

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

FRIDAY, 7 JULY 1922

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

FRIDAY, 7 JULY, 1922.

The SPEAKER (Hon. W. Bertram, *Marce*) took the chair at 3.30 p.m.

REVISION OF STANDING ORDERS.

ASSENT.

The SPEAKER reported that, pursuant to the instructions given by the House on the 6th instant, he presented to His Excellency the Governor the amendments made by the House in the Standing Orders and Rules of Practice, and the new Standing Orders, and that His Excellency was pleased in his presence to accord his assent thereto.

QUESTIONS.

ART UNIONS, HORSE-RACE MEETINGS, AND "LIBERTY FAIR."

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*) asked the Attorney-General—

"1. How many applications for art unions were made during twelve months ended 30th June, 1922?

"2. How many applications to conduct raffles were made during the same period?

"3. How many horse-race meetings have been held in what is known as the metropolitan racing area during that time, and the number held in the year 1913 for the same area? How many people paid for admission during those years?

"4. Will he state on what grounds the permit is based connected with the operation of what is known as the 'Liberty Fair'?

"5. Did the application for such permit outline the allocation of the proceeds; if so, what is the allocation? Has this allocation been adhered to?

"6. Has he the power to prohibit street or open lane betting; if so, does he propose to use such power?

"7. What control has the Government over proprietary and unregistered horse-race meetings?

"8. Is it the intention of the Government—no such intention being indicated by the Governor's Speech—to introduce additional legislation to secure adequate control?

"9. Will he investigate the question of taxation connected with the sporting public who utilise the enumerating machines or totalisators as against the same public who pay no taxation when operating per medium of the bookmaker?"

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullen, *Finders*) replied—

"1 and 2. 432 art unions granted and 57 refused, 759 raffles granted and 98 refused, 79 art unions and raffles combined granted and 7 refused. The hon. member for Enoggera contributed to the number of applications.

"3. 222 for the year ended 30th June, 1922, and 178 for the year ended 30th June, 1913. The Department of Justice has no record of the number of persons who paid for admission.

"4 and 5. Permits were granted for the conduct of art unions, raffles, and guessing competitions at certain carnivals on condition that the proceeds would be devoted to funds for educational purposes, to the Returned Sailors and Soldiers' Labour League, and the Tweed Heads and Coolangubra Life Savers, and I have no reason to believe that the proceeds were not so allocated.

"6. This question should be addressed to the Home Secretary.

"7. I would refer the hon. member to the Queensland statutes for information on this and cognate subjects.

"8 and 9. The Government policy in this connection will be disclosed in due course."

RETRENCHED GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*) asked the Premier—

"1. What is the number of employees of the Government who have been deflated or retrenched for the year ended 30th June, 1922?

"2. What is the total amount of salaries and wages not paid in consequence of such deflation or retrenchment?"

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

"1 and 2. The hon. member should move for a return."

RAILWAY FREIGHT ON CATTLE.

Mr. MORGAN asked the Secretary for Railways—

"1. What is the total amount received for freight on cattle conveyed on the Queensland railways for the year ended 30th June, 1922?

"2. What was the total number of cattle conveyed on the railways during the year ended 30th June, 1922?"

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. J. Larcombe, *Keppel*) replied—

"1 and 2. It will take some time to prepare these figures."

CONDITIONS AND TERMS OF AMERICAN TEN-MILLION DOLLAR LOAN.

Hon. W. H. BARNES (*Bulimba*) asked the Treasurer—

"Will he inform the members of the House the conditions and terms of the 10,000,000 dollars loan recently obtained in America, and which was referred to by His Excellency the Governor in his Speech at the opening of Parliament?"

The TREASURER (Hon. E. G. Theodore) replied—

"The loan was a dollar issue at a rate of 6 per cent. with a currency of twenty-five years. The price of issue was 96. As a Sinking Fund, 50,000 dollars are to be set aside each half-year during the currency of the loan for the purchase of bonds of the issue on the open market at a price not exceeding par. Any portion of the Sinking Fund not expended during any six months shall be invested at the option of the Government in bonds

of the issue or any other issue of the State of Queensland or Commonwealth of Australia without restriction as to price. The cost of the loan for underwriting charges, brokerage, etc., was 4 dollars per cent. As with the previous American loan, the Government made a large profit in the conversion of the dollars into sterling."

COCKATOO ISLAND (YAMPI SOUND) COMMISSION OF INQUIRY.

Hon. W. H. BARNES asked the Secretary for Mines—

"1. Will he furnish members of the House with the names of the members of the Commission who went to Western Australia and reported upon the Cockatoo Island (Yampi Sound) mineral lease?

"2. Did all the members of the Commission report favourably upon it?

"3. Did the Commissioners all report favourably upon it as a payable proposition?

"4. If they did not all agree as to its payable character, 'associated with the objects for which it was being bought,' will he furnish the House with the name or names of the members of the Commission who reported upon it or against it, as the case may be, as a payable proposition?

"5. Will he lay any returns or correspondence with regard to it upon the table of the House?"

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

"1. Yes. Mr. Brophy, Mr. Cullen, and Mr. Jackson.

"2 to 5. I now lay on the table of the House reports by Mr. A. Montgomery (Geologist and State Mining Engineer, Western Australia), and Messrs. Brophy, Cullen, and Jackson, which will afford the honourable member the desired information."

OBJECTIVE OF INTERSTATE LABOUR CONFERENCE AND ORGANISATION OF PRIMARY PRODUCERS.

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*) asked the Premier—

"1. Is he aware—

(a) That the All-Australian Trades Union Congress, held in Melbourne in June of this year, reaffirmed the objective of the Australian Labour party passed at the Interstate Labour Conference held in Brisbane last October, namely, 'The socialisation of the means of production, distribution, and exchange'?

(b) That the firstnamed congress passed a resolution acceptable to both sections of the advocates of socialism—namely, those who believe in attaining socialism by constitutional methods and those who believe in attaining this objective by industrial and (or) revolutionary methods?

(c) That the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture and Stock, at an Eight-hour Day meeting in 1921, and also on other occasions, said that the Labour

party's objective—namely, production for use and not for profit, must not be lost sight of?

(d) That in the 'Standard,' the official organ of the Labour party, the following statements are made bearing upon the policy of that party:—

In the issue of 1st October, 1921—
 'Therefore, public ownership, passing through the nationalisation stage to the goal of socialism, must be battled for at all costs.'

In the issue of 30th May, 1922—
 'State enterprises to be extended until ultimately they merge into complete control and ownership of industries by the community?'

"2. Did he make the following statement in a speech delivered by him at a meeting of the full State Council of Railway Unions on Sunday, 26th February, 1922, as reported in the 'Railway Advocate':—'The parliamentary party are trying to achieve an objective gradually, and, until they had reached that, they would require to administer the capitalistic system, which was the only system given to them to administer by the workers?'

"3. In view of these clear official statements of policy of the Labour party, does he consider that the Government's present scheme of organisation of primary producers for the purpose of giving assistance to them in their farming operations and co-operative enterprises (the objective of which is increased profit to the individual producer) can be carried out by the present Government, which is admittedly pledged to the objective of the socialisation of the means of production, distribution, and exchange?'

The PREMIER replied—

"1. Yes; although I cannot vouch for the accuracy of the reported utterance of the Minister for Agriculture and Stock and the statement alleged to have been made by the 'Standard' newspaper, I am quite prepared to accept the hon. member's word in that regard.

"2 and 3. Yes."

SUSPECTED CASE OF LAND DUMMYING, BLACKALL DISTRICT.

Mr. BULCOCK (*Barcoo*) asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

"1. Was a suspected land-dummying case, involving Blackstock Brothers, of Forest Hill, in the Blackall district, brought under the notice of his department?

"2. If so, when was the complaint first made, and when finalised?

"3. Was the matter kept prominently in view and zealously pursued during the whole period it was in the hands of the Department of Public Lands?

"4. How many officers, and whom, of the Lands Department were concerned in the investigation?

"5. Was their evidence at variance?

"6. In what manner has this matter been finalised?

"7. Have any successful 'show cause' cases been entered upon by the Crown in the Barcardine Land Commissioner's district during the last two years; if so, how many, and with what results?

"8. Owing to the keen demand for pastoral lands, will he cause to be issued to all Commissioners, land rangers, etc., special instructions to thoroughly investigate any cases where dummying is suspected?'

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

"1. Yes.

"2. Complaint was first made in June, 1919; matter finalised on 6th July, 1922.

"3. Yes.

"4. Four—the Land Commissioner, two land rangers, and a clerk in the head office.

"5. At first, yes; finally, no.

"6. It has been decided to take no further action.

"7. There have been two successful 'show cause' cases during the last two years—one in the Blackall district and one in the Barcardine district. In each case forfeiture of the selection was declared.

"8. All Land Commissioners and land rangers already have instructions to this effect, and it is a general rule of the department incorporated in the manual of instructions to district officers."

RETIREMENT OF MR. HUNTER AND APPOINTMENT OF MR. FIDELLY AS AGENT-GENERAL IN LONDON.

Mr. CLAYTON (*Wide Bay*) asked the Premier—

"1. What is the total expenditure (apart from salaries) incurred by the Government consequent upon the appointment of Mr. Fidelity to the position of Agent-General?

"2. From what date did Mr. Fidelity commence to draw the salary of the Agent-General?

"3. On what date did Mr. Hunter's salary as Agent-General cease to be paid?

"4. For what period was Mr. Hunter appointed as Agent-General?

"5. Did he receive any compensation upon the loss of his appointment?'

The PREMIER replied—

"1 to 5. The information will be given to the House at the proper time."

CROWN LANDS REVENUE; UNPAID CROWN RENTS.

Mr. BEBBINGTON (*Drayton*) asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

"1. What are the total receipts for the year ended 30th June, 1922, from land revenue under the following headings:—Land revenue; selection, etc.; sales by auction; rents of selections; timber proceeds of log sales, royalties, stumpages, export tax, or special charges on timber consigned to other States or exported; special leases; deed fees; survey fees; transfer fees? Also, other receipts—Pastoral occupation; rent of holdings and runs; and occupation licenses?

"2. What is the total amount of rents due and unpaid on selections, and on holdings, runs, and occupation licenses?'

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS replied—

"1. Land revenue for year ended 30th June, 1922—

	£	s.	d.
Sales by auction	6,235	14	6
Rents of selections	710,725	3	5
*Timber—proceeds of log sales, royalties, and stumpages	134,784	0	5
Special leases	7,766	2	9
Deed fees	1,610	11	7
Survey fees	34,712	19	8
Transfer fees	3,002	17	1
Other land receipts	12,038	6	7
Rents of holdings and runs	542,496	13	9
Rents of occupation licenses	62,162	5	5
	£1,515,534	15	2

*There is no export tax on timber, but a charge is made for supervision of pine logs exported. The amount collected under this head was £310 9s. 1d. This sum was not credited to Forest Revenue, but was absorbed by the expenditure vote for cost of supervision, etc.

"2. Rents due and unpaid on 30th June, 1922—

	£
Selections	105,560
Pastoral holdings	4,900
Occupation licenses	7,185
	£117,645."

LOAN EXPENDITURE ON RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION.

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

"What is the amount of loan money spent through his department on railway construction since 1st July, 1915?"

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS replied—

"Approximately £5,548,000 to 30th June, 1922."

LOAN EXPENDITURE ON SCHOOL BUILDINGS AND OTHER PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. SWAYNE asked the Secretary for Public Works—

"What amount from Loan Account has been spent since 1st July, 1915, on—

- (a) The erection of school buildings;
- (b) Other public works apart from railways?"

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

Finan- a Year.	School Buildings.		Other Buildings.		Total.	
	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.
1915-16	32,508	3 11	119,782	13 1	152,290	17 0
1916-17	32,491	19 1	151,227	19 10	183,719	18 11
1917-18	40,180	1 7	95,101	17 3	135,281	18 10
19 8-19	42,917	16 0	78,967	7 4	119,885	3 4
1919-20	80,455	1 4	128,433	10 7	208,888	11 11
1920-21	51,044	18 3	262,756	11 6	313,831	9 9
1921-22	38,792	9 8	141,921	7 8	180,713	17 4
Totals £	318,390	9 10	976,221	7 3	1,294,611	17 1"

PAPERS DEALING WITH RETIREMENT OF MR. HUNTER AND APPOINTMENT OF MR. FIEHELLY AS AGENT-GENERAL IN LONDON.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowong*) asked the Premier—

"Will he lay upon the table of the House the papers dealing with the resignation, deflation, or otherwise, of the late Agent-General (Mr. Hunter), and the appointment of Mr. J. A. Fihelly as Agent-General?"

The PREMIER replied—

"It would not be advisable to table these papers, but questions relating thereto will be answered when the Agent-General's Estimates are under consideration by the Legislative Assembly."

PUBLIC SERVICE MASS MEETING.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE (*Oxley*) asked the Premier, without notice—

"In view of the importance of the meeting of public servants which is being held in the Albert Hall this evening, will the hon. gentleman adjourn the House, in order to permit of members of Parliament attending the meeting?"

(Laughter.)

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

"I am afraid it would not be convenient to do that, but I have no objection to hon. members opposite attending the meeting."

(Laughter.)

FINANCIAL EMBARGO ON ITALIAN AND DANISH IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. PETERSON (*Normanby*), without notice, asked the Premier—

"Seeing that the Premier yesterday denied that an embargo had been placed by the Queensland Government against Danish settlers emigrating to Queensland, is he the Edward G. Theodore, Premier, who signed the following letter, dated 9th March, addressed to Mr. J. C. Peterson, M.L.A.:—

Dear Sir,—Replying to your letter of the 7th instant, I have to state that at the present time we are not making any arrangements in the direction of inducing other than British subjects to emigrate to Queensland.

The Queensland Government, however, recognise the value as future citizens of Danish farmers with capital, and I would be glad to consider any proposal that would lead to the settlement of such farmers in this State, provided they were possessed of, say, not less than £700 each.

If Mr. J. Hundtoft has more definite information on the subject, I shall be glad to hear from you.

Yours faithfully,

EDWARD G. THEODORE,
Premier."

The PREMIER replied—

"The letter which the hon. member has read is a letter which, I presume, I did send him. That represents the position exactly."

Mr. MORGAN: Is that not an embargo?

The PREMIER: It is no embargo at all. The question I answered yesterday was answered accurately, and, if the hon. member is acquainted with the limitation of the powers conferred on the States by the Federal Constitution, he will know that the Government have no power, constitutionally, to impose any embargo against anyone coming here, nor have we power to exclude immigrants of any kind. That is entirely within the powers of the Commonwealth. But, in connection with the giving of assistance to immigrants who desire to come to Australia under the Commonwealth laws, we lay down our own regulations, and, as I mentioned in that letter, we give preference to Britishers, to which the hon. member seems to object. (Government laughter.)

RETROSPECTIVE CROWN LAND RENTS.

Mr. FLETCHER (*Port Curtis*) moved—

“That there be laid upon the table of the House a return showing—

1. The total amount of retrospective rents collected from all sources during last financial year.
2. The number of persons or companies who received extension of time to pay retrospective rents, and the total amount of same.
3. The total amount of retrospective rents yet to be collected.”

Question put and passed.

REDUCTION IN NUMBER OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

Mr. CLAYTON (*Wide Bay*) moved—

“That there be laid upon the table of the House a return showing—

1. The number of employees in all branches of the Government service whose services have been dispensed with (other than for disciplinary reasons) since 1st January, 1921, showing the number in each department.
2. The total saving effected by the action of the Government in reducing the number of its employees.
3. The number of employees affected by any scheme of pooling of work, and the saving effected during the past financial year by all such schemes.”

Question put and passed.

LAND TAX ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION.

The PREMIER 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 Land Tax Acts in certain particulars.”

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): While we are in agreement with the Premier that there is a very great necessity to bring in legislation to amend the Land Tax Acts, we do not think that this House should consent merely to the desirableness of amending it “in certain particulars.” We would like to see a general debate on the question of land taxation. There are many matters upon which we never get an opportunity of testing the feeling of the House.

The PREMIER: You will get the opportunity on Tuesday, if it is necessary to alter the motion in Committee.

[*Hon. E. G. Theodore.*]

Mr. VOWLES: No, if I miss the opportunity now, it is gone.

The PREMIER: No.

Mr. VOWLES: The words “in certain particulars” limit the scope of the Bill to the particulars which the hon. gentleman wants. I say that we should have a general debate on land taxation. There are many principles in the Country party’s platform—the hon. gentleman has swallowed a few of them, and we would like him to swallow some more—and one of those principles is that a living area in all cases should be exempt from land taxation. We are quite agreeable to an amendment of the Land Tax Act, but not in the restricted way that the Premier would like to have it done.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: How do you know that it is a restricted way?

Mr. VOWLES: I know this much, that if I miss this opportunity now and allow this motion to go through, I will have no chance at a later stage of moving an amendment. The Premier may prove his bona fides in this matter by allowing us to have a general discussion of the Land Tax Act, and give us the opportunity of bringing forward amendments. In order to put the matter in order, I move the omission of the words “in certain particulars.” If that amendment is carried, it will give hon. members on both sides of the House an opportunity to bring forward very necessary amendments which, from their point of view, should be made in the present Act. Everybody must recognise that the land tax only affects one class in the community, and that is the freeholder. When the principle of land taxation was agreed to by this House, it was never contemplated that it would be extended in the way that has been done. Not only has the tax been increased, but the landowners have had to pay a super-tax as well. A tax such as that is in the nature of a confiscation of property. I submit that, when this House agreed to the principle of freehold land taxation, it was regarded as a temporary expedient. It was only to satisfy the temporary requirements of the Treasury. It was not intended to be carried further; but, instead of that, it has been carried to the greatest possible extreme.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*): I beg to second the amendment.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would like to point out that I gave a ruling last year that this was not the stage where hon. members could debate the introduction of Bills.

Mr. VOWLES: I am only proposing to amend the motion.

The SPEAKER: I pointed out last year that this was not the stage when amendments could be made at all. Under those circumstances, I cannot accept the amendment of the hon. member. I can assure the hon. member that he will have an opportunity of moving his amendment at a later stage.

Mr. VOWLES: I submit that I can amend the notice of motion to-day.

The SPEAKER: This is not the stage for making amendments of any kind.

Mr. VOWLES: If I do not do it to-day, I will have no chance of amending it later on.

The SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman will have every chance of amending it at a later stage.

Mr. VOWLES: So long as I get the opportunity that is all right.

