the men they employ have to be paid with borrowed money, thus piling up the public debt of this State. The Government have driven out industries which would have given employment to a large number of those men.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Did you not wait on me this afternoon and want me to spend more money?

Mr. EDWARDS: By all means I am asking you to do that. I say now that, because of your neglect of other industries, because of your interference with the grazing and other primary industries, you have forced them to sack their men and turn them on the roads.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Do you mean that wages are too high?

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not say that wages are too high in country districts. The producer has been harassed to such an extent that it is quite impossible for him at the present time to employ men. I do not care where you go, you will find that the producers say it is quite impossible to put men on their land.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The production in Queensland is a record this year.

Mr. EDWARDS: If the production is a record, it is not the fault of this Government.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: No; it is to the credit of this Government.

Mr. EDWARDS: It practically comes from sugar, in which industry they have been doing well—not from other industries.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You are simply a "barracker" for low wages.

Mr. EDWARDS: If the Secretary for Agriculture will look at this morning's paper he will see that resolutions have been passed by men employed at the Ipswich workshops, which resolutions prove who are the "barrackers" for low wages.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Are you in favour of the Government going to the Arbitration Court in connection with the public service?

Mr. EDWARDS: That has nothing to do with me; it is a Government matter entirely. If the Government had not interfered with

[Mr. Edwards.

primary production, but had given private capital all the encouragement they possibly could in years gone by, they would not to-day be placed in the position they are in with regard to unemployment.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: It is very small in Queensland compared with the other States.

Mr. EDWARDS: I would like to bring before the notice of the Government the fact that the adoption of the policy of day labour is holding back the building of new schools and the painting, repairing, and extension of existing schools.

Mr. DASH: Do you mean by that that the men will not work?

Mr. EDWARDS: I say without any hesitation that in many country districts schools could be built for a good deal less than they are costing to-day if the local men were given the contracts. We would not have the children sitting on the floor, as is the case to-day in many districts. In my district there are many schools which are asking, not only for repairs, but for extra accommodation. That is only an instance of the conditions existing in many districts.

Mr. COLLINS: It is not true so far as my district is concerned.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am pleased to see that the Government are likely to bring forward a Bill in connection with State advances to settlers. I hope they will see that the Act is so extended that the settlers, particularly those who are pioneering, will be able to get the accommodation they require. That is one of the best means of assisting settlers in the early stages.

I was pleased to hear the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply refer to the question of soldier settlement. Both those members mentioned certain estates which they considered had not been cut up into living areas. Practically throughout the length and breadth of the State soldier settlement has been carried out in a most disgraceful manner. There is no doubt that hundreds of settlers must leave their holdings. The local committee of practical men in the different districts have asked time and again that these areas should be made larger, and no notice has been taken of their representations. Some time ago I went over the Coominya Settlement. As one who has been on the land all his life, I say it was in the most disgusting state of any on which I have set eyes. In many instances the settlers have been placed on 25 acres of poor forest soil. I hope the Government will take steps at once to have some alteration made. If a man leaves his block, let the Government see that another soldier is not put on to that block, but that it is given to the man who holds the block alongside it. Those small blocks of land are capitalised to the extent of £25 to £30 per acre by the improvements of housing, fencing, and clearing. In that particular district a home was pointed out to me which could be purchased for £8 an acre. Will any person with common sense say that this is a business proposition in the interests of this State? I think the Land Settlement Committee who dealt with that question did not carry out their duty to these unfortunate lads who have been placed on that country. We find many settlements throughout the State in distant areas, in some cases 20 and 30 miles away from the

railway, that are in a similar position. In some cases there are grazing blocks of 600 acres and 700 acres. I commend the Government at once to consider that most vital question.

In reply to the Premier's remarks with regard to my attitude on the agricultural policy, I want to state that I will give that policy all my assistance, so long as it is going to be on co-operative lines.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Have you supported it so far?

Mr. EDWARDS: What do you mean by supporting it?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Have you spoken in favour of it?

Mr. EDWARDS: I have told the farmers to accept it, because it is nearly time the Labour party gave them something. It is my opinion that, if this scheme of organising the primary producers is going to be a success, it will have to be removed from political control.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I know your electorate pretty intimately. You dare not oppose it.

Mr. EDWARDS: I dare oppose it. The Premier has made a lot of statements to-night about men "ratting" on parties, and that sort of thing.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The Premier used the word "deserting."

Mr. EDWARDS: The Premier, in placing this agricultural policy before the primary producers as a co-operative method, assures them that it is going to be handled entirely by the primary producers themselves. At the same time the hon. gentleman and his Government are pledged to the policy of nationalisation of the means of production, distribution, and exchange. How are the Government, and the Premier as the head of the Government, going to clear themselves on this question? In 1921, at a conference in Brisbane, the Premier opposed the objective of the Labour party of socialisation of production, but it was carried and was endorsed in Melbourne recently, and the Premier and his Government are pledged to carry it into effect. Will the Secretary for Agriculture assure me that the agricultural policy is not a step in the interests of nationalisation of production?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: That is only a red herring.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You will admit that it is a good step.

Mr. EDWARDS: I will not admit it is a good step if it is going to nationalise everything we are going to produce. The Government's policy of nationalisation has done a tremendous lot of harm to this State, and, if they are going to introduce it and apply it to the primary producers, and ask them to accept what is the first step in the direction of the nationalisation of production, I am going to fight it at every turn.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You are bitterly opposed to it, and that confirms what you say.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am not opposed to it. If it means nationalisation, I am certainly opposed to it.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You are opposing the scheme.

Mr. FLETCHER: It is not loaded for us to go to the elections with?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: No.

Mr. EDWARDS: The Premier and his Government have ratted on their own policy, and, if they are going to throw their nationalisation and socialistic ideas to the wind, I say without hesitation that there is nothing between us, and that they can either join us or we can join them in doing the best we can for this State, because, in my opinion, that is practically all that stands in the way.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The Labour platform stands for the encouragement of co-operation.

Mr. EDWARDS: If the Government go on with this scheme, and are going to bring co-operation into Queensland as I understand co-operation, then they have thrown their own platform overboard and accepted ours, and I am with them all the way.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You are in league with the middleman; we are not.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am not in favour of the middleman. I am in favour of the producers handling their own business, and I have advocated that for twelve years. I want the Secretary for Agriculture to understand that, if the Government are going to flood the agricultural scheme with Government officials, with the Secretary for Agriculture in control as chairman, it is not going to be in the interests of the producers of this State. After all, it seems to me that there is a weakness in the scheme. Previously, the dairy industry was organised right from the producer up to the dairy associations. If the Government are earnest in doing something for these people, why have they not taken the advice of the men who have been in office for years? At many conferences with the Secretary for Agriculture these gentlemen advocated certain matters in the interests of the dairying industry of this State, but they were certainly never carried into effect. I refer to the cold storage question.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: We are getting along very fine with that.

Mr. FLETCHER: At what cost?

Mr. EDWARDS: The representatives of the dairying industry came before the Government on this matter, but they were defied, and the Government went on with the building of the cold stores at the [9.30 p.m.] Hamilton. There is another matter in regard to which we differ very largely from the Government at the present time, and that is the question of the leasehold or freehold tenure of land. If the Government are prepared to do something in real earnest for the settlers of this State, let them give preference to freehold tenure.

Mr. COLLINS: What nonsense!

Mr. EDWARDS: You know nothing about it. If the Government gave preference to freehold, they could go to the Southern States and get thousands of settlers to come to Queensland at the present time.

Mr. COLLINS: From Victoria, where they are paying £3 an acre rent for land?

Mr. EDWARDS: Yes; and why not give them encouragement to come here? They are men with capital.

Mr. Edwards.]

There is another question which has been practically sidestepped so far as the Governor's Speech is concerned, and that is the question of the enormous spread of prickly-pear throughout the State. Do hon. members, either on this side of the House or on the other side of the House, realise the necessity of urgently dealing with the prickly-pear menace in this State? Is it not spreading over millions of acres of our best agricultural lands, and are the Government serious in taking steps to check the spread of the pear? If they were, they would come forward with a land policy which would give a freehold tenure to people who were prepared to take up land and keep back the pear. The Government could do a lot for this State if they were to take these things seriously instead of being everlastingly engaged in window-dressing in order to catch votes. That is the position they have taken up practically ever since they found they were losing their majority.