Question put and passed.

PRIMARY PRODUCERS' ORGANISATION BILL.

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

(Mr. Kirwan, Brisbane, in the chair.)

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Eacham*), in moving—

“That it is desirable to introduce 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”—

said: The title of the Bill practically sets out its object, with which I am sure every member of the Committee will agree, and the need for which he will recognise. No observant man, at least on this side of the Chamber, is satisfied that the rural community, on which all our progress depends, are sufficiently organised to be able to place their views effectively before Governments and to carry out schemes, financial and otherwise, in their own interests. Lack of organisation for marketing, the effects of gluts and shortages, and the disorganisation of markets generally are sufficient justification for doing something to organise the rural community along non-party political lines.

[4 p.m.] Not only in Queensland, but throughout the world—particularly in America—this need has been recognised, and steps have been taken to bring about properly what the farmers themselves have sporadically and spasmodically attempted. It is, in my opinion, no longer a matter which should be left purely to the farmer. He should not be left to struggle along in the old way and unite in voluntary bodies by which he may seek to make his wishes articulate. It is the duty of the nation—of this Parliament—of the Government—to assist the farmer in the direction in which he has been attempting to go all these years. Many sections of the farming community, the dairying section, for instance, have to be congratulated on the fact that in the face of very hostile opposition—

Mr. BRAND: 1915-1916.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: The seizure of our butter.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: That shows your opposition.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Let me express the hope that, for the sake of a good cause, no hostility will be shown to the introduction of the Bill. It will be time enough to criticise it when hon. members see it, but I am satisfied that no member of the Committee, no matter what his politics may be, will take much exception to the measure. The organisation of the farmers of which I have spoken is only the first step. After they are organised, the power which they can exercise in their own interests is unlimited. The farming community have sufficient security to enable them to get all the money they require to develop their own individual co-operative concerns—indeed, they should be able to get more financial backing than any section of the community. The manufacturing and the commercial interests have not the same security to offer; yet the most important section of all have to go cap in hand to the local storekeeper or banker for accommodation they ought to be able to demand at the very best possible rate,

because of the adequate security they have to offer. So I say that organisation is the first step in a scheme whereby we seek to emancipate the rural community of the State. (Opposition interjections.) I want briefly to explain the provisions of the Bill, if the so-called friends of the farmers will give me the opportunity. (Renewed interjections.) Am I going to be allowed to make my speech, or am I to be compelled to listen to hostile interjection?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope hon. members will pay to the Minister the compliment of listening to what he has to say. They will have full opportunity later on to discuss the Bill.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The genesis of this Bill is to be found in that masterly address to the farmers made by the Premier at Laidley on the 21st February last. I admit that Premiers may have made similar speeches before, but that speech has been followed up by some tangible work. A conference was held, and a provisional Council of Agriculture brought into existence, and the Bill seeks to give legal as well as financial backing to that, as I shall explain as I go along. The organisation which the Bill seeks to bring into existence and legalise will be known as the “Queensland Primary Producers' Association.” It will be divided into three tiers. First there will be the local organisation, similar to the local progress associations and other local organisations. Then, in the second place, the agricultural part of the State having been divided into districts, the members of the local associations will elect a district council. The district council will, in turn, elect a member to the Council of Agriculture, which will be the executive of the Queensland Primary Producers' Association. That will make it possible—if all the farmers are organised in this non-party body—for the farmer to make his wishes articulate, first of all to the district council, and, secondly, to the Council of Agriculture, which will in turn come into contact with the Department of Agriculture and the Government, and so enforce public notice of his wishes in a way that has not been possible for him so far. It is proposed that the producers shall elect three-fourths of the Council, the Government having nominees upon it—largely experts, such as the Commissioner for Railways, for, after all, transport is one of the most important things in agricultural progress, as my friend, the hon. member for Albert, knows very well. The drawback in connection with bad roads and railway facilities must be overcome; therefore the transport authority should be a representative of the Government on the Council. Probably the Director of Agriculture, Mr. Quodling, also will be acceptable as a representative, by virtue of his expert knowledge of agriculture. The Government nominees in all cases will be able to give expert advice and assistance to the Council of Agriculture.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Will there be any politicians on it?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: We cannot disqualify a man because he happens to be a politician.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Will the Minister be chairman?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I am coming to that if the hon. member for

Hon. W. N. Gillies.]

Drayton will only have patience. The Secretary for Agriculture for the time being will be chairman of the Council. I think he ought to be. I want to say that I am the chairman now, but the chairman has no special authority; he is not allowed to speak under the rules which have been drawn up. I hope those rules will be adhered to. The chairman is not allowed to address the Council unless he vacates the chair and allows someone else to take the chair. It is all very fine to raise the question of party; but this scheme is going to continue and progress no matter whether there is a change of Government or not. Once we get it established, it must go on, otherwise our rural industries are not going to develop, but will go back. I think the idea of the Minister being chairman by virtue of his office is a good one. I am open to conviction on that, but I believe that, no matter what Government may be in power, it is desirable that the Secretary for Agriculture should be an fait with everything the Council do and should hear what they have to say, because it is his department that will be called upon to carry out their schemes, etc. This is the most important organisation that has ever been brought into existence in Queensland. I say that, because Queensland is a country of primary production, because agriculture is the foundation of all wealth, and because of the possibilities of expansion in this great State. Therefore, I say that this organisation will be the most important that has ever been brought into existence, because it will be the mouthpiece of the farmers, and will be able to confer with the Department of Agriculture and make the wishes of the farmers known to Governments in a way that has been unknown in the past.

The Bill is a very simple one. It provides that not more than twenty-five members shall constitute the executive, and not more than a fourth of those members shall be Government nominees. The objects, functions, and powers are set out very clearly. They have already been published in the Press, and I am sure that every member on both sides has followed very closely what the Council of Agriculture have been doing, and they will be familiar with its powers and duties. It is proposed to appoint a director, a secretary, and other officers. In order to finance the scheme the council will have power to levy on industries with the approval of those concerned, those levies being subsidised £1 for £1 by the Government for at least five years.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: Do you state what industries you propose to levy on?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That is purely a matter for the council; and the levy will be small.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Surely you are not going to allow the council to levy on some industries and not on others?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The council, as I have explained, will be elected by the producers themselves, and will be responsible to the producers. Power will be given under the regulations to consult the producers before levies are made. The levies will doubtless be made with the co-operation and approval of the various industries concerned. A suggestion has been made—it is a matter for further consideration—that, instead of levying on individual farmers, the levy should be made on industry; but that is purely a matter for those con-

cerned. In order to carry on the proper management of the dairying industry, it has been suggested that 1d. on every 100 lb. of butter would provide a sufficiently large sum. The same thing might apply to the sugar industry—½d or ¼d. per ton of sugar-cane should enable the industry to be properly financed. That principle is in operation already in regard to the sugar cane prices legislation. The same thing might apply to the fruit industry, but in that case it would not be as easy as in the case of butter and sugar-cane. Those are matters of detail which can be left altogether to the representatives of the farmers appointed on the permanent council. The sum so levied will be subsidised by the Government £1 for £1 for five years.

I want to call attention to the fact that the regulation-making power in a new measure of this kind must be very large. It is experimental legislation. It has not been in operation, or even suggested, in any part of Australia. It has been in operation to a certain extent in America, and we have been guided to a certain extent in framing our Bill by the legislation there. I think it is desirable that the regulation-making power should be very large; that is to say, the representatives of the farmers on the Council of Agriculture should not be hamstrung or tied up when they want to do something in the interests of the farmers. There is this safeguard—that although the regulations will have the sanction of the Governor in Council and be laid before Parliament, they will not be passed except on the recommendation of the Council of Agriculture. It is really a scheme to enable the farmers to organise and to bring into existence an executive which will have power and authority to make their wishes and the needs of the rural community known to the Government. Not only will they have that power, but they will have responsibility. Whenever power is given to any body, it should be prepared to take responsibility. I am prepared to give them power; but, at the same time, they must take the responsibility of what they recommend, and must do the right thing in the interests of the farmers. If the Council of Agriculture say to me, as Minister, "Your dairying regulations are too drastic; we can maintain our good name on the London market by relaxing them," so far as I am concerned, I will recommend to the Government that the regulations should be relaxed. But the Council of Agriculture must take the full responsibility of having made that recommendation to me.

I submit the Bill with that brief outline of its provisions. It is a very simple measure, and I have great pleasure in moving the motion.

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): I think all members of the Opposition are in agreement that this House should do all it can to promote the best interests of the agriculturists in Queensland.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. VOWLES: It is a funny thing that, after seven years of power—

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: What about your fifty years?

Mr. VOWLES: My fifty years? I am not fifty years old. (Laughter.) The Government, after seven years of inaction, have suddenly made up their minds that the time

[Hon. W. N. Gillies.

has arrived to set themselves out to do a good thing for the men whom they have been oppressing in the past. Just a little while ago this Government claimed to have emancipated the worker; in what direction can easily be seen by walking the streets of Brisbane or going into the country, where there will be found innumerable unemployed. There was a time when the Government looked to those men for political support; made them all sorts of rash promises and held up to them the same pretty picture that they are now displaying to the farmer, in order to enlist their sympathies for the purpose of obtaining and holding the Treasury benches. They have now been found out. The industrialists have discovered that this Arcadia that they were led to expect is a sort of hell. It is necessary now, in order that the Government should carry on, that they should make themselves good with some other section of the community. I have read some observations on the failure of the One Big Union, more particularly some by Mr. Cleary, of New South Wales, who points out that the solution of the trouble is to dangle a bunch of carrots before the agriculturists. I do not know whether the Premier or the Secretary for Agriculture has read that work, but here, at the eleventh hour, we find them coming forward professing to make up for all their misdeeds of the past, and trying to enlist the sympathies of the men whom they have deliberately robbed in the past by their legislation.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That is not true.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: It is true.

Mr. VOWLES: The fact remains that the very basis of this scheme was put before this Chamber by no less a person than the last member who interjected. There was a proposal by the hon. member for Drayton in this Chamber—

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Why are you so hostile?

Mr. VOWLES: We are not hostile. (Government interruption.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask hon. members to give the leader of the Opposition the opportunity of making his speech.

At 4.20 p.m.,

Mr. POLLOCK (*Gregory*), one of the panel of Temporary Chairmen, relieved the Chairman in the chair.

Mr. VOWLES: The principle that the Government are adopting now was refused on a former occasion, when the hon. member for Drayton moved an amendment on the Profiteering Prevention Bill providing that the Price Fixing Commissioner should be guided by the advice of two representatives, one representing the producer and the other representing the consumer.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The old wages board system.

Mr. VOWLES: No; it was simply a matter of appointing an advisory board. That principle was not good enough when the Government were taking from the farmer a large amount of profits which should have gone into the farmer's pockets and which would have helped him along during the dry time that followed.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Do you believe in price-fixing?

Mr. VOWLES: No.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Why did the hon. member for Drayton recommend that?

Mr. VOWLES: It was simply a suggestion to the hon. gentleman. I am not casting any reflection on the Price Fixing Commissioner, but you could not expect one individual to have all the necessary information and experience that would be required to enable him to do his work competently in the position in which the Government were seeking to place him. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Drayton proposed to give him the assistance of an experienced man engaged in the farming industry, and also of a man who had to buy the farmers' produce. Although we have not seen the Bill, we are in the unique position of having had the whole of its contents foreshadowed to us by the Premier. It must be regarded as one of very great importance, otherwise the hon. gentleman would have adopted the usual practice in connection with measures of this sort, and the first persons he would have taken into his confidence would have been hon. members in this Chamber. But during recess, as is customary with the Premier, he went on an electioneering stunt, and took the opportunity of going into the farming districts and proposing something, as I said before, in the nature of a bunch of carrots, so as to get their votes at an election shortly to come along.

Mr. MORGAN: That is where the Government have a weak memory.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Are you in favour of the scheme?

Mr. VOWLES: I am in favour of the scheme, provided it is a *bonâ fide* one. We know that it is always customary during the last session of a Parliament for a Government to do a little bit of window-dressing.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: This is not the last session.

Mr. VOWLES: I venture to say that it is, and that it is closely approaching the end of it.

Mr. PEASE: You are a poor prophet.

Mr. VOWLES: We will see. My experience has been that every time the Premier says "Yes," the truth is "No." He has said that we are not going to have an election, and I say we are.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope the hon. member will confine his remarks to the motion before the Committee.

Mr. VOWLES: The Premier is becoming a member of the Country party very rapidly, and perhaps what I have said is not so much out of place. I am under the impression that there is a tremendous amount of make-believe about this scheme. The hon. gentleman, judging by the speech he made two days ago, has been in consultation with a gentleman known as the political Judas of Toowoomba.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Who is that?

Mr. VOWLES: I refer to the editor of "The Producers' Review." The scheme that he handed over to the Premier is the scheme of the farmers on the Downs, and one which was being advocated by no less a person than Mr. McAnally, who went through my electorate, the Nanango electorate, and the Murilla electorate prior to this announcement by the Premier. That scheme was exactly the same as that brought forward by the Premier, who virtually admits now that he

Mr. Vowles.]

got it from Mr. Harrison, of Toowoomba. The hon. member for Pittsworth was one of the men who drew up the scheme.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: He never saw it.

Mr. VOWLES: He did. It originated years ago. It is brought forward now as something that the Government in power think will be a means of getting them votes, because they pretend they are in a position to put it into operation. They say, "This is something that will gull the farmer, and we will give it to them as a little dope in the way of make-believe before we have an election." If the Government were genuine, they would have come to the assistance of the farmers months and months, or even years, ago.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: So we did.

Mr. VOWLES: You did not. This is only window-dressing, and we are led to believe by no less an authority than Mr. Harrison that it is going to cost us £30,000 a year. That is a conservative estimate, and it will possibly cost £50,000 per annum. The point we have to study is whether there is any justification on the part of the Opposition or the Committee to support a scheme that will cost £50,000 per annum if it is only being proposed for a purpose with no business in it. The party on this side is going to assist to put the scheme through; but we propose to make it much better, and we propose to take it to the people at election time and ask them to return representatives who will see that it is put into operation, and who will demand that it be placed on the statute-book in the same way as other Bills that have been passed by this Committee.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: You have already had an opportunity.

Mr. VOWLES: We have never had an opportunity. Hon. members opposite thought that this was an opportunity to steal our platform because it will be popular, and we trust they will put it into effect. Another point to be taken into consideration is whether the scheme is going to be effective except so far as Queensland is concerned. The Minister should take into consideration whether there should not be an Australian policy.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Do you think we should make a start in Queensland?

Mr. VOWLES: This matter was discussed before the Premier ever came into office by representatives of farmers' unions. I was present on a deputation when the matter was brought before the Premier.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: What matter?

Mr. VOWLES: The matter of this scheme.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You have not seen the Bill.

Mr. VOWLES: I have seen in the newspapers the scheme outlined by the Premier. One difficulty I see is that, although the scheme may be quite practicable, unless it is made a Commonwealth concern instead of a State one, there will not be any advantage to be gained by the farmer except in regard to marketing overseas. We are expending a large sum of money—

At 4.30 p.m.,

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Under the provisions of the new Standing Orders passed yesterday, I must now leave the chair and make my report to the House.

The SPEAKER resumed the chair, and the CHAIRMAN reported progress.

[*Mr. Vowles.*

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. POLLOCK (*Gregory*): I am afraid that the Opposition, or at least the Country party, cannot be complimented upon the new apostle charged with the duty of leading the criticism against the Government. I listened very carefully to the remarks of the hon. member for Oxley, and to me they seemed to be nothing but a tissue of generalities. When the hon. member for Oxley first came into this Chamber, and for a few months afterwards, he did make an effort to indulge in at least fair criticism of the Government, and at that time, too, I can fairly say, he always endeavoured to supply some sub-tratum of truth to support the statements that he made. But when he was launching his criticism against the Government on this occasion, he appeared to rely solely upon wild and somewhat inaccurate and misleading statements. I took a careful note at the time of what he said, and one of the things that he said was that one had only to walk down the street and count the unemployed in their thousands to realise what an awful mess the Government were making of Queensland. In reply to that, I want to say that no Government in Queensland, no matter what its label might be, could possibly hope to solve the unemployed problem.

Mr. J. JONES: They can relieve it.

Mr. POLLOCK: They have already done much to relieve the unemployed.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: The Secretary for Mines said there were no unemployed in the State.

Mr. POLLOCK: No other State in Australia has made any effort to compare with what Queensland has done to solve unemployment and relieve the unemployed. No other Government in Australia has spent a tithe of what Queensland has spent upon the construction of public works calculated to diminish the amount of unemployment. It was not very long after the Nationalist Government came into office in New South Wales that we were told they were spending £100,000 towards the relief of unemployment. Anybody who has any idea of what it costs to relieve a large amount of unemployment knows that there is no possibility of relieving unemployment to any appreciable extent with the expenditure of a miserable £100,000. Queensland is spending more than £100,000 in feeding the unemployed who have come from the other States, and that is not a very wide estimate.

Mr. EDWARDS: It is a bogey, though.

Mr. POLLOCK: It is no bogey, because as fast as Queensland has poured its millions into schemes, such as the Burnett land scheme, the building of the Bowen Coalfields Railway, and other schemes for the purpose of relieving unemployment—immediately unemployment has been temporarily relieved, men have come from the other States by thousands seeking employment, and the more we spend in the relief of unemployment, the greater will be the influx of men from the other States. How Governments can hope successfully to solve the problem of unemployment, not only in Queensland, but apparently in all the other States of Australia, is more than any hon. member on

the other side of the House has yet attempted to explain.

Mr. EDWARDS: You are going the right way to do it now by the Government's agricultural scheme.

Mr. POLLOCK: I will have something to say about farming later on. Meantime the Government are keeping large numbers of men who were created unemployed in the other States of the Commonwealth. Prior to the opening of the sugar season the sugar districts are inundated with men from the other States who come here seeking employment because there is a Labour Government in power here. The shearing industry, to a large extent, is being run by men from the other States—by men who come here because of the higher rates paid in that industry in Queensland, and I suppose the influx of men, for that reason, will be even greater as time goes on, now that we have a higher award in Queensland than has been granted by the Commonwealth Arbitration Court for the other States.