I hope the matter I mentioned in connection with the education of our children in country districts will receive the early attention of this Government, and that they will see fit, in the very near future, to go out and assist in building schools in the country districts and to see that the children have reasonable and fair accommodation. It is one of the big things in the interests of decentralisation in the State.

MR. WINSTANLEY: They have done more for the children than any Government that has ever existed in Queensland.

MR. EDWARDS: So you should, because, after all, the State is practically in its infancy, and, if you sat on those benches for seven years and did not do more than Governments before you had done, it would be a disgrace. The present Government have done very little up to the present time, and I am putting this question before them so that they will realise that their duty lies in still going on with the work. I know of a number of parents who have removed to the large centres of population on account of the poor school accommodation in the country.

HON. J. G. APPEL (*Albert*): I confess that I have never for one moment thought I would see the day when, through the wreckage of our Constitution, Queensland would be governed under a unicameral system. I realise that the action which has been taken by the Labour party in so revolutionising our Constitution was simply the carrying out of that policy which they set forth to carry out despite the wishes of the electors of Queensland, as was so amply demonstrated by the vote which was taken as to whether the second Chamber should be abolished or not. Their object, we know, was the following out of that confiscatory policy which the Labour party now are endeavouring to hide. We realise that, under a cloak, they are endeavouring to deceive a section of the community for the purpose of gaining their sympathy, while still bound to adhere to that policy which has resulted in the abolition of the second Chamber, which unquestionably was a safeguard. It did not matter what party might be in power, the second Chamber was a safeguard to the electors of Queensland against hasty or ill-considered legislation. It just happens that a publication published on 19th February, 1916, called "The Rising Sun," came under

[*Mr. Edwards.*

my notice, and it gives ample evidence of what I have contended—that it is simply the policy of confiscation that the Labour party have followed out. As a matter of fact, I give them credit that they advocated that policy of confiscation that they have carried out. They have shown at least that they have had the courage of their convictions. An article in the publication I have mentioned states—

"There is one thing the Legislative Council of Queensland has set its face against. That is confiscation. It has not been able to stop the Cabinet from spending hundreds of thousands of pounds without a shred of authorisation from Parliament; but against the Assembly's latest doses of oppressive taxation, against its Constitution-wrecking project of last year, and against its conscription of shipping (and incidental conscription of sailors) it has stood like a rock. One of the Bills that the Ryan Ministry wanted to pass into law last October, and actually did get through the Assembly, had a provision to this effect—

Clause 10 gave the Minister power to seize all offices, premises, wharves, stores, and any other property, and incidentally all officers, employees, and agents. Should one of these persons refuse to work for the Government which had commandeered his shipping office, he was liable to a penalty of £500.

"That was one of the clauses of the Government's Shipping Acquisition Bill; and if the Council had not stood in the way it would have been law now. Queensland would have had the unique distinction of being the one country in the British Empire, and probably in the world, where not only privately-owned ships could be confiscated by the Government, but seamen and ships' officers could be taken as well.

"With a recent example like this confronting one, will it be said that it is necessary, advisable, or even safe to entrust the affairs of Queensland, with the property of everyone in it, to a body of men representing one Chamber, and one class of voter—the class of voter who has most to gain by getting hold of the property of others? There can be no misunderstanding about the matter; the facts are in no way misrepresented. The Brisbane Labour Conference has approved the speech of its president (delivered 28th January last), in which he expressly announced the goal of 'common ownership.' 'Common ownership' means only one thing. It means laying hands on the capital of others—not perhaps on their actual household requisites, but on everything they possess that has a productive value. It means wrenching from Paul what Paul has hardily earned, and handing it over to others. Against that kind of thing the Legislative Council is standing now. The Council believes it has the goodwill of the bulk of the electors in fighting the revolutionary, confiscating proposal of the Ryan Government. It looks for their support on 16th March; and that support can only be given by a vote against the party whose hand is raised to strike the Council down."