Another thing that the Queensland Government have no power to prevent, and which the working people of Queensland should take steps to alter at the next Federal elections, is the influx of men who come here with practically only what they stand up in. It is not very long ago that I saw in the "Courier" a paragraph to the effect that a fine type of men were coming from other countries to this country to start a new life, and they were so brave that all they had was the clothes they stood up in. Queensland does not want that type of immigrant. Queensland already has sufficient unemployed. So have all the other States, and, as this question is entirely controlled by the immigration laws of the Commonwealth and by the Commonwealth Government, then those who have votes to record at the next Federal elections should see that only those immigrants who have sufficient to enable them to start out for themselves are allowed to come to Australia.

Mr. EDWARDS: Some of the best men we have here came to Queensland without a shilling.

Mr. POLLOCK: Perhaps at the time those men came there were not so many other men here without a shilling. The position is different to-day. I have already explained that it is not our own unemployed only whom we are looking after. It is the unemployed of all the other States, and that can be seen when I say that during an investigation of the police in Winton last year they discovered that out of 154 men convicted in Winton for various offences, 151 of them were from other States. That is an indication of the number of men coming from the other States to Queensland.

The hon. member for Oxley further said that in the northern part of Queensland squatters were giving away cows and calves to escape the Government's extortionate taxation.

Mr. J. JONES: It is correct.

Mr. POLLOCK: It is not correct, although it is correct that the hon. member for Oxley said so. The Commonwealth Government are doubly as harsh in their taxation of the pastoralists in that respect as the Queensland Government are, because the Queensland Income Tax Department charges only 15s. per calf as the natural

increase, while the Federal Government charge the full value of £3 per calf outright.

Mr. J. JONES: That is not true.

Mr. POLLOCK: The hon. member may deny it, but if he will approach either of the Income Tax Departments he will find that the Commonwealth Government charge £3 on the natural increase, while the Queensland Government only charge 15s., making the added value of £3 during the second year.

Mr. J. JONES: That is £3 too much.

Mr. POLLOCK: If the Queensland Government are charging too much, then the Commonwealth Government are charging four times as much. That is only another indication of the loose and inaccurate methods of the hon. member for Oxley.

In dealing with education, the hon. member said that the children in the cities were being taught on cold cement floors, and were being educated under the hardest possible conditions.

Mr. J. JONES: There are no floors at all where I live.

Mr. POLLOCK: All I have to say to that is that it is a pity a lot of the city people are not as considerate in the matter of education as some of our bush people are.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. POLLOCK: I know that in most of the places in my constituency out back, where they are glad to have a school at all, the committee generally manage to raise sufficient money by means of a social to erect a fence around the school, and carry out repairs to the school building. In the city here all this work seems to be left to the Government.

Mr. PETRIE: You are wrong there.

Mr. POLLOCK: I am only stating my own opinion, and my experience of the Education Department as I have found it. I have never yet approached the Secretary for Public Instruction in vain for the erection of a new school. I admit that I have gone to the Education Department asking for repairs to various schools, and that my requests have been refused—and, I believe, rightly so when fresh schools were required—but I have never yet gone to the department asking for a school to be established where there were sufficient children of school age to warrant its erection, without having that consideration which was necessary extended to me by the department. That is a good deal to be able to say of the department.

Mr. EDWARDS: How long does it take to get them erected sometimes?

Mr. POLLOCK: I have found no very great delay in having these matters attended to. In addition to that, the hon. member for Oxley said that the schools were being starved. He said that everywhere there was an indication that the Government were not doing their duty in regard to the education of the children. If the Labour party have not been doing their duty so far as education is concerned, what an awful mess the hon. member's colleagues must have been making of education when they controlled the Government. I have here a table showing the expenditure by the Liberal Government during their last six years of office, and a comparison showing the amount expended on education during our six years

Mr. Pollock.]

of office to the year ended 30th June, 1921. I find that, whereas on administration—and salaries, etc.—the late Liberal Government in that period spent £2,892,735; we spent £5,113,860. On buildings—that is, for all schools, including grammar schools and the University, whereas an amount of £520,857 was spent for the six years ended 30th June, 1915, we spent £528,754 for the six years ended 30th June, 1921.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: That table is absolutely against you.

Mr. POLLOCK: Our increased expenditure over and above what was spent by the Liberal Government during their last six years of office was £2,434,121 16s. 11d.; and, in the face of that, the hon. member for Oxley has the effrontery to say that the Government are starving the educational services of this State.

The hon. member went on to criticise what he termed the Government's lax control of gambling. So far as the "Golden Casket" is concerned, my constituents would far rather have the "Golden Casket" operated by the Queensland Government than they would see its abolition and "Tattersall's" of Tasmania permitted to carry on as it previously did—

Hon. W. H. BARNES: No one is advocating that.

Mr. POLLOCK: For the reason that the hospitals of Queensland are receiving a great deal of benefit from "Golden Casket" funds. The money which is being used to assist hospitals is, in my opinion, being well and wisely distributed. I can give an idea of the manner in which country hospitals are benefiting by the operations of the "Golden Casket," by stating that for the year 1920-1921 the Winton Hospital received £1,050 15s. 8d.; the Boulia Hospital, £243 5s. 6d.; the Kynuna Hospital, £120 3s.; and the Jundah Hospital, £201 2s. 5d. For the year 1921-1922 Winton received £1,126 15s. 8d.; Boulia, £310 6s. 4d.; Kynuna, £140 18s.; and Jundah, £473 16s. 10d.—showing that over £5,000 has been distributed among the hospitals in the constituency I represent during the past two years. Not only has that happened, but to-day in the far Western districts of Queensland there is a drought. It is not nearly so easy to secure money from the citizens in that part of the State as it was when seasons were good, and these people would not now be able to carry on their hospitals so efficiently but for the subsidy received from the "Golden Casket" funds, and many hospitals in other constituencies are in a similar position. It is not to be expected that when a dry season is experienced in one part of the State, persons residing, say, in Brisbane, are going to give their money in order to enable the people of the West to carry on their hospitals; and for this reason I believe that the Government's policy of "Golden Caskets" is not only permissible, but highly laudable. So far as the Government's agricultural policy is concerned, I am not in a position to speak with any great degree of authority. My experience of farming has been mostly gained from working on farms, following a plough, or acting as a general farm hand; and, naturally, a man who has gained his experience by working in an industry such as that cannot be expected to have the same knowledge of farming as, say, for instance, a city lawyer like the hon. member for Dalby, or a seller of agricultural implements,

[Mr. Pollock.

such as the hon. member for Oxley. I admit that I shall be at a disadvantage in speaking on such a matter as that in comparison with those illustrious hon. members; but, all the same, if I were a farmer, I am quite satisfied that I would easily be able to distinguish the difference between a true farmer's representative and a produce agent, who for many years has been acting as a farmer of the farmer.

At 4.40 p.m.

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

Quorum formed.

Mr. POLLOCK: There is no doubt that the Country party desire to attain power in Queensland, and some of them are optimistic enough to expect that, after the next general election, they will be the Government, but I do not share that opinion. But if Queensland was so unfortunate as to be afflicted with the Country party and the Nationalist party, then the farmer would certainly be in a very bad way afterwards, for the reason that the farmers of Queensland, from what they have heard from most of the men who compose the Nationalist party, can expect very little quarter from them. Every farmer should know that, owing to the peculiar state of parties in Queensland, the Country party cannot possibly hope, under any circumstances, no matter what the result of the general election might be, to form a Government and carry on without the co-operation and assistance of the Nationalist party. The farmers know that.

Mr. COSTELLO: What about the Labour party?

Mr. POLLOCK: Realising that, the average farmer will want to know just what sort of a deal he can expect from a Government in which the hon. member for Dalby and the hon. member for Aubigny are Ministers, and in whose ranks also will probably be found the hon. member for Windsor and the hon. member for Bulimba. There is a combination of lawyers, farmers, and produce agents! It is unthinkable that there could be a Government in Queensland without there being in the Ministry a leavening of representatives of each party. The average farmer ought to realise that from the produce agent, who has been his life-long enemy, he can expect very little. All he has received from the produce agent in the past has been kicks. If such a Ministry did attain office, then it would be a case of "the lion lying down with the lamb." The hon. member for Bulimba will appreciate that quotation, seeing that it comes from Isaiah. Anyone who knows the hon. member for Windsor would never accuse him or the hon. member for Bulimba of being a lamb. If the two parties opposite obtained a majority at the elections and were called upon to form a Government—

Hon. W. H. BARNES: Why say "if" when you know it is a certainty?

Mr. POLLOCK: We will oblige the hon. member by supposing that it is a certainty. They are fighting now. The line of demarcation between the two parties in the country is supposed to be very sharply drawn. If, after the election, in spite of their position to-day, they obtain office, the people who provide the fighting funds for this purpose will soon insist, in order to keep the Labour

party out of office, that these parties shall coalesce. Then will come the unholy alliance to which I have just referred.

Mr. VOWLES: We have no fighting funds. Where are they coming from?

Mr. POLLOCK: No fighting funds! I direct the hon. member's attention to that little circular that was issued by the Pastoralists' Association calling upon its members for a levy in order to support both the Nationalist party and the Country party. Or perhaps hon. gentlemen opposite would like to see that circular wherein the insurance agents of Queensland, in order to oust the State Insurance Office from its position as the leader of the insurance business in this State, succeeded in getting sufficient money to enable the Opposition to carry on during the elections. It was the late Hon. T. J. Ryan who said that a good thing could not be repeated too often, and I propose to give the Queensland farmer a further indication of what he can expect if the alliance I spoke of takes place after the next election. The hon. member for Windsor was one of those who signed that petition wherein the Railway Department was asked to take some action to prevent newspapers getting the fullest information with reference to consignments sent to produce agents from time to time. That circular was signed by Denham Bros. and many other produce agents, including the present hon. member for Windsor.

Mr. MOORE: We have heard that before. This is tedious repetition.

Mr. POLLOCK: This circular related to the practice of the "Courier" of publishing the lists and numbers of trucks, and read—

"We understand the manner in which the representatives of the paper get their information is that they go and look at the little ticket which is attached to every truck, giving the truck number and from where the truck comes. Might we suggest that these tickets should not be on the trucks at all; also, that books of the railway giving information about the place of loading of trucks be kept private. . . . Of course, we are aware that you cannot do anything to prevent them going to the shed and taking down the prices that produce brings, but, on the other hand, you could assist us greatly in giving such instructions as would ensure a little privacy in our business transactions. . . . We would esteem it a great favour if you would kindly instruct all officers of yours who have to do with advice notes, also those who are in possession of the books with the information regarding where the truck is from, to kindly keep this information strictly private and not to give it to any representatives of the newspapers."

That is an indication of just what sympathy the leaders of the present Nationalist party, who must coalesce with the Country party, have for the farmers.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: You don't suggest that I signed it?

Mr. POLLOCK: I suggest that, if the hon. gentleman did not sign it, he agreed to it.

Mr. STOPFORD: He inspired it.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: Nonsense!

Mr. POLLOCK: It is just what the hon. gentleman would agree to.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: You cannot find my name there.

Mr. POLLOCK: I do not doubt that the hon. gentleman did not sign it. I said before that the hon. gentleman was no lamb, and it is not likely he would be found signing a public document which, later on in his political life, might be used against him. But he got the other lamb, the hon. member for Windsor, to sign it. That hon. gentleman did not know that one day he would become the hon. member for Windsor, and that he would be leading the Nationalist party, from the leadership of which he deposed the hon. member for Bulimba.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: He did not.

Mr. POLLOCK: Well, you were leader, and he was not; now he is leader, and you are not. We heard a great deal from the hon. member for Oxley as to how the railways should be made to pay. We heard from him that the railways were going to the bad. He said that the Government should make an effort to pull themselves together and straighten out the finances, particularly in regard to the railways. He did not tell us how this was to be done; in fact, during the course of his whole speech he entirely omitted any reference as to how the Government might economise. He merely said that the Government were spending more money than they ought to do, but he did not say how they should alter their spending capacities or how they should economise. His speech was a tissue of generalities from beginning to end, and he made no effort to prove his case. I propose to show what the Government have done for the farmers and graziers of Queensland in the way of freights on their stock. We have heard a good deal about the deficit on the railways, and about the difficulties that the cattle-owners have in making ends meet at the present time. That is not the fault of the Government. The Government, so far, have been more considerate to the graziers and farmers in Queensland in the matter of railway freights and other protection than any other Government in Australia.

At 5 p.m.,

Mr. WALKER (*Cooroora*), one of the panel of Temporary Chairmen, relieved the Speaker in the chair.

Mr. POLLOCK: I challenge contradiction on that point. It was the hon. member for Windsor, speaking on behalf of the Nationalist party, who said that the way in which he would make the railways pay would be by increasing fares and freights.

Mr. MAXWELL: Where?

Mr. POLLOCK: He said, throughout the whole of the State.

Mr. MAXWELL: He did not.

Mr. POLLOCK: Where would he increase fares and freights? Would he increase freights in the city? What freights are there in the city? The cities produce for the railways practically only fares. There is very little freight but that to and from the country, so that, if the hon. member was talking of increasing freights, he could only have been talking of freights to and from the country.

Mr. MOORE: Why did you not read his speech?

Mr. Pollock.]

Mr. POLLOCK: I did read his speech, and that is the only conclusion I can come to.

Mr. VOWLES: He specified preferential rates to farmers in distant places.

Mr. POLLOCK: I want to show that the Queensland rate on stock for slaughter—and this comes very near to the cattle-owners of Queensland—is 6s. 6d. per head per 100 miles, whilst in New South Wales it is 10s. 11d.

Mr. MOORE: It only operates coming to Brisbane.

Mr. POLLOCK: Those are the average rates. They operate coming to ordinary works in Queensland. I do not intend to allow the hon. member to take out of my mouth information I have asked for and obtained from the Commissioner. The Commissioner says that the rates are 10s. 11d. in New South Wales; 11s. 1d. in Victoria; 10s. 9d. in South Australia; 12s. 6d. in Western Australia; and 8s. 2d. in South Africa. I have here a comparison of rates from 100 to 1,000 miles, and any member can see it if he is doubtful.

Mr. MOORE: But outside Brisbane they pay the same rate.

Mr. POLLOCK: The Queensland rate on sheep for slaughter is 8d. per head per 100 miles; 1s. 1d. in New South Wales; 1s. 1d. in Victoria; 10d. in South Australia; 1s. in Western Australia; and 1s. 2d. in South Africa. Not only have we the lowest rates on stock for slaughter, but we have also the lowest freights on all other agricultural produce, despite the fact that in Queensland we pay higher wages, give shorter hours, and have a longer and harder railway system to manage.

Mr. MOORE: And a bigger loss.

Mr. POLLOCK: We can take Victoria, a small, compact State, but which charges between 40 per cent. and 50 per cent. more than Queensland. They have a Tory Government there, yet in spite of these facts, hon. members opposite insist that the Queensland Government are doing nothing to assist primary industries. If the Government wanted to make the railways pay, all they would have to do would be to put up freights to the level they have reached in the other States of Australia.

Mr. MOORE: Nonsense.

Mr. POLLOCK: If we were to increase freights, without making any allowance for increased wages and better conditions here, we would have a very much smaller deficit on the railways. I want to show that the Government are the friends of the farmers in respect of the freights on agricultural produce. The charge on truck load to ports in Queensland is 3s. 10d. per ton for every 25 miles; in New South Wales it is 4s. (4s. 4d. on hay and chaff); in Victoria 4s. 2d.; South Australia 5s. 9d. (hay and chaff 6s. 1d.); and in Western Australia 6s. 10d. There, again, we are from 15 per cent. to 75 per cent. lower than any of the Tory-governed States in Australia. Yet hon. members opposite tell us that they are the friends of the farmers, and the hon. member for Windsor, who wants to raise these freights, of course says that he also is the friend of the farmers when he is trying to get into the Ministry with the members now on the front Opposition bench. The farmers of Queensland, if they would only read the comparison

of rates charged on the railways by Queensland and other States, and remember the concessions given to them by the Queensland Government as compared with other Governments, would never vote for hon. members opposite. In Queensland, on 1-ton lots of barley, bran, pollard, flour, wheat, grain, maize, straw, chaff, and vegetables the charge is 4s. 7d. per ton for every 25 miles; in New South Wales it is 10s. 5d.; in Victoria 3s. 2d.; in South Australia 10s. 2d.; and in Western Australia 11s. 1d.; and all those States are governed by Ministries composed of alleged friends of the farmers such as hon. members opposite. On butter and cheese—in order to give a little diversion to those who would like to know what are the Queensland Government charges on other articles—Queensland charges 7s. 11d. per ton for 25 miles; New South Wales 10s. 5d.; Victoria 7s. 4d. (for ton lots only); South Australia 13s. 4d.; and Western Australia 14s. 10d. There, again, are the freights levied by the friends of the farmers upon their friends, the farmers.

Mr. MOORE: What are they on 5-cwt. lots?

Mr. POLLOCK: The hon. member's constituents are not quite such stupid business men as he would lead us to believe. I am quite sure that no farmer, at least no farmer worth any consideration, would send away 5 cwt. of cheese.

Mr. MOORE: It is not the farmers; it is the factories.

Mr. POLLOCK: No other Government in Australia have given the farmers the concessions the Queensland Government have given them and are giving them, as evidenced by these tables. Not only that, but during the debate on the Address in Reply the whole of the statements made by Opposition members are an indication that in debating this matter they are not to be trusted to make out a case that is correct; and, after all, no more serious charge can be levelled against a public man or any body of public men than that they are incorrect in the statements they make as responsible representatives in Parliament.

The hon. member for Oxley, for one, and other hon. members who have spoken while levelling vague charges against the Government, have simply repeated, like parrots, the material they read every morning in the "Courier" and other daily papers without having made any effort to substantiate the charges. I hope that during the course of this debate, if other Opposition members are desirous of making charges against the Government, they will bring forward some substantiation.

Mr. NOTT (*Stanley*): I desire to say a few words, since the opportunity of speaking on the Address in Reply is still ours. I am particularly pleased with a lot of the legislation forecast in the Governor's Speech. The Premier, in speaking, dwelt considerably on the agricultural policy he has brought along. I am ready to push that policy as far as I can to a successful issue. Because a Labour Government are bringing it forward it does not necessarily follow that it is of no use. I certainly believe that "good can come out of Nazareth." I am prepared to make this scheme as far-reaching as possible, and to get it into operation as quickly as possible. I would be very sorry to say that I was prepared to support the particular Government who have launched this scheme. I do

[*Mr. Pollock.*]

not think that I and my brother farmers can be blamed if we look askance at anything they do. During the past five or six years we have experienced the effect of the legislation of the present Government.

Mr. PEASE: The way they made the sugar industry.

Mr. NOTT: Some little time ago conferences were held at which the various bodies connected with the sugar industry were represented, and we find that the sugar people were unanimous in putting themselves in the hands, not of the Government, but of the Federal authorities.

Mr. PEASE: What are the Federal Government doing for them?

Mr. NOTT: In the time of the Denham Government I was a mill owner and sugargrower. I do not think that Government did anything to help the sugar industry when the chance was theirs. In the Bundaberg district I was asked what we were to do. I said we were between the devil and the deep blue sea. I am particularly glad that we are getting away from both by having here a Country party which looks after the interests, not only of the sugar industry, but of every source of production, and of all the secondary industries throughout the State.

Mr. PEASE: Mr. Hughes thinks very little of the Country party. He said they would have six seats after this election.

Mr. NOTT: In spite of that, with Mr. Hughes in charge, the sugar industry is quite satisfied to work under the agreement in existence at the present time. I am certain they would rather trust the Federal authorities, even with that courageous little imp, Mr. Hughes, in charge, than trust the present Labour Government in Queensland.

Mr. COLLINS: What rot!

Mr. NOTT: Then we have experience of the manner in which the Labour Government have treated the pastoralists, since the time when the late Mr. Ryan threatened that he would make the pastoralists squeal. I believe the Government have been very successful in making the pastoralists squeal; but the pastoralists are not alone in their squealing.

Mr. POLLOCK: Are you sure Mr. Ryan said that?

Mr. NOTT: I think Mr. Ryan said it.

Mr. POLLOCK: That is just another of the loose statements you people make.

Mr. NOTT: I will come to another matter which is more nearly related to the agricultural scheme. I do not think the dairymen will easily forget the treatment they received in regard to the commandeering of their butter. They will not forget that, when they might have been able to obtain up to 27s. for their butter, the Price-fixing Commissioner fixed a price 30s. lower than they could have got by selling it for export. In bringing this policy forward, the Premier hopes that those things will be forgotten; but the actions of the Labour Government during the last six years are not likely to be forgotten.

Looking back over that period, one cannot but be impressed with the fact that the Labour Government have been doing their utmost to exploit Queensland for the advantage of their militant supporters. Those supporters have been so encouraged by success

and by the sympathy they have received, that they have become a veritable Frankenstein. Their insatiable demands have been backed up by implacable determination. They have driven, and are now driving, this Government to enact legislation which is incomprehensible when one considers that the Labour party always claimed to stand for democracy. The actions of the Government during the past six or seven years furnish a reason for our being here with a rush session. To my mind, this agricultural policy is being pushed, not with the idea of assisting the man on the land, but because of the fact that some time ago the Government had a majority of over twenty, whereas now their majority is one.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: No, two.

Mr. NOTT: An effective one, and a numerical two. This agricultural policy that is brought forward by the Government does not seem to me to be consistent with their policy when they rose to the zenith of their power. At that time they came back to this House with a very strong majority with a cry of high wages, shorter hours, and cheap food, and now we find that they are beginning to reduce wages. Certainly, in the advocacy of this agricultural policy, they are advocating dearer food, because, if the scheme is insisted upon, it will have the effect of increasing the price of food to the city worker.

Mr. PEASE: Will you take up that attitude in connection with the sugar industry?

Mr. NOTT: The Labour party, in bringing forward this policy, are ratting on the objective on which they were elected.

Mr. PEASE: You are ratting on your fellow sugar workers and farmers.

Mr. NOTT: The Premier, in enunciating his agricultural policy at Lowood, in answer to a question put by me, admitted that perhaps the Labour party had been very dilatory in bringing in this legislation to assist the farmers, and in reply to another question put by me, as to why his Government had delayed for the whole of the six years that they were in power, he said it was because there was such a lot for the Labour party to do, and they had so very little time to do it in. The excuse as to time goes for nothing, because we have been in recess quite a long time, and this session, so far as the Premier is concerned, is certainly intended to be very short and sharp. The Government have delayed for six years.

Mr. PEASE: That is not true. Do you think that the Upper House would have passed any legislation like that before there was a Labour majority there?

Mr. NOTT: I asked the Premier at Lowood, if he was so careful and so zealous in his desire to assist the man in the country, why the commission responsible for the alteration of the boundaries of the electorates had seen fit to abolish three electorates represented by genuine Country members out of the four that are to be abolished.

Mr. COLLINS: Where are those genuine Country party members?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: 24,000 country people were disfranchised.

Mr. NOTT: The Premier, in his reply, stated that the ability and the integrity of

Mr. Nott.]

the Commission were unquestionable. The finding of this Commission has the same effect as the finding of a Commission, if one had been so appointed, to inquire into whether the Government in power during the last six years had been successful in developing the country outside the industrial centres. The Commission, by their finding resulting in the abolition of those three country electorates, have absolutely proved that the Labour party's policy during the past six years has been absolutely detrimental to the country's interests.

Mr. COLLINS: We made regulations under the Regulation of Sugar Cane Prices Act on two different occasions.

Mr. NOTT: The Government have absolutely failed to develop the State outside the industrial centres. Many hon. members are continually quoting the increase of population in the industrial centres and in the sugar districts. I admit that population is increasing right through the sugar districts, and I hope it will continue. That increase in population is due to the favourable agreement which is at present in existence. If you look up the records, you will find that right from the inception of the sugar industry it has been steadily developing, notwithstanding that on many occasions it received very heavy and hard knocks from past Governments. The hon. member for Gregory mentioned that numbers of men were flocking to Queensland from the other States in order to work in the sugar industry. That has always been the position. Twenty-five years or more ago, when I was interested in sugar-mills and sugar plantations, we had a number of men who came regularly every season from Southern States to work in the sugar fields and sugar-mills during the season, and then returned to their homes. I have in mind the case of one man who did that for seventeen years without a break.

Mr. BARBER: They got low wages in those days.

Mr. NOTT: It paid them to come up from as far south as Adelaide in order to get the wages that were paid in those days, and then go back again.

Mr. BARBER: They were paid about 15s. a week, and they used to walk backwards and forwards.

Mr. NOTT: Are not the farmers justified in being somewhat suspicious of this agricultural policy? I think they will be suspicious, and you cannot blame them so long as the policy is up in the air, and until they begin to see that it is actually doing some good.

Mr. PEASE: The farmers are not suspicious. It is only your so-called Country party members who are suspicious.

Mr. NOTT: I will now deal with irrigation.

Mr. COLLINS: Don't start criticising irrigation unless you know something about it.

At 5.30 p.m.,

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Mr. NOTT: The schemes that are being advocated are certainly schemes that eventually will possibly be of very great use. I notice that evidence has been taken by the Public Works Commission in connection with the construction of a dam in the Nathan Gorge in the Dawson Valley, and I have learned that a tremendous body of water will be impounded, exceeding that held by

[Mr. Nott.

the Burrinjuck dam in New South Wales. The engineers who gave evidence before the Public Works Commission estimate the scheme will cost something like half a million pounds. During the past five or six years the Government have expended something over £400,000 in doles to the unemployed, and, if they had got value in work for that £400,000, it would have gone a long way towards the building of that dam.

Reference is made in the Speech to cotton-growing. Cotton-growing in Queensland is no new industry. Many years ago there were 14,000 acres under cotton in the vicinity of Ipswich, and for quite a number of years small areas of the crop were grown in that district. In the Cairns district in 1907 there was also a good area put under cotton. There can be no question but that cotton-growing is likely to bring a good deal of money into Queensland from outside, and, so long as the growers have a guarantee of 5½d. per lb., the industry will be remunerative.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The Government guaranteed that as a concession.

Mr. NOTT: The hon. gentleman claims it as a Government concession. The Premier, when speaking, gave credit to Mr. Crawford Vaughan and Mr. Daniel Jones for what they had done in encouraging the growing of cotton. I daresay the hon. gentleman could have mentioned one or two more who deserve a great deal of credit, and I would like to ask this question: Did not the late Agent-General, Mr. Hunter, have a good deal to do with the arrangement of the guarantee of 5½d. per lb. for seed-cotton?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: With the co-operation of the Premier, when he was in England.

Mr. NOTT: Yet Mr. Hunter was not mentioned by the Premier. There are several others also who have advocated the growing of cotton in Queensland for several years. For instance, the late editor of the "Agricultural Journal," Major Boyd, was very insistent on the possibilities of cotton-growing in Queensland. In spite of what the Government are doing, I would advise them to be somewhat cautious in extending the cotton areas to any great extent, unless they first of all make sure that the price of the crop can be guaranteed for some considerable time. There is another factor that may possibly help to make cotton-growing a valuable industry to the State. That is, the production of oil from the cotton seed and also the use of the pressed seed as a food for dairy cattle.

I mentioned once before that, apart from these new industries, such as cotton-growing, a great deal might be done to improve the condition of established industries, such as maize-growing and the dairying and pastoral industries, because they extend over a very much greater area than cotton-growing does at the present time, or is likely to do for some considerable time.

Some time ago the leader of the Nationalist party referred to other crops that might be grown, and he mentioned cocoa. There is another crop also that might be grown. As a matter of fact, there are very few crops that cannot be grown successfully in Queensland so far as the climate and soil are concerned. We have the climate and soil to suit almost any crop in the world. There is a small crop that would be particularly

useful to dairymen. That is anatto. At the present time the materials used in the making of cheese cost quite a lot, as compared with the expense of their manufacture. Anatto is a crop that grows very easily, and it is very easy to harvest and manufacture.

The PREMIER: What particular variety would you recommend?

Mr. NOTT: So far as I know, two varieties have been tried in Queensland, and the variety known by the botanical name of "Bixa Orellana" will grow successfully. Already anatto manufactured in Queensland has been used in some of our factories for the colouring of butter and cheese.

A number of returned soldiers have been settled in my electorate, and I regret to say that a number of them are leaving the land, and a great many more will have to leave.

Mr. GLEDSON: You advocated settling them there. You are partly responsible.

Mr. NOTT: The soldiers on this settlement have been settled on some of the poorest land it is possible to find. Those responsible should have inspected the land before asking the soldiers to go there. The capital value of the land when it has reached the productive stage will be from £25 to £30 an acre, while there is an established farm in the same district with trees in bearing, buildings erected, and also cow-bails and milking-sheds that the soldiers have not got, and the owner is ready to sell it at £8 an acre.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Where is that?

Mr. NOTT: At Coominya. I venture to say that, if a member of the Country party had been on the Land Settlement Committee, the soldiers would never have been settled on land of such poor quality.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You would have received the same reports that we did.

Mr. MORGAN: We would have inspected the land.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Why?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: We are practical men; you are not; that is the difference.

Mr. NOTT: The leader of the Nationalist party was on the committee, and I know that he has been over that land time and again, and yet the soldiers are there.

The first object of railways in a State like Queensland should certainly be the development of the country; but, if the settlers were encouraged and prospered as they should prosper, the railways would have a very much better chance of paying than they have at the present time. There have been a lot of comparisons made of the Queensland railways with the railways in the other States of Australia. I am glad that in Queensland we have the 3 ft. 6 in. gauge, and not the wider gauge, because, if we had the wider gauge, we should have a less mileage of railway, and a greater amount of money to pay interest on. With a wider gauge, if there was any attempt at any time to save loss on the railways, freights would have to be put very much higher than they are at the present time. The hon. member for Gregory mentioned an increase in freights as one of the means by which the railways could be made to pay, but I venture to say that, if you were to raise freights any higher than they are now, the traffic would fall off to such an extent that there would be a greater loss than ever.

The matter of forestry has perhaps not received much attention from a great number of people in Queensland so far, but it is a thing which will increase in importance as time goes on. In my locality there are some fairly large reservations for forestry. I am given to understand that, although a very large expenditure is anticipated in the vicinity of Yarraman and Blackbutt, no responsible Minister or anyone else has inspected those forests, in connection with which a tremendous expenditure is likely to take place this year and in future years.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Is every Minister supposed to be an expert in everything?

Mr. NOTT: The Minister is certainly not supposed to be an expert in everything, but he ought to have the interests of the State so much at heart as to make a personal inspection where a large expenditure is concerned, so as to become better acquainted with what is taking place. It would certainly give the people in the locality greater confidence in the expenditure of the money.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I will go up there at the first favourable opportunity.

Mr. NOTT: Thank you. (Laughter.) There are quite a number of ways in which the Government would get very much greater value for money expended than by dabbling as they do in various State enterprises. They expect people to inquire thoroughly into the marketing, the stabilisation of prices, the advertising of our products, and the educating of, not only our own people in the use of products grown here, but also the people in England and other parts of the world. This suggests the query, "What is the matter with father?" so far as Mr. Fihelly is concerned. It is hardly natural for him to be so silent as he has been since he went to England as Agent-General. To illustrate the advantages to those engaged in the dairying industry by having representatives in England to see that our produce is passed through the existing agencies there in a satisfactory manner, I would like to mention something which came under my notice a little while ago while in New Zealand. Mr. Goodfellow is the managing director of the New Zealand Co-operative Dairy Company, which sold produce to the extent of £6,400,000 last year. He went over to London and opened an office in Tooley street himself. He engaged a Tooley street man, who was supposed to know the business from A to Z. The company started to feed the merchants, as required, with the produce from New Zealand. The produce was not sent along to the agents in very heavy quantities, or at wrong times, but careful control over shipments was exercised, and by delaying one shipment for four days £40,000 was saved on that one shipment.

I would urge the Government to be particularly careful in their legislation dealing with taxation, because the taxation which they have been imposing for some considerable time past has been having a very detrimental effect on industry in Queensland, and is driving many companies to move their offices down South. Some men have left Queensland altogether, on account of the heavy taxation. I know of men who are anxious to leave, and are trying to sell their businesses or properties, and I know of some who have their farms on the market

Mr. Nott.]

at the present time owing to the heavy taxation. The Government should be very careful not to inflict any further burden, and to see if they cannot in some way mitigate the taxation which they have already imposed on the people.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Hear, hear! Let them prove their repentance by showing us some fruits of repentance.

Mr. NOTT: The hon. member for Gregory mentioned how successful he was in obtaining all that was required for schools in his electorate, but I would like the Government to give greater attention to requests for money for fencing and other improvements to schools. Many applications that are made to the Department are turned down for want of funds. Anyone coming from the country electorates knows perfectly well that the schools and fences in many cases cost from 50 per cent. to 100 per cent. more than they would have cost if the school committee had been allowed to raise the wind themselves and have the repairs or improvements carried out by contract. But they are tied down by the departmental regulations, and are not allowed to make their own contracts. I know in many cases that the school committees could get the work carried out for half what the department gets it done for.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): The Governor's Speech displays a good deal of optimism so far as the State is concerned. One cannot help sympathising with the Government owing to the many disabilities they are suffering from at the present moment. I refer to such meetings as that of the public servants which is being held to-night, and to such conflicts as that in the Ipswich Railway Workshops. I also refer to such matters as the teachers' conference, where we learned that matters have not received the consideration they should have done from the Education Department. I also refer to the many monthly meetings that are being held all over Australia in regard to the proposed republic, supported by the colleagues of the Premier. There are some of the matters which should be discussed in this Chamber on the Address in Reply. The Premier, on many occasions, has been asked to define his position in regard to the last-mentioned matter, but he has practically declined to do so. It can be said of the Queensland Nationalist party that we are not chasing myths. We have something sound to go for—not like the Labour party, who are for ever chasing something which the community cannot see for a moment. In this State we should legislate for our present-day requirements, and we should also look ahead in regard to certain matters, and legislate accordingly.

On perusing the Governor's Speech we find that there is a lot of proposed measures which require the expenditure of loan money. We have, for instance, irrigation and conservation of water schemes. We have proposed roads, proposed railways, and other things that are necessary in this country, but they all mean the expenditure of loan money. It is the Government's essential duty to consider facilities of transport, roads, and such like. It is not their duty to deal with minor matters. The Government should not deal in trading, or butchering, or such small transactions, or carry on small businesses. It is purely their

[*Mr. Nott.*

business to develop this country, and to provide facilities and the means of transport. To get back to the proposed works which require loan money, it is natural when we spend loan money on our public works that we should look for some return. There are very few members in this Parliament, especially on the Government side, who realise that revenue is raised as the result of the expenditure of loan money. They are inclined to point to the fact that Queensland is receiving a revenue of something like £12,000,000 per annum without for a moment investigating the amount of loan money expended. If they went to the trouble of seeing what loan money is expended, and finding out what return we get from it, they would learn something about our financial position. If they compared the return from the loan money spent by this Government with the return from the loan money invested up till 1914, they would see that we are, approximately, £2,000,000 per annum behind in our revenue to-day. If we got the same return from the expenditure of loan money now as we received in 1914, we would be £2,000,000 better off; and, instead of our revenue being £12,000,000 per annum, it would be £14,000,000. That loss of £2,000,000 has to be made up somehow, and the Government make it up by taxing the community to that extent. Prior to this Government coming into power, the loan money invested gave us such a return that less than £1,000,000 was required to be raised by taxation. Previous Governments only required an additional £1,000,000 from taxation to pay the interest on the public debt. To-day, if you analyse the accounts, you will find that the community is taxed to the extent of £3,000,000, and the Government save nothing to pay the interest on the public debt. The Government should utilise the loan money for the advance and progress of those already settled on the land; but it is like drawing a winning ticket in a sweep for a farmer to get an advance from this Government to spend on his improvements. (Hear, hear!) The principle of advancing loan money instead of trust money to the settlers has already been approved by the Government. There is money belonging to the Savings Bank, and there is other money upon which we are paying interest to the Commonwealth to-day. If we could utilise that loan money more expeditiously, we would be providing revenue, and we would be going a long way towards helping our finances to-day.

The Government should be glad to find a way to help them in the financial troubles in which they find themselves. There are matters, such as the maternity wards, which the Government propose to establish, and other questions like that which will require a great deal of money from revenue. That extra revenue will have to be raised by the taxation of industry. The industries are taxed heavily enough now, and it looks as if the Government are going to tax them still further to provide these extra services, which are more or less for propaganda purposes. These things should all be left alone until our revenue is more stimulating, when we shall be in a better position to afford it. When we look into the financial position and see how much interest has to be paid on our public debt, it makes us wonder how we got on some years back. If we go back to 1907 or 1908, we will find that there was

sufficient revenue raised to pay the trustees of the public debt fully £500,000. That money was utilised for the purpose of reducing our public debt. It was utilised for the purpose of redeeming Treasury bills, debentures, and inscribed stock. To-day, owing to the methods the present Government have of handling the finances, during their tenure of office, covering a period of seven years, they have only put by for the purpose of reducing the public debt the sum of £64,000.