The country gave its vote against the proposal, and the party opposite, who pose as the men who alone stand for democracy, turned down the will of the people, and abolished the second Chamber, which will enable them to carry out that policy of confiscation which they have hitherto pursued. Can the leopard change its spots, or the Ethiopian his skin? Just as the costermonger, with a bundle of carrots, endeavours to induce the donkey to go forward, so are the Government shaking a bundle of carrots before the farmers and primary producers to-day. If the farmers are fools enough to take the bait of that bunch of carrots, all I can say is that they deserve to get all that they will, and they will get that which the chicken gets—the axe on his neck. (Opposition laughter.) Personally, I am one of those who are not very much concerned as to what party should control the administration of my native State—whether it be a Labour Government, a National Government, of a Country Party Government—so long as they carry out the administration for the advancement and prosperity of the people of the State, and for the development and settlement of the country. Unless all that we hear, see, and actually know is absolutely false, it cannot be said that the Labour party have carried out such a policy. I charge the Government with the betrayal of the trust placed in their hands by the people of Queensland. I charge the Government with reckless extravagance and expenditure of public funds, and, through faulty administration, with the dislocation of our great utility—the railways. I charge the Government with imposing taxation grievous to be borne, which has had the inevitable result of hampering expansion, and the progressive development of the State, and has caused the continued growth of unemployment. I charge the Government with entering into schemes outside the province of good government, resulting in the diversion of millions of public funds from their legitimate use. I charge the Government with fostering and encouraging the gambling instincts in our people, and thus sapping the very foundation of our moral and social advancement. They evidently feel that, with such a record, they are losing their grip on their supporters, as is shown by the daily meetings of men who were formerly prepared to stand by them under all and every condition. We find that meetings are being held daily by the workers of the State, who are absolutely disgusted with the men whom they have placed in a position to control the destinies of the State. Can it be wondered at that we, who likewise represent that interest which, above all others, goes to make for the development and settlement of this State, feel that we should be false to our trust if we did not take the action we are doing, and point out to those who placed us here that the promises which are being made to them are intended to deceive them, and to enable the Administration to retain their grip upon the affairs of the State and push us further into the Serbonian bog in which we are wallowing to-day?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. J. G. APPEL: As I said before, can the leopard change its spots? Do I understand that this Government, which took part in the convention which was held not so long ago in Brisbane, and which practically adopted what may be termed the

Soviet system of Russia, have turned down that policy which placed them in the position in which they are to-day, or have they not? Are they bold enough to say, "We have cast aside all those principles which we advocated, and by means of which we were placed in the position which we occupy to-day." If they are not prepared to do that, how can they go to the primary producers and attempt to gull them in the way they are doing? The hon. member who moved the adoption of the Address in Reply said that he considered the Government's programme a courageous one. I admit that it is a courageous programme for any party, with a knowledge of the policy which they cannot disregard or set aside, to go to the electors and endeavour to deceive them to the extent of trying to make them believe that they have recanted from their former principles. What are the principles by which the Government are bound? I have here the Labour objective, as expounded by Mr. Demaine, who was the president of the Labour Conference which was held early in 1918. "The Rising Sun" contains this reference to Mr. Demaine's address—

"There must be no private ownership of capital left, for 'Capitalism must be overthrown'! Note that Demaine does not say 'the owners of large capital must be overthrown.' No distinction is made or even suggested. The owner of £200 or £300, scraped together by a life of toil, is to that extent a capitalist, and according to the pronouncements now made, and endorsed and approved by the Labour leaders, the capital of such a one ought not to be left in his possession. It should be 'socialised'—that is to say, thrown into a common fund, and become the property of no one—except the caucus."

Would not the members on this side of the House be absolutely false to the trust which has been reposed in them by the electors who sent them here if they did not expose electioneering tactics of the present Administration? The party opposite is absolutely bankrupt so far as any progressive policy is concerned. Were it not for the fact that Providence has been good to Queensland in the way of providing good seasons, the party opposite would have absolutely ruined this fair State of ours. The people are already groaning under the severe and grievous burdens of taxation imposed by this Government. The present Administration is one which has introduced measures and forced them through the House by means of the "gag." They did not permit hon. members, the representatives of the people, to express an opinion upon that legislation as they should have done. The party opposite introduced legislation which was so worded that it gave them an opportunity to impose upon the estates of deceased persons in a way that was never intended. The legislation was so drawn that it permitted charges to be levied against an estate amounting to a third more than the estate actually consisted of. In the estate of the late Dr. Lightoller it was thought that they would collect probate and succession duties on the actual value of the estate, which was fixed at £60,000, but the Government, owing to the catchy wording of the section of the Act, claimed to increase the actual value by another £20,000. Is that administration which should commend itself to the electors of this State? Is that the