A great deal has been made by the Government of the fact that £145,000 has been allocated by them from revenue to the reduction of deficits. In my opinion, instead of paying that sum away for that purpose, it should have been paid to the trustees of the public debt, on which we pay heavy interest.

But it has been the ambition of [7 p.m.] this Government during the last couple of years, for purely propaganda purposes, to reduce the accumulated deficits. The accumulated deficits for the three years prior to the last couple of years reached the enormous figure of £834,953. That has been whittled down by the issue of Treasury bills, which was very quickly carried out, to the extent of £253,933, reducing the total to £581,000. The £145,000 I have just mentioned reduced it further to £436,000. Taking off the surpluses, it has been further reduced to £364,000. In that manner the Government, so that criticism may not be levelled at them by the initiated during the elections, have whittled down the accumulated deficits by over 50 per cent. The previous Government, as we all know, had a succession of surpluses, and prior to that, if any deficits occurred, we had a sinking fund to meet such deficits.

In His Excellency's Speech there is a good deal that is worthy of consideration, and no assurance is needed that the Opposition are going to give every consideration to any measure that is worthy of it. But there are many things which should be in the Speech which are not mentioned—in particular, a consolidating Health Act. It is regrettable that the only proposal is an amendment of the Health Act, but we hope all the same that it will give a measure of relief to the local authorities and remedy some of the abuses that exist at the present time.

One thing is predominantly in evidence in Queensland at the present time, and it reminds us that, although we have a Government which is more or less for the employees, they have stopped the principle of what is called the right to work in Queensland. That principle leads to the freedom which we cherish so much. If any interpretation is to be put on what we might call a reasonable Australianism, it is that no man in the community should be debarred in any way from the exercise of that principle. Yet the Government have denied it in a number of instances. In the first place, in the classification of certain workers the line of demarcation is so closely drawn that the men in various trades are limited to those trades, whether they be skilled or otherwise. If the classification as recognised by the Arbitration Court were eliminated, we would not have so many unskilled men out of work. I notice in a report which we have had presented to us something which it is very difficult to reconcile with the actions of the

present Administration. It now is provided that a man can register at a labour exchange in one or more occupations. For instance, a carpenter may be able and agreeable to take employment as a labourer. Therefore, he should be registered as a carpenter, "B class," and as a labourer, "C class." The fallacy of the thing—that is all I can call it! I defy the Government to employ that man. They can register him all right, but they cannot employ him. They issue regulations which under no circumstances will be permitted to be carried out in this State of ours. That is a point that is responsible for a great deal of our unemployment and distress. The policy is dictated purely by the Trades Hall, and Parliament has not yet stepped in and stopped the abuse that exists. I want to read out a clause from the "Right to Work Bill of Great Britain." The principle of the right to work has been recognised practically all over the world except in Queensland by this Labour Government. I come in daily contact with men to whom the right to work is refused; yet, if we can get men working in this State, we are going to solve one of our greatest problems. I am not going so far as to say that the duty devolves on the State of finding work for every man. The material at hand is too difficult for classification; there are men to whom it is impossible to give work. But I do maintain that it is the responsibility of the State to see that every able-bodied man has work.

Mr. PEASE: How many returned soldiers are out of work?

Mr. KERR: If the hon. member will wait I will tell him the reason there are returned soldiers out of work. That is the first time I have noticed any interest in the unemployment question on the Government side. A clause of the "Right to Work" Bill, introduced in the House of Commons, reads—

"Where a workman has registered himself as unemployed it shall be the duty of the unemployed authority to provide work for him in connection with one or other of certain schemes; or, failing the provision of work, to provide maintenance for that person and for those depending on that person for the necessaries of life."

There is this difference between other Governments in Australia and the Labour Government of Queensland: that this Government provide maintenance for the unemployed and their families but do not provide an alternative. Other Governments have provided alternatives. The hon. member for Gregory cast reflections on the Nationalist Government of New South Wales for making available £100,000 to provide work; but it is better to do that than to find £180,000 for rations and get no work in return.

Mr. POLLOCK: What is your remedy?

Mr. KERR: If you take taxation off industry, cut out the socialisation of industry, and permit capital to expand in this State, you will provide a remedy.

Mr. PEASE: Why are there so many unemployed in Melbourne?

Mr. KERR: If the hon. member will look at the statistics, he will find that the men coming here from Victoria are unskilled, and had to leave Victoria for the reason that the skilled men are occupying the jobs. If I had my way, I would legislate to give every man a chance to become skilled. In different

Mr. Kerr.]

parts of the world they have gone into the question and ascertained who are the unskilled men, and then given them an opportunity to become skilled. They impose penalties on parents who are not looking after their children and employers who do not give their men an opportunity of becoming skilled. The apostles of the new order of communism are at the root of a good deal of this trouble. Not only are the Government building up a nation of men who are willing to live on a certain amount of rations per week, but they have reached the stage of pooling work, inclusive of the public service. If anything is detrimental to the welfare of this nation, it is irregular work. In my opinion, it is far better to give half a dozen men continuous work than to give ten men work for three or four days per week. In the Railway Department to-day, by the system of employing additional hands who are not required, all the employees get a certain amount of money per week. It is far better to find other avenues for the surplus men than to bring all down to the level of three days per week. On Saturday mornings we see youths of twenty-one years of age leaning against posts smoking cigarettes. During the time they are not working they learn the habit of having a drink and of gambling. That state of affairs is regarded passively by the Government. These youths who do not work on Saturday mornings go to the race meetings in the afternoon. They are drawing the basic wage, exactly the same as the man who has a wife and five or six children. The whole principle is wrong, and the Government are not game to come out and remedy it. They propose to get over the difficulty by having an allowance in respect of children and by passing unemployment legislation, which will act to the detriment of the people of the State. It has been recognised in New South Wales that by declining to give men the right to work a certain class of men have become unworkables. The situation has been summed up very concisely by the Director of the Labour Bureau in New South Wales, who says—

“There are many men who, by reason of old age, physical infirmity, incapacity, unworthiness, etc., are never likely to be employed under normal conditions. These form a class of unemployables. Only to meet some emergency would anyone seek their services, and they must always largely live on some system of charitable relief, as work in ordinary channels cannot be found for them. With the utmost sympathy for their infirmities, and even for their shortcomings, they are most difficult to deal with. Nearly all are without initiative of any kind, many without energy, almost without capacity, and frequently without hope.”

The Government encourage that class which is likely to develop to “unworthiness.”

I also wish to refer to the apprenticeship difficulty existing here. Some action should be taken in regard to the present method in Queensland. We have an Apprenticeship Committee which, on the surface, looks as if it is going to work all right. In some instances it is doing so. But there is a point that has not been got over. When an examination is held at the college, boys who have left school for at least two years are examined in arithmetic, English, and

[Mr. Kerr.

other educational subjects. What is going to happen to these boys desirous of entering the plumbing, tinsmithing, moulding, fitting, or any other trade, if they are unable to pass the educational test? They will be cast into the world without a trade, and, when they reach the age of twenty-one years, will be classed as unskilled, and be going from job to job and from loan to loan. But it does not stop at that. It goes further; it is used by the Labour organisations as an argument against immigration. Here is an extract from a paper setting forth the idea of labour unions—

“UNEMPLOYMENT IN AUSTRALIA.

“ATTEMPT TO CHECK IMMIGRATION.

“SYDNEY UNION'S ACTION.

“Sydney, January 11.

“The general secretary of the United Labourers' Union (Mr. G. Wate) estimates that there are 40,000 unemployed in New South Wales. His union has decided to inform the labour unions and the Press in Great Britain that there are thousands of unskilled labourers out of work in Australia, and that the number is increasing weekly. It is also intended to point out that it is of no use for men to come to Australia in the expectation of getting work which does not exist.”

The Government have created in this State a position which it is difficult to get out of. Are they going to take action? If so, it is not indicated in the Speech delivered by His Excellency, by whom we are invited to consider these matters. The advisers who are responsible for that Speech have failed dismally. As a representative of one of the metropolitan constituencies, I want to take this opportunity of forcing, as far as possible, down the throats of this Government the fact that I have more than 300 men on my books to-day looking for work.

Mr. PEASE: You ought to be ashamed of it.

Mr. KERR: Make no error; I endorse what the hon. member says. I am ashamed of it. I am ashamed of the Government; I am ashamed that they cannot whittle that number down, the same as they have whittled their deficit down. The Premier has said that we are able to carry on our industries and make a greater margin of profit than any of the other States. If that is so, I want to know why capital is not coming into this State, to provide more industries and utilise the raw material produced for manufacture. The Premier has merely quoted a few facts in regard to wages and raw material, but he has not gone into miscellaneous expenses, and analysed overhead charges, taxation, and the local authority rates which the people in this State have to pay. Had he done so, he would have found that the cost of production here is much greater than in the other States of Australia, more especially when he takes into consideration the taxation placed on industry to balance the accounts of this State. He should realise that the Nationalist party is out with a programme with scope enough to co-ordinate the interests of the country and the interests of the consumer and other persons in this community, and that we are not fighting for a myth. We are fighting for capital to come into this country. To illustrate what I mean by capital, I will give an illustration

dealing with the irrigation scheme. I mean that the water companies of the world should be encouraged to come to Queensland to formulate plans for irrigation. There are in some places in America 500,000 acres that had been pear-infested somewhat similar to some of the land in this State. The pest was dealt with by means of irrigation. Certain qualities contained in the artesian waters killed the pear, and instead of having a desert of pear to-day, the water companies are running an irrigation plant thereon.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Where?

Mr. KERR: California.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Nonsense!

Mr. KERR: They are producing 6,000,000 dollars worth of stuff. That is the difference between the expenditure of money by private enterprise and the way in which loan money is being unwisely expended by this Government. It is time that the potentialities of this great State were utilised, and that something was done. The capital which we require so much in this State will never come in while we have a system of confiscation existing, such as is applied to the Brisbane Tramways Company to-day. No more valuable asset has ever come into this State. £2,000,000 of private money has been expended in providing work by building carriages and laying tram rails, and we want hundreds of such "private enterprise" concerns here.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: They have made huge profits.

Mr. KERR: We not only require capital for public utilities, but for a hundred different purposes. When the foreign nations met at Geneva recently they wanted to lay down the doctrine that Australia should be the primary producing country of the world. The Southern States of Australia look upon Queensland as a primary producing State. The sooner we can alter that state of affairs the better it will be for our producers. One proposition, into which immigration enters, is that we should have a greater industrial area, not only in the city, but right throughout Queensland. The greater the number of industrial areas, the greater will be the number of consumers we shall have. If we did not have an industrial area, would we be able to make an agreement in connection with the sugar industry? I say, no. If we had an industrial community, giving work to the primary producers, we would be able to guarantee a price for cotton or other primary products if we had a sufficient number of industrialists to handle and consume those products. We would be able to give a guaranteed price for wool. The Government have done nothing to create that industrial community. I will quote a typical example of what is happening. I will take wool. Queensland produces an equal amount of wool with Victoria, double as much as South Australia, and ten times as much as Tasmania. Since March 1920, twenty-two woollen mills have been established in Australia.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Why?

Mr. KERR: I will tell you why. The establishment of those mills required the expenditure of nearly £1,000,000. New South Wales received ten mills, Victoria ten mills, South Australia one mill, and Tasmania one mill. That is damning to this Government. There were no mills established during this period in Queensland. We are showing the same disregard for our secondary

industries. That is happening already in regard to cotton. Have this Government ever communicated with Mr. Sterling Taylor, the Director of Commerce and Industry, to ascertain the manufacturing disabilities we are suffering under in regard to cotton? There is a good deal of propaganda from various hon. members from the Central districts of Queensland. They should study the question a little more, and do more practical work rather than talk. This is an extract from a report issued by the Department of Agriculture, showing that they are taking no interest in the cotton industry at all—

"Inquiries were made in Great Britain with the view to manufacturing medicated cotton for use in Queensland. The result has been the knowledge that the manufacture of cotton-wool in its several forms is kept a close secret by the several firms engaged in the industry; indeed, so well organised is the trade that no one firm is responsible for the whole process, and each firm has a particular branch allotted, the combined process being kept secret."

That is dated some years ago, but the position to-day is exactly the same. I wrote to Mr. Sterling Taylor to see if I could get some information to supply to the present Government in regard to this matter. I have his reply dated 6th January, 1922. As this Parliament was then in recess, there was nothing politically to be gained. My idea was to try to do something for this great State. Mr. Sterling Taylor was here, and I interviewed him in order to get information for the people and the Government of Queensland to act on. These are the sort of things I have done, and these are facts I am telling you now. I am trying to do something for the unemployed men to-day. Mr. Sterling Taylor's letter reads—

"6th January, 1922.

"Dear Mr. Kerr,—I acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 30th December, and am writing to Great Britain and America with a view to securing as much information as I can in regard to the acquirement of plants for the manufacture of medicated cotton.

"Yours faithfully,

"STERLING TAYLOR,

"Director.

"J. S. Kerr, Esq.,

"Legislative Assembly,
"Parliament House,
"Queensland."

It shows at once that the Queensland Government have never instituted inquiries from that particular source, and yet he is an Australian with an expert knowledge, and one who is in direct communication with the various people in the world with capital.

At the beginning of my speech I recommended the introduction of a consolidating Health Bill. This is one of my reasons for my recommendation: our health [7.30 p.m.] authorities—the local authorities, the Health Commissioner, and the Home Department—have duties that are overlapping. Between the three of them there are several nuisances in the vicinity of Brisbane that cannot be got rid of. I refer first of all to the Ithaca wool scour, and I refer next to an institution in my own electorate, where health is of such importance. That is the Brisbane General Hospital, which has been nationalised by the Government. That institution is at present overcrowded.

Mr. Kerr.]

and the patients are placed in beds on the verandas, and, as it is minus a septic system, the sanitary cart goes there nightly, and is allowed to stand outside the wards for hours. That is an institution nationalised by the present Government.

The SPEAKER: The time allowed to the hon. member under Standing Order No. 17 has expired.

Mr. F. A. COOPER (*Brunner*): After listening to the hon. member for Enoggera, one wonders how it is that he was elected to this House. But these things will happen, and I suppose he just "blew in." I heard the hon. member say a few words on the matter of apprenticeship. Might I introduce once more my hardy annual, and ask the Secretary for Railways, now that the new financial year is started to do something in the matter of apprenticeship for the boys in the Ipswich workshops. There are numerous openings there for apprentices, and I hope the hon. gentleman will have some regard for those boys who have passed their examinations. Many of them have been trained for a year or two at the Ipswich Technical College, and notwithstanding the fact that they are a little over the age of sixteen years, I hope he will do what he can in connection with the Arbitration Court to see that these are employed in the Ipswich workshops.

It is very interesting to see the unanimity that exists on the other side of the House to-day. Of course, on this side we are accustomed to say that parties on the other side of the House are one.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Evidently you are not one over there.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: We are thirty-seven, and that is the sore point with you people. We are in the habit of frequently saying that the parties on the other side are one, with the same ideas and the same objects, but I doubt whether we are altogether right in that. Sometimes I think they are more like some of the characters in one of Dickens's books. In "Oliver Twist" hon. members will remember that there is a very remarkable character known as "Fagin," while "The Artful Dodger" and "Charlie Bates" are other remarkable characters. I think the members of the Opposition are the political "Fagins" of Queensland. They are very clever at getting other people who are uninitiated to do things they are not game to do themselves.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: That is what you are trying to do at Ipswich.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: There is one thing I am game to do. I am game to go to them.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: Rymer is the man for you.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: Never mind about Rymer. I can deal with him. I do not want to waste too much of my time on these matters, but I do want to stress one or two things about the political opinions of hon. members on the other side. I know the "artful dodgers" of the Country party do not like me reminding them of the way they have been used by these experts in the matter of political crime, but it is high time they "took a tumble" to it. The hon. member for Nanango is not yet an expert in these things, but he seems to me to be learning. If the Government do anything for the advantage of the people, he immediately tries to counteract it by going to his elec-

torate and denouncing it. The hon. member for Drayton is no better. Nobody, by any stretch of the imagination, could call him an "artful dodger." I think if we called him the "artless dodger," it would be much nearer the truth.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I will give you some more truths directly.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I want to remind the Country party that the Nationalist party have a habit of just making a little alteration in that fine old saying, "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might"; but they put it this way, "Whatsoever your party finds to use, use it with all your might." They used the agriculturists of this State for many years, and it was nearly time the agriculturists found the Nationalists out. Year after year the Labour party has been pointing out to the agriculturists that they are workers just the same as the industrialists; that their interests are wrapped up in those of the industrialists, and it seems to me that at last those things are bearing fruit. I absolve the Country party, because they are young in experience. They are young "artful dodgers." While the Nationalists have used the Country party—not all of them—they are not all given to this sort of thing; but some of them will use anything that comes to their hand, so that it will do something to damage the workers, or damage the Labour party in the eyes of the electors of Queensland. A little while ago there was an election in New South Wales, and some of the Nationalists helped at that election. They got many points in the matter of organisation and in the matter of propaganda, but what pleased them more than anything else was a little organisation they stumbled across down there known as "The Protestant Labour League." The Protestant Labour League was a very useful thing to the Nationalists in New South Wales. It did a wonderful service for the Nationalists, though it did no good for Protestantism, for no sooner were the Nationalists of New South Wales elected to office than they began immediately to deny the things they promised to do. Sir Thomas Henley, a leading man in the Protestant organisation of New South Wales, was elected to the Ministry. But his health failed him, and he had to resign his portfolio. Why? A trustworthy man like Sir Thomas Henley would naturally fall ill when he found out how he had been deceived. It may be interesting to know the things which were promised to the Protestants which have not come to pass. I want to draw the attention of the Protestants to that great fact. The Protestants of New South Wales were promised all sorts of things in connection with their Protestantism if they returned the Nationalist party. They returned the Nationalist party, and those things have not come about. Some of the Nationalist politicians who went to New South Wales found that this was a very good organisation, and they made overtures for the starting of this organisation in Queensland. They were told to leave the matter to New South Wales and New South Wales would fix it up. And, sure enough, they did. A month or two after the election there came from New South Wales one or two gentlemen who were Queenslanders, and who had been working in the interests of this organisation in New South Wales. One gentleman came across, and with him at the same time came a big bank balance that was placed to the credit of the organisation. He

[Mr. Kerr.

came across with liberal expenses and salary and established himself. He had not been here more than a day or two when another gentleman came across, and the two gentlemen went down to the General Post Office in Brisbane and hired a letter-box and signed for it in the name of the Protestant Labour Council. They issued a circular, and made a very remarkable statement in that circular. They said this—

“We feel sure, in a country like this, with the forces of darkness and subjection in control at every point, you will excuse us for not making our identity known.”

Such modesty appeals to me, but I do not know that I can allow these gentlemen to hide their light under a bushel. I think it only fair to them that the men doing this mighty work should be known. The Protestant Labour Council had three shining lights. There was a number of lesser lights, but, at any rate, there were three shining lights in the forefront. There are other organisations and other bodies which are using this council for their own purposes, but I will come to that later on. The gentleman whom I wish to mention first is the real star. He is the foremost worker of this band. He rejoices in the good Protestant name of Gilligan. He is well known to many of us in Queensland, and, as a matter of fact, he has helped on many occasions to stir up the authorities in this city. If I remember rightly, he chained himself to the palings and defied the regulations of the city in the matter of the holding of public meetings. He has been a political prisoner, and he has suffered for his sins in that regard. He enjoys the distinction of being the only man in Australia who was lately convicted on the charge of being a member of an illegal organisation. There have been other men convicted for other crimes, but Gilligan enjoys the distinction of being the only man who, being a member of the I.W.W., was sentenced to six months' imprisonment, and he got that sentence in South Australia. The Nationalist party put the indignity on Mr. Gilligan of making him a political prisoner; but they have forgiven him and Mr. Gilligan has forgiven them, and they are now working hand in glove for the purpose of elevating Protestantism, and whatever else they may do, for the purpose of damning the Labour movement. I mention these things to show that he suffered the penalty for political crimes. I am not altogether saying that a man who suffers for political crimes is bad. If Mr. Gilligan has any other past, I expect he has paid the penalty; and, if that is so, it is gone so far as I am concerned.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Why mention it, then?

Mr. F. A. COOPER: The next gentleman also enjoys a Protestant name—his name is O'Brien. Mr. O'Brien is not unknown to us. He revelled in beer strikes and other strikes in Queensland. He has been a member of the I.W.W. in New South Wales, and he has been a foremost mover in agitations in various parts of Australia.

Mr. MORGAN: You will be accused of raising sectarianism.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I am not raising sectarianism, but I am making a decent attempt to bury sectarianism.

Mr. KERR: What is your object, if it is not sectarianism?

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I am making an effort to disclose to Queensland the men who are professing to work in the interests of Protestantism; but they are not working in the interests of Protestantism but in the interests of a movement to damn the Labour party, at whatever cost. I want to be fair and honest, and I am not going to say anything against these men if I cannot substantiate it. I want to say that Mr. O'Brien and Mr. Gilligan were the gentlemen who signed the application for a box at the General Post Office. They were given Box 1006, and that was the centre, so far as we were able to find out, for some time of this wonderful organisation. These two gentlemen came to Brisbane and started their organisation. They had a room wherein they met, and a number of gentlemen assisting them, who are by no means connected with the Labour movement in Queensland. They have been connected, and are still connected, with the Nationalist organisation.

Mr. KERR: That is not right.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I will name them.

Mr. KERR: I defy you to name them. I challenge you to prove your statements.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: Feeling that it might be good to get another Queenslander to help them in this matter, they brought over from New South Wales a young gentleman who, at the time of the last elections, was enjoying a holiday in New South Wales. At least, it was supposed that he was holidaying, but he was really doing propaganda work on behalf of this precious organisation. He was a young man of good standing, of good family, and of good appearance; he could speak well and address anybody. I have no hesitation in saying that he is a man who was a friend of mine for some considerable time. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. KERR: That is not saying much for him.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: He was a very respectable young man.

Mr. KERR: Then why criticise him like this in Parliament?

Mr. F. A. COOPER: They brought him to Queensland, and said, “We want you to help in this little matter.” I have his card here, and I will read it. They brought him across, and he had some cards printed. It was necessary that he should do so. I want to say that he did some of this work in New South Wales, and being a person of good address, they thought it was a good thing to bring him here. He rejoices in the name of R. F. Woodward. For some time he was a Nationalist organiser in Queensland, and that is why I want to connect him with the matter to show that there is nothing of the Labour movement about him. He organised in the interests of the Nationalist party for Bremer, in 1918. This gentleman came to Queensland and helped in the formation of this Protestant Labour League. They met for some considerable time in a room in George street. Their meetings there were attended with a certain amount of success right from the start. They had a number of Brisbane gentlemen who wished to meet them occasionally and confer with them. The first meeting of this council was held, and it was quite an interesting sight to see members of this council going down to that meeting. They came down George street in quite an off-hand way, as if they were going down to

Mr. F. A. Cooper.]

the Gardens. They would walk down the street and look in the shop windows as if they were admiring things.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: You must have been spying on them.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: No, I was not spying on them; I was just looking at them. They would read the name-plates over the doorway, and then gradually float upstairs. One man, a clergyman, came along and pretended to light a cigarette, so that his going into the doorway might not be noticed by anyone. This organisation met upstairs and held their first meeting, at which there was submitted for their edification the first pamphlet issued by this precious organisation, which is entitled "Labourites, Protestants, Awake!"

Mr. KERR: You are giving the secrets away. You gave the caucus away, and now you are giving this other thing away. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. F. A. COOPER: The only reason why I do not give the hon. member for Enoggera away is, that you cannot give him away—there is nothing to give.

The HOME SECRETARY: Did you ever hear of the hollow of a pipe?

Mr. F. A. COOPER: No, but I have heard of the bung hole of a cask. (Laughter.) I want to say that this precious Protestant Labour Council met, and this circular that they were issuing was approved. I am not going to read the whole of the circular, but I want to read one or two of the statements that made the eyes of some members of the Nationalist party open when they saw it. One of the statements was—

"The most important portfolios in the present Ministry are held by Catholics. Catholics secure every Labour selection."

In reply to this, I might say that in the State Ministry there are nine Ministers and only three are Catholics. In the State Labour party of thirty-seven members, only thirteen can be described as Catholics. This another statement in the circular is this—

"Queensland's cleverest detective—T. Head—was kept back for years because he was a Protestant."

It so happens that Sub-inspector Head is not a Protestant but a Catholic, and I am informed that he is a real dyed-in-the-wool, warranted to wash, and a yard wide. He is the "real Mackay" or, one might say, the real "Gilligan." It is astonishing what these men will do when it comes to downing the Government. One of the Nationalists was somewhat astounded at this circular when he read it, but he said, "Is it all right?" They said "Oh, it is all right." He said, "Will the workers take it?" They said "Of course they will take it, as they took it in New South Wales, like big fishes with their mouths wide open."

Mr. KERR: You did not do too well in Ipswich.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I have done well in Ipswich ever since 1915, and they have returned me every time. If you think you can win the seat from me, come up and have a try. In dealing with this council, I do not want to read the whole of the circular, because it is filled with statements of a most fantastic character, and it is most far-fetched. At the first meeting they were

wondering how they should conduct the business. Mr. Gilligan had previously been at Labour meetings, and Mr. O'Brien had also been at Labour meetings. They were both present at this meeting.

Mr. KERR: Mr. Cooper was there, too, evidently.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: No, I was not there. All the people who were at that meeting were very much like the shipwrecked mariners who did not know what to do. When the shipwrecked mariners got to that state, one of them suggested that they should do something religious, and another said, "Let us take up a collection." (Laughter.) It was the same at this first meeting of the Protestant Labour Council. Mr. Gilligan said, "I think we will do the same as they do at the commencement of all Labour meetings. We will sing the first verse of 'The Red Flag.'" (Laughter.) Not being singers, they were unable to sing, so they adopted the good old religious method of saying the first verse line by line as the chairman repeated it. The chairman said—

"The workers' flag is deepest red."

and the good Nationalists present said after him—

"The workers' flag is deepest red."

They went on to the end of the first verse, and then they sat down. The chairman wanted them to sing "Solidarity"; but, as none of them had any voices for singing, and they did not know the tune of "Old John Brown," they did not sing it. Everything was going well with the new council. Money was coming in, and they were getting big amounts by way of donations until the "Daily Standard" of the 31st May exposed the whole plot. As a matter of fact, one of the members of the council went up North with reams of paper and pamphlets for distribution. He had something like 35 lb. weight of paper for distribution, but when he got to Rockhampton word came through from Brisbane that the whole game was exposed by the "Standard." The gentleman who went to Rockhampton was speaking to some of the wharf labourers, and they had pretty heated words about the whole thing. However, he took the 35 lb. weight of pamphlets, and heaved the lot into the waters of the Fitzroy.

Mr. KERR: Did he walk on the water?

Mr. F. A. COOPER: No, he did not, but there were enough lies in those pamphlets which were thrown into the water to block the Fitzroy River for ever and ever. The man then returned to Brisbane, and reported the matter to the council. The hon. member for Enoggera asked me if the man walked on the water. I can tell the hon. member that he lived on it. He was sprinkled with water when he was an infant: he was dipped in it when he became a Baptist, and he was washed in the "Blood of the Lamb" when he became a Salvationist. He has been a political advocate for every party. He has been a "Bung" advocate, and an advocate for the cold water party. He has been everything it is possible to be in religion and politics if he can only make anything out of it. He would tackle anything at all so long as there was money in it. He was engaged at the same game in New South Wales, where he also ran as a parliamentary candidate. He received £200, and £1 for every vote he got, and, as he got fifty-two votes, he received £52. These

[Mr. F. A. Cooper.]

are the men who have come to Queensland for the purpose of running this precious Labour council in order to delude the workers of Queensland. I raise my voice on behalf of the workers of Queensland against this sort of thing. I want the workers to know who the men are who are concerned in this matter. More than that, it is my duty to the Protestant community in Queensland to let them know the actual facts of the case, so that they will not be gulled by these gentlemen.

Mr. WARREN: They will be very thankful to you.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: Yes, they will. It is because these gentlemen have been endeavouring to push the council along that I refer to the matter to-night. It is by no means dead. If it were dead, I would not worry about it. These men are still attempting to carry on their underground work, and it is my duty to expose them. I understand that they are now engaged in running two organisations, known as the Protestant Labour Council and the Protestant Political Council.

Mr. MORGAN: You say that the "Standard" exposed it, and killed it.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: If I hear anything about the sectarian business anywhere, I will expose it every time. I have no time for sectarianism in any shape or form. If we allow sectarianism to make headway in this country, we will never be able to stop it. We have been a little bit too careful in these matters, because we are not game enough to grasp these wretched matters as we should and wipe them out as we should. What I hope to do with my exposure to-night is to put a stop to this precious council altogether. There has been great consternation in the council at the exposure of their precious game. Some of them were hoping that it would be a great help to them in the coming election. I should be sorry to think that there is any section of the community who would stoop to such means as have been adopted by these men for the purpose of obtaining power in the government of the country. I am surprised that there are men who pander to anything of this sort. I understand that one Nationalist candidate gave a cheque for 10 guineas and another of the Nationalist leaders, not a member of this House, but one of the leaders outside, gave a cheque for 15 guineas.

Mr. SZER: Who is he?

Mr. F. A. COOPER: Another Nationalist supporter, who is known to be a very strong Protestant, was waited upon by Mr. Woodward. Mr. Woodward did not approach him very gently, but asked him straight out and said, "We want the money, and we must have it." He put his whole case before this Nationalist gentleman, and asked for a donation, when he received this reply, "I am a keen Protestant, and I am a keen Nationalist, but I have too much regard for my honour to be mixed up with anything of this kind."

Mr. MORGAN: You say that the "Daily Standard" has already killed it. Why revive it?

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I said that the "Standard" exposed it. The "Standard" certainly squashed it for some considerable time, but it is going on still. If I take the opportunity to-night to say one or two things about this precious organisation, I

hope to prevent it from continuing any longer. A prominent business man in South Brisbane was approached, and he treated them in the same way as the gentleman I have just referred to. He refused to have anything to do with them, because of the contemptuous way they proposed to raise the funds. They also went to a big Nationalist in Ipswich, and his reply to them was, "I have no time and no money for men who attempt to do things in this way." Personally, I have the greatest possible admiration for Nationalists of that brand. I give great credit to men of that kind, and it is a pity that all the members of the Nationalist organisation are not like him. A well known Nationalist rang up the Protestant Labour Council and objected to Mr. Gilligan, because, he said, he never liked his name. I understand that that Nationalist is a member of this House at the present time.

Mr. FRY: Tell us his name.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: We know that the Nationalist organisation are fully aware of the existence of this council. There are wheels within wheels and circles within circles, and there is a circle within the Nationalist organisation that has been pushing this precious council ahead for all it is worth. They are not doing it in the interest of Protestantism, or in the interests of the Nationalist party, but solely with the desire to down the Labour party at the next election. It is high time that that sort of thing was stopped. I was very pleased to read this advertisement in the "Brisbane Courier" of 1st July—

"WARNING.

"Sympathisers and friends are warned against making contributions or donations to any person on behalf of this council. This council has no authorised collectors.

"J. F. WATSON,

"Hon. Secretary,

"Queensland Protestant Labour

Council,

"Box 1006 G.P.O., Brisbane."

Good old Box 1006 G.P.O.! Some people have been collecting money and refusing to hand it over. The Protestant Labour Council finds that it had one man

[8 p.m.] collecting funds on its behalf, and it is not getting the funds.

There is a very shrewd suspicion that one of the men collecting for the Queensland Political Protestant Council is adopting the same line of action. He is refusing to hand over to the council the funds that he has been collecting. He wants some sort of assurance that he is going to score out of it as others have been scoring out of it in New South Wales.

Mr. MORGAN: Why do you not have him arrested?

Mr. F. A. COOPER: He will be arrested as soon as the Protestant Labour Council go to the police authorities and lay an information; and so soon as the other council lay an information against these men for obtaining money that is not theirs, I have not the slightest doubt that the police authorities will give instructions to have them arrested. But unless the Protestant Labour Council lays a charge and the other council lays a charge, there is no hope of anything being done. After the first exposure, this precious council met and decided they would issue

Mr. F. A. Cooper.]

another pamphlet. They ordered a big quantity of them, but while it was on the press something happened, and instead of 30,000 being printed, they published 200 and let it go at that. Two lads were employed by members of this council to distribute these dodgers on the Sunday night. The boys were picked up in the street and told they would get 4s. each for the job—that they would get 1s. down and 3s. when the job was done, and they were to do the job thoroughly. They took the 1s. in advance and the dodgers, and they did their work, and they went back to the appointed place to pick up the 3s. from the gentlemen who promised it to them, but they were not to be found, and those two lads have not yet received the 3s. they were promised. I appeal to the Protestant Labour Council to pay those boys. The address of one of them is Dunwich. The unfortunate boy, who was not in complete possession of his faculties, became quite excited over the thing, and he roamed for days about the streets looking for the man who owed him "three bob," and at last a policeman took him in charge and took him to the Home Department. The lad was in absolute poverty, and he was sent to Dunwich that he might be fed and clothed.

Mr. MORGAN: Why did you not go to the Commissioner of Police?

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I am not in the employ of the Commissioner of Police.

Mr. COSTELLO: You ought to be rat-catching.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: If I were rat-catching, I would advise the hon. member to keep well out of my road.

Mr. COSTELLO: I am a pretty early bird, like you.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I am surprised at the hon. member making that interjection. I understand that it is the early bird that catches worms. I want to say that one or two of the expressions used by the members of this organisation show the character of men they are. When these exposures were made, the first expression they used was, "Who is the shelf?" I had to make some inquiries to find out what the word meant, but I understand now that it is a word used by certain people in the State to mean that somebody has, as we would say, "given them away" or "blown the gaff." They also accused each other of "lashing" those two boys. I understand the meaning of that word is "to take down," not to give up to a man the part of the spoils he thinks should be his. I think the people in whose interests these men work should make some further inquiries into the whole matter. I appeal to the Protestant clergymen in Queensland who have been intimately connected with Protestantism to make a public statement that they are not connected with this Protestant Labour Council.

Mr. MOORE: Why should they?

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I think it is up to them to do so. When I see something of that kind being done in the name of Protestantism, I think it is up to these gentlemen to say that they are in no way connected with it.

Mr. MORGAN: Why does not the Premier say that he is not connected with it?

[Mr. F. A. Cooper.]

Mr. F. A. COOPER: So far as I know, these men are not leaders of any political organisation.

Mr. MORGAN: Why should they deny something they have not been accused of?

Mr. F. A. COOPER: They have used the name of Labour in connection with it, and we are repudiating it. The Labour movement is repudiating these men who are using the name of Labour for their own ends, and I think the leaders of Protestantism should equally rise up and declare that they have no hand in or connection with it, and that it has no connection with Protestantism in any shape or form. I think it is up to the Nationalist party, also, seeing the way in which this has been and is being used, to stand up and say without any qualms of conscience whatever that they, too, are in no way connected with it. I think it rests with every member of this organisation to repudiate these precious people who, for some considerable time, have been battenning and fattening on this scheme. It is a thing that no political organisation should tolerate for one moment.

Mr. MORGAN: Have some of your party suspected you?

Mr. F. A. COOPER: No, they have not.

Mr. MORGAN: One would think you were doing this to clear yourself.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: The hon. member seems so much concerned about the exposure that I wonder—like the hon. member for Bulimba—if the hon. member who interjects is on tenterhooks? I give him the benefit of the doubt. I do not think he is; but, if he were genuine, he would be with me in exposing these precious people.

Mr. MORGAN: It is so silly that it is not worth taking notice of.

Mr. BRAND: Say it outside. Don't bring it into this Chamber.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: This is the place to bring it and expose it. This is the place for me to show that the Labour movement has no connection with it in any shape or form.

Mr. BRAND: You are not game to say it outside.

Mr. FRY: Why does not the Premier say this?