Hon. J. G. Appel.

sort of administration which any honest and patriotic member can commend to the electors of the State? I know, despite the policy which they profess, and the policy which they are bound to, that there are men on the Government side of the House, unfortunately, who know in their hearts that what I am stating to-night is the absolute truth, and that is that the policy they are pursuing is not one which is for the benefit of the people of Queensland. I affirm that the gaming and gambling which is encouraged by the conduct of a State lottery is one which cannot commend itself to any member of the community with any patriotic feeling when he sees that the gaming instinct is being fostered, and when he also sees that that gaming instinct is not for the welfare of this fair State of ours.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Is it any worse than playing bridge at night?

HON. J. G. APPEL: That is not the question. I have never gambled or won a bet in my life. (Hear, hear!) It seems to me that we have arrived at a strange position indeed when an hon. member speaks about the deficit of £188,000 as being rather a creditable matter. Despite all the exactions and the increased revenues which have been drawn by the Government from the unfortunate taxpayers of the State—in many instances putting severe and grievous burdens on their backs—despite all that, they look with pride upon the fact that they have a deficit of £188,000. I was in the Chamber during the whole of the hon. member's speech, and I did not hear him refer to the approximate loss upon our railways. Assumedly that is regarded with pride by the present Administration, but the fact remains that the railways last year showed an approximate loss of £1,700,000. I wonder when hon. gentlemen opposite go before the primary producers of the State, after having practically extracted all the available funds from them, if they will tell them to what condition they have reduced the finances of the State. When we realise the direct taxation extracted during the year from the small handful of people in the State—when we realise that the handful of population here, which does not exceed the population of a second-class town in Great Britain, paid in taxation last year the sum of £3,420,000—surely we can realise why unemployment is rampant in the State of Queensland to-day. We must realise that, owing to the amount of taxation which has been extracted, many men have had to go out of business, and those employed by them have been cast upon the streets. Owing to the position which has been created by the Government, these men have been absolutely unable to gain re-employment. When I last spoke on the Financial Statement I quoted from J. S. Mill, who stated that taxation, and more particularly excessive taxation, always falls on the shoulders of the workers. It might be levied on the shoulders of what is called the wealthy class, but inevitably it falls upon the workers, who are the ones to suffer, and who are the severest sufferers from excessive taxation. That is realised throughout the world, and it is realised by all the greatest financiers in the world. The foremost of our statesmen and the greatest of our financial experts in Great Britain to-day realise this, because they are formulating plans to combat unemploy-

Hon. J. G. Appel.

ment, and, in order to assist in the rehabilitation of trade, commerce, and industry, they are reducing the taxation in the motherland. In Queensland apparently the sole object and purpose of the Government is to increase those burdens. It has been suggested here, and very properly so, that, if deflation is absolutely necessary in the public service—if it is necessary to reduce the wages and salaries of those employed by the State—then we should start from the head and not from the bottom. I am quite in accord with the statement that we should start with members of Parliament. The Government have not only inflicted grievous burdens upon the shoulders of the primary producers, but they propose to add another additional paid Minister to their Cabinet. Another Minister is to be added to the number, although the Cabinet is in greater number now than ever existed in the State before.

[10 p.m.]

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: That is quite incorrect.

HON. J. G. APPEL: A Cabinet, the largest which has ever existed in the history of Queensland.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: That is incorrect again.

At 10 p.m.,

THE SPEAKER resumed the chair.

HON. J. G. APPEL: What did the Prime Minister of New Zealand do? He followed that course which should be followed here if we are honest and patriotic in our endeavours to assist the people of the State by reducing expenditure. He started at the head, and I would suggest that the present Administration here, before they ask the farmers to give them another term of office, should show their bona fides by reducing their own salaries, and those of the members of the House. I can assure you that there will not be one dissentient voice among members on this side if such a proposal is made by the Labour Government. I often find in speaking to people outside that they are unable to realise the amount of taxation which is extracted from them by this Administration. They see that there has been an enormous increase in revenue, so that it is to-day almost double that received before the present party came into power; but they cannot realise the tragedy—and hon. members opposite when in Opposition referred to these things as tragedies—that to-day more than £4 10s. is extracted every year from every man, woman, and child in the State of Queensland, whereas before they came into power the amount was not more than £2 10s. It seems hardly conceivable. Yet, despite that fact—and I do not blame the Secretary for Public Instruction for this, because he has approved of additions to schools and the erection of new schools in place of schools which are absolutely unfit for use—the Government refuse to find the necessary money, notwithstanding the fact that money is being wasted for every illegitimate purpose, so that the eyesight of the children is even endangered.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Who erected those old schools?

HON. J. G. APPEL: They were erected in days gone by when the present population did not exist. I am not blaming any Administration for that, but I am blaming

this Administration for this—that, having the approval of the Minister concerned, they do not find the necessary funds.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That has always been the case.

HON. J. G. APPEL: I admit that, but with enormously increased taxation, had not millions been wasted on wild-cat schemes which are absolutely illegitimate administration, there would have been quite sufficient money to carry out the necessary works and prevent the endangering of the health and the eyesight of that generation to which we must look for the development of this great State. I say it practically amounts to a crime. The money is there. It has been extracted from the taxpayers of this State, and yet, because the Government have entered into schemes quite outside the sphere of Government, the health of the children is endangered, and in many instances settlers who have gone into our rough scrub lands, as in the mountains of the South Coast, have been compelled to abandon their holdings because they could not get education for their growing children.

THE PREMIER: I am afraid you must be exaggerating.

HON. J. G. APPEL: I am quite sure that the hon. gentleman takes no interest in the children of the State. If he did, he would, as Treasurer, provide the absolutely necessary funds for carrying out works of this character. What is the good of hon. gentlemen opposite going into the farming districts and telling the farmers, "I have knocked you down, I have prostrated you in the dust; but come along, boys, give me your votes, put me into power again, and I will do something for you." Again, I say, "Can the Nubian change his skin, or the leopard his spots?" Hon. members should hear the honeyed words of the Premier when he goes into the country. They would never think he was the same man who comes here and talks of scientific taxation to enable him to extract the last farthing from the unfortunate farmers, raking them fore and aft with continual notices from the Land Tax Department—harrying them. Now he comes with honeyed words, "I am going to introduce legislation which is going to make you all prosperous. I have signed the Labour platform, as enunciated by Mr. Demaine, the president of the Labour Conference, but I have recanted on that. We are going to turn over a new leaf. We are going to give the farmer relief. What for? To give us a further accession to power. We find we are too well known among the workers in the city. They have found us out, and now we are going to the farmers." Oh, you have only to tickle them a bit, and they will take it all in. (Laughter.) They are not going to take it in. I can assure the Premier that there are numbers of men sitting on this side of the House who are, and have been, pointing out the value of the assertions and the promises of the Premier and the party of which he is the leader. If he could only hear the expressions of opinion, and the language in which those expressions are made, concerning the attempts he has made to gull these farmers, I venture to say he would "give them best."

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: The result would be a shock to you.

HON. J. G. APPEL: I am quite prepared to endure that. A bigger shock will be

experienced by hon. members sitting on that side of the House. What was this Barmecide feast which was promised? I am quite sure the Premier had his tongue in his cheek when he made this great policy speech to the farmers, telling them what he was going to do. I could quite imagine going home with some hon. members of that party. I can imagine hearing them say, "We didn't do too badly. Didn't we put it over the fool 'cocky'?" The farmers took it all in." The "cockies" have not taken it in. The Premier will be "taken in" if he thinks he has succeeded in deceiving them. We find that this speech promises a Producers' Organisation Bill. I suppose there are to be nominated to the directorate of this organisation some of the gentlemen who have a pull at the Trades Hall, and for whom billets have to be found. We are to have a Fruit Cases Act Amendment Bill. That was referred to by the hon. member for Nanango. This has been found necessary owing to the hasty manner in which legislation has been gagged and rushed through this House. Perhaps the Premier is going to give them the fruit cases free! I venture to predict it will not be free fruit cases, but taxed fruit cases.

Then we are to have a Co-operative Agricultural Production Act Amendment Bill. I suppose that the Premier promised them there would be a double crop of all that is grown in every locality, without having rain or fertilisers. We have done so much by means of legislation that probably the hon. gentleman thought that, with the assistance of his party, he would be able to introduce a measure providing that, if rain did not fall and the crops did not grow, or if they did not grow in double quantity, they would be cast into prison. The name of the measure is sufficiently long to choke some hon. members. I can imagine the Premier saying, "Look what a wonderful measure I am going to give you! Look at the size of it!" I believe some people will be taken in by that wonderful name.