Mr. F. A. COOPER: Do hon. members want the real reason why I say it? The real reason is that they have formed a branch of it in my electorate—(Opposition laughter)—and I think it is up to me to let the people of Queensland know what I know about this precious Protestant Labour Council. I have considered the matter thoroughly, and I am taking the advice of the leader of the Opposition, and speaking to my electors on the Address in Reply. I am accepting the hon. gentleman's advice, and speaking to the electors of Bremer in particular, and to the whole of the people in Queensland in general. I hope they are not going to be beguiled by this precious Protestant Labour Council. It is a thing which has been instigated for the purpose of damning the Labour movement. It is being acquiesced in by political parties who hope to benefit by the overthrow of the Labour movement. They are ready to acquiesce in anything which comes along that they think might benefit them. I take this opportunity of warning the Labour

people of Queensland to keep clear of them. It is a thing that will do no good. I also take the opportunity of warning the Queensland Protestants to have nothing whatever to do with this thing. It is not in any way designed to help them; it is designed only to feather the nests of those people who are running it, and to be used by a political party as its only hope of damning the workers of Queensland. It speaks well for the Labour movement, and for the high position it occupies in this State, when it cannot be beaten by straightforward means, and we find its opponents introducing into this State methods that are unworthy.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Who is introducing them?

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I say it has been introduced on behalf of the Nationalist organisation of this State.

Mr. FRAY: That is a lie.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I say it is not a lie. It is the truth.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! The hon. member for Kurilpa must withdraw the remark "It is a lie."

Mr. FRAY: In deference to your wish, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw it. I say that, so far as I know, it is not true.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I quite believe that the hon. member for Kurilpa may know nothing whatever about it; but I ask him to come with me and make further investigation into this matter—to come and see if we cannot find out something else about it. There are wheels within wheels, being used for political purposes for the overthrow of the Labour movement. Let hon. members be men enough to stand up and admit that all the things I have said are the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

Mr. SIZER (*Nundah*): This session has started off in an extraordinary manner. I think the speech of the hon. member for Bremer affords the most disgraceful spectacle we have ever witnessed since I have been in this Chamber.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. SIZER: I followed the hon. member's speech very carefully. My friend the hon. member for Enoggera distinctly asked him to connect this party with it, and he promised to give the names. We waited patiently. The hon. gentleman built up a glass house from the beginning. He endeavoured to connect this party, by innuendo, with something that he described as contemptible, and which I and other members of this party describe in a similar manner. He has attempted to build up a glass house and connect us with the matter, in the hope of gaining something by it. Such a disgrace should not be permitted. I am very glad the front Government bench remained very silent. Members on that bench did not applaud the hon. gentleman, and neither did any members of his party.

Mr. POLLOCK: Would you like me to show you one of those pamphlets? I will show it to you now.

Mr. SIZER: If there is such a thing in the community, it is named "The Protestant Labour Council," not the "National Council." The hon. member has said that

every man he named has been connected with the Labour party—not with this party. To attempt to connect us with it is contemptible. The hon. gentleman has a great knowledge of the workings of this organisation, and a great knowledge of the workings of the Government. Has he betrayed this organisation in the same way as he has betrayed the Government?

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. SIZER: He said he was not "in the bag" with the Premier. Probably he is "out of the bag" with this organisation also. By his remarks he betrayed a wonderful knowledge of the organisation. I heard him refer to religious meetings and mention the collection. I suspect that was the time when he left the meeting of this precious council. (Opposition laughter.)

The SPEAKER: Order! Order.

Mr. SIZER: Not one of the men the hon. gentleman mentioned is known to me; I have never heard of any of them. As a party, we do not know them, and have never had anything to do with them. The hon. member became apologetic towards the end of his speech, and said there were Nationalists who did not agree with the policy of this organisation. I ask the hon. gentleman again, as we asked him by interjection, to name anyone connected with this party who is responsible in any shape or form. He cannot do it. He is only beating the air. He realises that the genuine Labour organisations of Bremer are going to desert him. Probably, he thought he might get into this Protestant Labour organisation, and get them to support him; but, evidently, they also have found him out. I am surprised at the hon. gentleman. Speeches like his inflame the public mind.

Mr. POLLOCK: Read this circular now.

Mr. SIZER: Even if the organisation does exist in the community, we have no cognisance of it.

Mr. POLLOCK: Have we not a right to repudiate a thing which is issued on behalf of Labour?

Mr. SIZER: If the hon. member for Bremer likes to put out a circular, no one can stop him. In descending to sectarianism, it is very unfair to attempt to connect this party with it, when there is no proof of such a thing.

Mr. KIRWAN: Why did you "put the boot" into Colonel Currie down your way?

Mr. SIZER: I did not "put the boot" into him.

Mr. KIRWAN: Your party did.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: Who got Mr. E. A. Douglas to withdraw from Fassifern?

Mr. MORGAN (addressing Mr. Kirwan): What about you? Perhaps they can accuse you of many things of that sort.

Mr. KIRWAN: No; thank God. There is no religious test in this party; it is not like yours.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. SIZER: The remarks of the hon. member for Bremer lead me to suspect more strongly than I did before that he is very closely associated with the movement, and that he is connected with sectarianism.

Mr. Sizer.]

This session has been remarkable in that it has shown a change of front on the part of the Government. The Government came into power with the idea of emancipating the workers. For years they told the workers they were out for their emancipation. To-day, after six years of administration, we hear hardly a word regarding industrial legislation; not a word about emancipation for the workers; only a newborn love for the farmers. That leads one to conclude, or assume, that the workers have been emancipated, and that there is no more work for the Government to do so far as the industrial workers are concerned; that, having put them on a high plane, they now devote their attention to those whom they have been crying down for the last six years, and they are going to try and offer them some measure of help as a kind of recompense for their maladministration. I intend to analyse the effect of the Government's action concerning the industrial workers, and to ask those workers whether they are satisfied with the past six years' administration, and whether they have got that full emancipation which they expected, and also to look through the list of acts of that Administration—to look at their broken promises in order that the farming community may also be able to judge what they may expect from the emancipation offered by the same party. The Government started in 1915 with the cry of "Cheap food." I do not know how far that can be maintained to-day. We found that a new system—State enterprises—was to be introduced which would solve the whole situation. When those measures were introduced, the optimistic remarks that have been made by the Premier on his present agricultural policy were used almost word for word on those occasions. Have these State enterprises been an unbounded success, and have they brought about the emancipation of the workers? I do not think so. Have the Government improved the position of the workers in connection with the erection of homes as compared with the legislation introduced by Governments before them? The workers at that time were able to own a home. The return shows that we have fallen away in that respect since this emancipating Government came into office. We also know that once upon a time a great industry was to be established in our midst to help to solve the situation. I refer to the iron and steel works. We are still waiting for them. We still have the manager, who is being paid. Evidently that scheme has been thrown overboard, because the industrial workers have been so emancipated, and have been provided with so much employment, that there is no need to pursue this policy further. Is that a fact? It is not.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: You have no right to speak for the Government.

Mr. SIZER: I think I am in order in saying that hon. members opposite are the party who promised to emancipate the worker. Now that they have abandoned that policy, our policy is to be adopted. They have found a new love, and I want to show the section of the community that they are now trying to court that they can place no reliance in the present Government, no matter what their programme may be, and that they will be left sadly in the lurch by the Government's maladminis-

[Mr. Sizer.

tration, in exactly the same way as the industrial workers have been right through. The State Fishery enterprise was to be a great success. It has not been. Hon. members opposite have had to admit that it has not come up to their expectations. At the time the Industrial Arbitration Bill was introduced in 1915 the Premier said—

"The Bill is being introduced to establish a system which will entirely do away with the industrial dislocation that has occurred from time to time in the past under a more imperfect system which has prevailed. It is desired to reach the objective of a permanent and lasting peace."

I ask hon. members whether that hope has been realised. Is it not a fact that the advent of the Industrial Arbitration Court has failed to satisfy anybody? It has not satisfied the employee or the employer, and it has not brought about the slightest solution of the industrial situation. It has not provided one permanent means of success, either for the workers or the community generally. Yet it was going to be the solution of all our industrial troubles! At the time of the establishment of the State Saw-mills the Premier said—

"Every confidence is felt that the successful future of these mills is assured, and their acquirement and running as a State enterprise fully justified."

Have the facts of a few years' experience borne that out? They have not. The Government predicted that they were to be an unqualified success in the same way as they now predict that this agricultural scheme is going to be an unqualified success. This Government, who are now pleading for the farmers, are the Government who, last year, took £480,000 out of the pockets of the farmers.

Mr. COLLINS: That is a deliberate falsehood.

Mr. SIZER: The only Government who ever introduced a land tax and a system of rent-racking is the present Government, and last year, by means of the land tax, they extorted £480,000 from the people.

Mr. COLLINS: Not from the farmers.

Mr. SIZER: Before they came into power, not one penny piece was paid in land tax. They have saddled that on to the farmer. They are the people who have burdened the pastoral community with rent-racking. They have increased their rents and crushed them. I would remind them that they robbed the farming community by means of the butter pool.

Mr. W. COOPER: That is not true.

Mr. SIZER: It is true. £3,000 was denied to one co-operative factory in one month.

Mr. W. COOPER: That is untrue.

Mr. SIZER: The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that it is true. When the farmers could have got 184s. they only got 140s. per cwt. which was the price fixed by the Government.

Mr. W. COOPER: You are wrong in both figures.

Mr. SIZER: The Queensland Farmers Co-operative Company, having 1,300 suppliers, lost £3,000 in one month as a direct result

of Government interference; yet hon. members opposite are the people who come along with a death-bed repentance to the farmers, and say, "We have emancipated the industrial workers, and now we want to do the same for you." If they do nothing more for the farmers than they have done for the industrial workers, I would say that the farming community in this State, no matter how excellent the policy of the Government is, must turn a deaf ear to them. We have to bear in mind the acts of the present Government and look at the State in general. We have to recognise that we are not in a prosperous condition, and that the Government will be appealing for support in the course of the next few months. With regard to this agricultural policy of the Government—

Mr. COLLINS: What is wrong with it?

Mr. SIZER: There may not be anything wrong with the policy. The farmers know full well the Government's maladministration and their broken promises to the workers, whom the Government at one time professed to represent, and the farmers must trust hon. members on the Opposition side of the House to bring the agricultural policy into operation.

Mr. BRENNAN: What about Wyrceema?

At 8.30 p.m.,

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

Mr. SIZER: Had their administration been sound, or had their legislation been sound, we might have been able to believe them to a certain extent; but even the words of members of the Cabinet or of individual members opposite cannot be taken for one moment. The farmers must not pay too much importance to what they are told by hon. members opposite. The workers of the State, and particularly the public servants, were told that there was to be no retrenchment. Is that not true? Did not the hon. member who has just resumed his seat and his colleague, the hon. member for Ipswich, at the time of the elections, state that if the Government attempted to reduce the wages of the public servants they would vote against it? We are waiting to see them do so.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: You will wait a long time.

Mr. SIZER: We want to see what happens. The public servants are well satisfied that the Government have broken their promises. We are waiting to see now whether the two hon. members I have mentioned will also break their promises, and whether, when the public servants' pay is reduced, they will still sit behind the Government and find some excuse to gull the workers still further. During the Paddington election the Secretary for Mines told us that within three months there would be no unemployed. I think those three months have elapsed, and there are still unemployed in this State.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: There are unemployed. I think the position has been greatly exaggerated.

Mr. SIZER: I do not know that the Government can solve the problem to-day, but they have no right to delude the workers into supporting them by stating they would do things that they knew they could not do.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: You are exaggerating the position.

Mr. SIZER: I am not exaggerating the position at all. The hon. gentleman now says that he was referring to the unemployed. Does he wish to insinuate that all the unemployed are unemployed?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I know the position has been greatly exaggerated.

Mr. SIZER: The hon. gentleman had no right to say there would be no unemployed. Everyone in the community knows that there are unemployed, and that there is a depression; but at the same time the Government have turned from the industrial workers. They have left them high and dry, and care no more for them, for the simple reason that the industrial workers have turned them down. The Government have been tried and found wanting, and now they are hoping to create a rural atmosphere in order that these things may be forgotten, and that it will be a case of "Let sleeping dogs lie." It is by their administration that we know them, and it is on their acts that the people will judge them. The people outside will not for one moment take notice of the glib phrases which fall so flippantly from responsible Ministers.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: They will not take notice of a gloomy pessimist.

Mr. SIZER: I am not a gloomy pessimist. Hon. members opposite are endeavouring, by every means possible, to placate the farmers. The high days of State enterprises have gone, and the high days of big wages have gone.

Mr. BRENNAN: Do you agree with it? Be honest.

Mr. SIZER: The hon. member need not talk about honesty. That question does not enter into the matter at all. The Government promised that they would not reduce wages. I want to remind the farming community, when hon. members go before them with their "high falutin'" policy and with their glib phrases uttered with their tongues in their cheeks, that they are the same gentlemen who were driven from the London money market, not because they were a Labour Government, because the New South Wales Labour Government received assistance at the same time, but because they had broken faith with the pastoralists of this State. They were driven from the London money market because of their iniquities so far as the men on the land were concerned, and they have made no effort to rectify the position. They were driven from the London money market into the hands of their Yankee friends because of their maladministration of the affairs of this State. The hypocrisy of the whole thing! If the farming community take the advice I give them, they will get all they can in the dying days of the present Government, because, if the Government were to remain in power for twenty years, they could not recompense the farming community for the losses they have sustained during the six years of Labour government. These are the gentlemen who dragged a widow woman through the courts in the Moore's *berrie* cattle case, and now they say they are solicitous for the farmers.

Mr. BRENNAN: Who paid her expenses?

Mr. SIZER: They placed a land tax on the farmers, increased their rents, confiscated their cattle, took away their butter, and made them squeal on every possible occasion; and now, in the dying hours of their political life,

Mr. Sizer.]

they make a death-bed repentance. If the farming community want assistance they know where to get it. At the time of the introduction of the State Produce Agency Bill all sorts of promises were made to the farmers. The other night the Premier said that everything would be glorious, and that the millennium would be reached so far as the farming community were concerned if they would only agree to a certain Bill. Figuratively speaking, he said they would be relieved of all their burdens if they accepted that measure. The self-same promises were made when the State Produce Agency Bill was introduced into this Chamber. Did those things come about?

Mr. BRENNAN: Who killed it?

Mr. SIZER: It does not matter who killed it. It was going to lead to a solution of all their troubles. The Government were going to charge only 2½ per cent. commission. There would be no more middlemen, and the millennium would be reached by the farmer.

The farming community has seen how miserably those promises have failed in practice. The industrial workers have also seen how miserably the Government have failed. They also can look for no measure of relief from the Government. The Government have come to the end of their tether, and can offer them nothing in future, so they exclude them altogether from the Governor's Speech.

Mr. COLLINS: That is not so. They are giving compensation in regard to miner's phthisis.

Mr. SIZER: Even if it is put in the Speech, it is window-dressing, and it can offer no solution of the industrial trouble.

Mr. BRENNAN: You are a carping critic.

Mr. SIZER: There will be some carping critics of hon. members opposite when the hypocritical statements they make in attempting to dupe one section of the community are fully realised. After duping one section of the community for six years, they are endeavouring to do it again. Whether the Government think agriculturists have a lesser mentality than other members of the community I do not know, but that is not so. The Arbitration Court is admittedly a failure—or, at least, it has not come up to expectations—and is not providing a solution in any shape or form for the industrial problem.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Is workers' compensation a failure? You will surely give us credit for that!

Mr. SIZER: I will, if the hon. gentleman wants it, give him credit for State Insurance. I do not want to be narrow. One realises that the industrial situation should receive a good deal of attention from this Chamber to-night. That the arbitration system has failed is admitted by the Labour party.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Not the Labour party.

Mr. SIZER: By the industrialists outside, and it is also believed by the majority of the people. But there is no room in the Government platform for any reform in that direction. They have nothing to offer after the experience of a number of years of the working of the Arbitration Act. Until they are prepared to come down and meet in conference and discuss the whole situation, they should endeavour to solve the trouble much on the lines—

[Mr. Sizer.

Mr. BRENNAN: Like the Fuller Government in New South Wales.

Mr. SIZER: The hon. member knows that the Government themselves are fast becoming as reactionary as the most reactionary Government in Australia. They accuse the Fuller Government of being reactionary because that Government reduced the basic wage and reduced the pay of public servants; but hon. members opposite are doing exactly the same.

Mr. BRENNAN: The Fuller Government are doing it against the promises they made.

Mr. SIZER: The Fuller Government are doing what they promised to do at the election. Hon. gentlemen opposite said they would not reduce wages, but they are doing it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The Fuller Government said they would not do it.

Mr. SIZER: The hon. gentleman is quite incorrect. Instead of the Government endeavouring to use that industrial knowledge which they led the workers to think they possessed, in order to arrive at a solution of the industrial question, they are adopting the old reactionary method of cutting down wages. I say that wage reduction alone will never solve the situation. It may be one of the essential requirements.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The wage system will never solve the situation.

Mr. SIZER: The Premier, in reply to a question asked by the leader of the Opposition to-day, admitted that he was a revolutionary, and that he wanted to see the overthrow of the capitalistic system and the introduction of a communistic system, but that he wanted to bring it about by constitutional means, and not by violent and revolutionary means. I have more respect for the burglar who comes to your house and burgles it than I have for the man who is invited to your house and gets your confidence and friendship and becomes the friend of your wife and family, and then gradually steals bit by bit that which belongs to you. That man is far more despicable than the burglar.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: We agree on that.

Mr. SIZER: I have a certain amount of respect for those men who honestly, in the Domain and at Labour conferences, tell you they are communists—that they want a revolution, and are fighting for it. There is a great difference between the open burglar and the man who makes your acquaintance and then robs you by stealth. Hon. gentlemen opposite are announcing an agricultural policy, which they know is diametrically opposed to the policy of the Australian Labour party. They know that, if they succeed in placing it before the people, the Australian Labour party will not stand for it or allow it to become the policy of the party. The Government derive their power from the Australian Labour party, which plainly tells them that it will only accept their policy so long as it suits their views. The members of the Government will have to sign the pledge to support the policy of the Australian Labour party, including the Melbourne objective, which is diametrically opposed to the policy which the Government are enunciating. There is only one course open to the Government—either to put their agricultural policy into operation, break

faith with those who are their supporters and turn traitors to the organisation they belong to, or throw over the agricultural policy. They cannot consistently put that agricultural policy into operation and reconcile it with the Melbourne resolutions or the Brisbane objective which they have been called upon to support. If ever we had an exhibition of "cant, humbug, and hypocrisy," we have it in the agricultural policy of the Government, which they have no chance of putting into operation, because they are bound hand and foot to their organisation, which says they must be revolutionary, and will only support them so far as they are revolutionary.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: If there is industrial chaos, why not suggest a remedy?