Then we are to have a State Advances Act Amendment Bill. If the advances are regulated and administered in the same way as is done at the present time, I do not know how they are going to be traced. The settlers are not getting them now. How is it that we country members are being continually met by electors who produce from the department an intimation that no funds are available?

THE PREMIER: No.

HON. J. G. APPEL: They produce the official notification. Some reason is given why the money cannot be advanced. I dare say it is considered by the leader of the Government that it will be quite sufficient to say, "We are going to give an increase"; and that the "cockies" will fall on their knees and present their votes to him. Perhaps he will find that that will not eventuate.

I think it is admitted by business men that it is owing to the political interference of the present Administration with the Commissioner for Railways that the railways are in their present condition. It seems a remarkable thing that this wonderful Administration, who refer to men sitting on this side of the House as men who are beneath contempt so far as any knowledge of men and matters is concerned, should so

Hon. J. G. Appel.]

administer the railways that the whole service is seething with discontent. They have apparently increased the wages of their employees, but in reality they have not done so. Their action in attempting to "do" the employees out of these increases, which supposedly have been granted to them and which they should receive, has reduced the whole service to the condition in which it is to-day. It is futile for hon. gentlemen to say that is not so, because we find the railway union men are joining with other unions in holding a meeting, I believe, to-morrow night, not in the Trades Hall, but in the Albert Hall, for the purpose of discussing the attitude of the Premier and his Administration towards them and the other servants of the State. It is well that the public of Queensland should know these facts. If you go through the figures, you will find that on the whole of the railways of Australia there is a loss of £12,000 per day, and of that sum Queensland is responsible for £5,000 per day. That is occurring under the Administration of these heaven-born administrators, who refer to hon. members on this side of the House as men absolutely without any business knowledge or acumen, without any ability to conduct even their own affairs. It is interesting to follow out a few of these figures. Victoria has been referred to very frequently, and I might as well refer to it again. Victoria, with a population which is slightly double that of Queensland, has a lesser total direct taxation than that of Queensland.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Does not that naturally follow?

HON. J. G. APPEL: One speaker on that side of the House spoke about the condition of the rolling stock in Victoria. If it is worse than it is in Queensland, it must be very bad. The state of the Queensland rolling stock reflects no credit upon the present Administration.

On the last occasion when I spoke in this Chamber I referred to the fact that during the whole of the administration of the Labour Government no attempt had been made to paint the premises of the Railway Department, and that the premises were seriously deteriorating owing to that fact. I do not know whether it is being done in the other electorates, but an attempt is being made to put paint upon the buildings in the Albert and Logan electorates.

The income tax in Victoria actually yields £750,000 less than in Queensland. Yet vast public works have been carried out by the Government of Victoria, and the people are in a prosperous condition.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: No.

HON. J. G. APPEL: I know it, and anyone who has any knowledge of Victoria knows that the people there are very prosperous, and, were it not for the capital owned by the Victorians that has come to Queensland to assist in the development of our State, the State would not be in the position it is to-day. We owe a deep debt of gratitude to Victoria and other States for the use of their capital in the development of this State.

The population of Queensland is approximately 750,000, and that of Victoria 1,530,000. I do not think that any hon. member opposite will have the hardihood to say that there

[Hon. J. G. Appel.

are not wealthier people in Victoria than in Queensland. We have very few of what we might call wealthy people residing in Queensland. Despite that, the amount of taxes levied in Queensland upon that small population amounted last year to the sum of £2,149,360, whereas in wealthy Victoria the amount levied only amounted to £1,446,209.

The hon. member for Bowen has stated that land is so valuable in Victoria that it gives a return of £3 an acre for rent. There may be one or two such blocks, but I doubt whether there is very much land in Queensland that would demand such a rent as that. The land tax levied in Queensland amounted to £485,517, and in Victoria it only amounted to £372,064. Does that not speak for itself? I doubt very much whether the Premier, when he goes before the "cockies," will give them those figures. When he shows them his scheme, will he say to them, "Look, gentlemen, I do not know whether we will be able to carry this out, because we have brought the financial affairs of the State into a state of chaos—practically into a bankrupt state—but I will give you the figures and you can see how we stand, and you can judge for yourselves"? I doubt it, and it therefore becomes our duty to point out to the electors and to all the "cockies" the true position.

The amount levied in Queensland for stamp and probate duty last year was £604,739. I have no doubt that some estates have paid the excess tax that was sought to be extracted in the Lightoller case. The succession duties, which have been increased and increased by this Government, are a burden grievous and heavy to be borne. Unfortunately, there are families where the father has managed, by dint of hard labour with the assistance of his family, to save up a little capital, and when death overtook him the amount levied upon the estate by means of probate and succession duties practically amounted to a burden on the whole of the estate. We realise that that estate pays land tax and income tax upon the money which was earned upon it, and these would-be farmers' friends come along and have a final cut and extract one-third of the value by means of probate and succession duties.

THE PREMIER: Fifteen per cent. is the highest rate that can be charged in Queensland.

MR. KING: That is only succession duty.

HON. J. G. APPEL: Stamp duty has been increased in Queensland and in Victoria. I give the Premier credit for having a knowledge of finance, and he realises the causes for raising the stamp duty charges. He knows that it is owing to the fact that transactions are decreasing, which indicates that a certain amount of legitimate business speculation which is taking place in other States is not taking place in Queensland. I do not refer to speculation such as Government cattle stations. The transactions are decreasing owing to the fact that people are not coming here from the other States and entering into that speculation, which would be for the settlement and the advancement of the State. We find that the average taxation in Queensland is £4 10s. per head, and in [10.30 p.m.] Victoria £2 2s. per head. The ratio of primary producers to our population is approximately 17 per cent. Take the percentage of land tax paid in all the States per farmer per head, and the per-

centage of the whole land tax collected from all the farmers in Australia, compared with Queensland farmers—New South Wales, land tax per farmer, 0.08 per cent., percentage of land tax, 2.1; Victoria, land tax per farmer, 11.71 per cent., percentage of land tax, 27.2; Queensland, land tax per farmer, 46.91 per cent., percentage of land tax, 48.4; South Australia, land tax per farmer, 10.94 per cent., percentage of land tax, 13.0; Western Australia, land tax per farmer, 6.05 per cent., percentage of land tax, 2.2; Tasmania, land tax per farmer, 23.50 per cent., percentage of land tax, 7.1. And then the hon. gentleman says he is the friend of the farmer, the friend of the dairyman, and the friend of the primary producer!

The PREMIER: The farmer does not pay that tax. It is the city man who pays it.

HON. J. G. APPEL: I have heard that statement come from the hon. gentleman on different occasions, but it is an extraordinary thing that, if you go round the farming districts, you will find that the farmers do pay land tax, and, proportionately to the amount of business they are doing, it is a very grievous burden to them. I do not say the proposition made to the farmers is a courageous one, when we know what the present Administration did to the farmers so far as butter is concerned. 27s. a cwt. was paid for all butter placed in cold stores until 31st March, 1921. All States in the Commonwealth got parity with Imperial contract with the exception of Queensland, which received 23s. a cwt.—a difference as against Queensland of 36s. a cwt. Queensland dairymen thus lost 3½d. per lb. on butter consumed in their own State, or a total of £8,000 per week was lost to the State producers. Under the price-fixing regulations second-class butter was worth £22 10s. per ton more than choicest butter placed on the local market, which resulted in the manufacture of second-class butter, which was sent overseas, and thus ruined the reputation of our butter. With all that, hon. members on that side of the House claim to be the friends of the farmer, and are endeavouring to capture their votes and gain their support in the forthcoming elections, which, I venture to say, are not very far off, and which I hope are not far off, because they are urgently longed for. Ninety per cent. of the electors of the State have urgently longed for an opportunity of revising and recasting their votes once more, although the period of the present Parliament has not expired, and I only hope the leader of the present Administration will give the electors of the State that opportunity, and, if he is once more returned with a majority—we realise he represents a minority to-day—if he is once more returned with a majority, then all I can say is that the electors and taxpayers of this State deserve all that they will get, and, if I am a prophet, they will get more than ever they want, or than they ever got before.

Mr. POLLOCK (*Gregory*): I beg to move—

“That the debate be now adjourned.”

Question put and passed.

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

The House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.