MR. SIZER: I am coming to that. We recognise that we have not reached the millennium, so far as the industrial situation is concerned. I recognise that the wage solution is not a permanent solution. There are other means. The arbitration system will not enable us to do everything that is necessary. It is too hard and fast. It goes on the theory of the reduction or increase of wages. The Government would show statesmanship if they would cast from their ranks those who are creating the bitterness which keeps employers and employees from coming together. Let them initiate a movement to select men who are honest in doing a fair thing in the workers' interests, and who are anxious to solve the situation. Let them meet an equal number of men in the employers' interests who are anxious to solve the situation. Let them come together and meet at an honest round-table conference, where they can appreciate the difficulties of one another, and endeavour to solve them. If wages have to be reduced, let them see if the capital costs and overhead charges cannot also be reduced. At any rate, that is the proper way to do it, and not simply sit idly by and let the Arbitration Court do it. The Arbitration Court has failed, so we should try the other system.

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

MR. W. COOPER (Rosewood): I listened attentively to the remarks that fell from the hon. member for Nundah as to how the farming community have been robbed by this Government. I claim to know as much about the butter industry, and also about the interests of the farming community, as the hon. member who has just resumed his seat. He said that the farmers had been robbed by the action of this Government in fixing prices so far as butter is concerned. I remember the time when the Federal Government fixed the price for the farmers throughout the whole Commonwealth, and the price fixed for butter was 128s. per cwt. Mr. Hughes, in his wisdom, no doubt saw what was coming. He relinquished the control of price-fixing for the Commonwealth, and handed it over to the various industries or co-operative factories, or perhaps to the butter merchants, to do exactly what they could for themselves in particular, and then for the farmer afterwards. The result was that the price of butter dropped from 128s to 118s. per cwt. When the Queensland Government saw what was happening to the farmer, they stepped in and resumed control and fixed the price of butter at 138s. per

cwt. But they went further. They pooled the whole of the butter that was manufactured in Queensland, and while the pool lasted, the butter producers in Queensland received a higher price for their butter than the producers in any other State in Australia. I took a keen interest in this matter, and went over to northern New South Wales to find out if the butter producers of that State were treated better than the butter producers in Queensland. At that time, the Imperial authorities were paying 174s. per cwt. for butter; but the highest price the farmer in New South Wales received was 2s. 3d. to 2s. 3½d. per lb. In Queensland, under the pooling system, the producer was receiving 2s. 4d. per lb., or 264s. per cwt., for his butter.

MR. BEBBINGTON: Why didn't the New South Wales farmer send his butter here?

MR. W. COOPER: The hon. gentleman knows nothing about butter. He is always interjecting something about butter, which he knows nothing about, and he ought to stick to cheese. I spoke to several directors of butter companies on the Richmond River, and that was the information they gave me, and, when I made that statement from the platform at a public meeting, they said that my statement was absolutely correct. The butter in New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, and Western Australia had got into the hands of the butter speculators, so the consumers were paying more in those States, while the producers were getting less than in Queensland. I admit that at that time I thought the butter producer in Queensland was not likely to get a fair deal from price-fixing, but since then I am something like the cat, I have had my eyes opened, and I find that, if the price had not been fixed in Queensland by the Government, the butter speculator would have taken a hand, and he would have got all the profit, while the producer would not have received the full reward of his labour. (Government members: Hear, hear!) Ever since 1915 the Labour Government have done all they possibly can to help the farmer.

We know that the cotton industry has made great strides in Queensland. I find that the Government have advanced £61,000 to the men who have embarked on the cotton industry, and they are to-day paying interest on that money, although they will not receive one penny interest back from the farmer after all the cotton has been sold. Hon. members opposite complain that a land tax has been placed upon the farmers. We know that a land tax has been placed on all holders of freehold land; but the man who embarks on intense cultivation pays the least tax of all. The city properties pay twenty times as much land tax as the average farmer does. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that the large squatter out West is a farmer, and that the interests of the squatters and farmers are the same. Do they mean to say that the squatter has the same interests as the farmer who takes up 160 acres of scrub land? What about the men who went into the Rosewood scrub with their wives and families? They had to fell the timber and carve out a home for themselves in the scrub. How much scrub land was taken up by the squatter? None at all. Where did the squatter go to take up his land? He selected the rolling downs, where there was no labour required, and no scrub to be cleared. There was too much

Mr. W. Cooper.]

work to be done in the scrub land, and the squatter selected the downs country, and in addition he received privileges which the small man could not get. Hon. members opposite say that they are the friends of the farmer. They are the friends of the squatter. The squatter would never allow a small man to take up land if he could prevent it. I know from experience in New South Wales how the squatter used to treat the small farmers. They used to "dog" his land and "duff" his cattle. They also used to chop down his fences and force him off his little bit of land. That was the attitude the squatter took up. It is no use hon. members opposite coming here and telling us that the squatter is concerned for the small farmer. Nothing of the kind! You can take my electorate, which was held at one time by the squatting interest. Perhaps a man who kept two or three dogs and black-fellows occupied that great tract of country, where the small man to-day is toiling to get a living for his wife and children. How much revenue did that land pay to the State before it was occupied by the small settler? If any Government deserves credit for doing something for the man on the land it is this Government. Some hon. members opposite—I do not say all—were in Parliament in the days of the grand old Liberal Government. These members say that we are now going cap in hand to the farmers. They went along at every election and said, "You want to look out for that socialistic mob; they will take your farm away from you; they will tax you off the land"; but to-day we find that the farmers are appreciating what has been done for them by this Government. Then they came along with the old Tory cry of "Bolshevism," and now their cry is "Communism." I am quite satisfied, from what I was told when speaking in New South Wales, that the hon. member for Bremer was on the right track in trying to scotch this sectarian business which is now being used to defeat the Labour Government at any price. Are they squealing against this Government because we are injuring the small man on the land? Not at all, but because we are passing legislation detrimental to their own interests. What do they care for the small man on the land? I have followed their tactics closely for thirty years. At every election they cry, "Be careful of these socialists; be careful of the Bolsheviks; they will tax you off the land."

Mr. EDWARDS: It has come out pretty right.

Mr. W. COOPER: I want to tell that hon. member something that I was told the other day. I do not know whether it is true or not, but he will have an opportunity to deny it. I was told [9 p.m.] that he was the worst small farmer in the Nanango electorate. I do not know whether the Bathurst burr grows there.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am prepared to take you on at any time.

Mr. W. COOPER: I will do anything on a farm that the hon. member can do at any time, and I will be able to do a lot more after he is finished. No doubt, the hon. member has told his electors, "Be careful of the propositions the Government are holding out to you," and yet he denied the statement made by the Premier the other night. It will be a very easy matter for any member

on this side of the House to get proof of what he has been saying in the Nanango electorate.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: He has told the truth, anyway.

Mr. W. COOPER: I am satisfied that, if he has told the truth, he has done more than the hon. member for Drayton has done in this Chamber. It is a sore point with these gentlemen that the Government are endeavouring now to help the men hon. members opposite pretended to help for so long. They say that we have stolen their platform. For sixteen years they had the opportunity to do something for the man on the land, and I defy any man on the other side to show that they ever did anything for him, or ever introduced a Bill that was beneficial to the small man on the land. They have always been with the squatter. The squatters have come along and said, "You must not pass this Bill, you will have to withdraw it; it is in the interests of the small man." You can introduce it, of course. It will be a very fine bit of electioneering for you." And so the Bill was introduced, and it was easy for them to go along to the other Chamber and say, "We do not want this Bill passed. We are introducing it in the Lower Chamber, but you can throw it into the waste-paper basket." When they were charged with repudiating election promises, they had a very fine excuse—"We certainly introduced it, but the Upper House threw it out. We could not help it—you know what those old chaps down there are—they would throw out anything." When it came to abolishing them the other day, they told a very different tale.

There is no need for me to belabour some of the statements of the Opposition. I am going to draw hon. members' attention to what the Government have done for the man on the land—for instance, the education of his children. I have some reason for speaking, because the Government have established a rural school in my district. The children get all the benefits open to city children in domestic science and secondary education. This Government have spent at least £650,000 a year more on the education of the children than the previous Government, and most of that is going into the country to give greater facilities for the education of the children of the man on the land. Hon. members opposite will come along and try to brush that aside, just as they have sought to do in the past.

The Government have built a railway in my electorate—unfortunately, it is not in my new electorate. I refer to the Rosevale-Rosewood railway. It was promised thirty years ago. Years ago the money was appropriated, but perhaps a change of party occurred, and the railway was scrapped. Each time the leader of this great Farmers' party—the friends of the farmer—as they call themselves—as a matter of fact, they have been the enemies of the farmer ever since I have known anything about politics—each time he would come along and say, "Oh, we are sorry. If you return us to power, or if you put the Government nominee in again, we will construct this line." Something has been said in connection with the spendthrift policy of this Government. Although the Government have had deficits, they are not the only Government who have been similarly situated in

[Mr. W. Cooper.]

Queensland. Previous Governments, as soon as they found they were going to have a deficit, cut up a big area of Crown lands, sold it, and placed the money in the consolidated revenue, afterwards going to the electors and saying, "We are the people who can finance this State; we have a surplus." That reminds me of a farmer who said to me, when I asked him how he was getting on, "I am doing very well." I said, "How many cows have you?" He said, "I have forty cows, but I have a loss of £10 every month." I said, "How can you, then, be doing well?" He said, "I sell a cow each month, and make up the deficit." At the end of forty months he had no cows. Had the hon. gentlemen opposite occupied this side of the House for the last six years, I am afraid they would have been in the same position as this unfortunate farmer, and would have had no Crown land to sell. It is amusing to hear hon. members opposite telling the people that the Government are not in earnest in their endeavours to do something for the man on the land. They never attempted to do anything. They so gulled the farmer that he believed them until 1915, when he awakened to the fallacy of the policies they were expounding on the platform at every election. They are now confounded to think that another Government could come along and do in seven years something which it took them sixty years to contemplate, without arriving at anything definite.

Mr. WARREN (*Murrumba*): This session has been productive of some wonderful events. We have a wonderful Governor's Speech—wonderful for how little there is in it, and how much is out of it. This night's sitting has been wonderful because of two gentlemen of the name of "Cooper" following each other on the Government benches and throwing out so much asphyxiating sectarian gas that the Chamber has been polluted. I am not going to bother repudiating such humbug and stupidity; I think the utterances of those gentlemen have been such as to bring sufficient condemnation on them. It is about time that hon. gentlemen raised the prestige of this House rather than put it into a sewer.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The hon. gentleman is not in order in suggesting that any member of this House is reducing the tone of it to that of a sewer.

Mr. WARREN: I take back the "sewer."

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman must withdraw the remark, which is entirely unparliamentary.

Mr. WARREN: I withdraw it. This session we are facing the most important thing that Queensland has faced since it became a self-governing State. The industrial question is very important, but I do not think it is as important as the agricultural question. I was very sorry to hear the Secretary for Mines refer to workers as "unemployable."

Mr. WINSTANLEY: He did not do anything of the kind.

Mr. PETERSON: It is reported in "Hansard."

Mr. WARREN: It is an unfair thing. I know a considerable number of unemployed, and they are the most unfortunate class it is possible to find. The man who is not able to work while willing to work is most to be

pitied of any man in the State. We want to know whether there is any sincerity in the promoters of this agricultural scheme. It is not a matter of whether the Government can carry it through, because the Government will not last long enough to bother about it. It is a matter of whether these gentlemen are serious and are going on right lines. I am in favour of this scheme, and it must come. Because of their insincerity, the Government will not produce the scheme or carry it into effect, even if they have the chance of doing so. I do not believe they have thrown the industrialists over. I do not believe the leopard has changed his spots.

Mr. COLLINS: You do not want us to throw them over.

Mr. WARREN: I do not want any man to throw the industrialists over. It would be a sorry thing for Queensland and for Australia if the great body of the people were thrown over. But we do not want this camouflage Government to dupe the people of this State.

Mr. COLLINS: Do you say we duped the farmer when we passed the Regulation of Sugar Cane Prices Act?

Mr. WARREN: I say the Government are not sincere. Take the case of the fruit-growers. Last year the fruit-growers of Queensland were organised to the extent of 90 per cent. of their strength, which is equalled by no other organisation. They asked the Secretary for Agriculture to bring in a Bill that would produce something better than that which is offered here to-night. The object was to constitute a Queensland fruit-growers' federal council, which would exercise exactly the same functions as will be exercised by the Council of Agriculture which is to be created now by the Government.

Mr. GLEDSON: Do you not know that the State Government cannot constitute a fruit-growers' federal council?

Mr. WARREN: The stupidity of the interjection is obvious. The federation was constituted. We asked the Government to bring in a Bill to assist us to consummate this scheme. We did not come to the Government asking for money. We desired to have an orchard tax so as to carry on this council of advice and education without coming cap in hand to the Government. Before the termination of the last session, I asked the Secretary for Agriculture if he was going to bring in that Bill, and he answered, "No." The Government at that time did not feel it necessary, or they thought it impossible to take over control of the farming community! They do not want to take over the control of the farming community any more than they want to throw over the industrialists. What they want to do is to break up the farming organisations politically. This communistic Government—this Government that has got neither soul nor mind—wants to destroy the organisations that we have built up in this State. If the Government had given us the Bill we desired in the interests of the fruit-growers, they would have been building up the organisation instead of causing it to lose ground, and the organisation would have been 100 per cent. organised instead of 90 per cent. That shows the sincerity of the Government. There was no communistic section in this Fruit Growers' Organisation. I am not afraid of the

Mr. Warren.]

Government splitting up the farming community. I give the farmers credit, the same as I give the workers credit to-night, for taking a stand independent of any political party. There is no doubt that the Government will not get 1 per cent. of the farmers to vote for this stupid move to try and destroy instead of building up. To show the sincerity of the Government, I will quote this extract from a paper called "The Advocate," which is not a Nationalist organ. It is in answer to correspondent "Bill Bailey"—

"Your letter indicates that you, like many others, have a real grievance, but, unfortunately, yours is of such a nature as to involve sweeping the present system of production for profits completely away, before you can secure the redress you desire. That event may or may not be a long way off. Keep on agitating."

The nominal head of this great agricultural policy is the Secretary for Agriculture. He is another hon. gentleman who says that we should produce for use only. Here is a paper hinting that the time may be pretty close when it is going to take effect. Hon. members opposite talk with their tongues in their cheeks and try to delude the poor "cocky," and to make out that he is a man of inferior mind. This scheme is in bad hands, and, if the Government were sincere in their desire to promote the interests of the agriculturists they would organise on different lines, and would see that the scheme was going to be beneficial to the farmer, instead of attempting to get support for themselves. I feel very strongly on this matter, because it is the only thing of importance contained in the Governor's Speech. We have seen the Secretary for Agriculture and the Premier going about addressing different meetings like Paul and Silas of old trying to make an impression upon the people and endeavouring to lead the farmers to believe that they are disinterested in regard to their scheme. I remember when I was a director of a fruit-growers' company seeing a document signed by a gentleman who has organised this scheme—I do not mean the Premier.

Mr. BRENNAN: You mean Mr. Harrison?

Mr. WARREN: No. This gentleman is in the employ of the Government. I saw this document, which was an offer of £2,500 to come into this scheme.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Shame! Shame! Bribery!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I would like to point out to the hon. member for Drayton that the use of the term "Shame" is not parliamentary, and, in support of my ruling, I will quote "May"—

"A gross form of interruption by loud cries of 'shame' has been strongly condemned by the Speaker, who declared his intention to take notice of the committal of the offence."

I hope the hon. member for Drayton will base his conduct on that of the House of Commons.

Mr. WARREN: The growers being so well organised, the organiser of the Government scheme thought it advisable to make an offer to them. The name of Mr. Story [9.30 p.m.] appeared at the bottom of that document. If this scheme requires that sort of thing to prop it up, it is abso-

[Mr. Warren.

lutely wrong and an immoral business transaction. I would not have taken the action I did with regard to the fruitgrowers if I did not think a scheme of this sort is needed. The scheme is needed; but let us face this thing honestly. It seems to me that hon. members on the other side do not like a matter of this kind brought forward.

Mr. GLEDSON: Let us have the truth about that £2,000 bribe you were talking of.

Mr. WARREN: I have made the statement that I saw this document. I also wrote to the Press two days afterwards, and my letter appeared in the Press. I want to know the reason for this offer, and it is only right that the Government should give some explanation. We know that primary production is the key to success so far as this State or any other State is concerned, and we will do all we can to assist a scheme of this description.

Mr. GLEDSON: You are doing your best to night to block it.

Mr. WARREN: I am not doing my best to block it, but I do not think it wise to allow the scheme to go through without using proper precautions and seeing whether we cannot make it better. Surely hon. members opposite do not think they have all the knowledge in regard to the scheme, or that simply because it was drawn up by a public servant it is an absolutely finished scheme? Schemes of this description take years to work out. It is only by the evolution of time that a scheme of this kind can be brought to perfection. Surely the farmers who have been working in the interests of co-operation for many years know quite as much of these matters as hon. members on the other side? I say hon. members opposite are not co-operationists. They do not know what co-operation is while they are tied to the communistic platform, and while they are tied to the policy of destroying a man's earnings.

Mr. BRENNAN: You are not responsible for what you are saying.

Mr. WARREN: The hon. member is not responsible. He will be all right in a week's time. We stand for co-operation, and we believe that co-operation and profit-sharing are going to solve our troubles. I want to ask the Government, who are introducing this scheme, what they stand for. Surely they are not above being asked such a question? Surely they do not think they are almighty? The question has been asked and evaded: Do the Government stand for communism? Do they stand for the policy propounded in Brisbane last year?

Mr. COLLINS: Communism and Christianity are very close to one another.

Mr. WARREN: I do not think the hon. member is an authority on Christianity. Those are the questions we have to ask when guiding this scheme through this House.

Mr. GLEDSON: You are the biggest communist of all—compulsory enrolment of fruitgrowers!

Mr. WARREN: I want to be very careful about this compulsion, and it seems to me that this Bill is bristling with compulsion. What has damned the Labour party is the compulsion in connection with it. There are no big men in the movement, and, if the whip cracks, these men run round

like a lot of sheep. If these men have to guide this great scheme, which is going to save the State from destruction, then I pity the chance the scheme has of being a success. We are prepared to assist, but we want to know something more about this compulsory humbug. Compulsion has done nothing for hon. members on the other side. Compulsion will do nothing for anybody.

Mr. BRENNAN: You were a conscriptionist.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WARREN: The hon. member is a twister of the truth. Because I volunteered to go to the war it does not say that I am a conscriptionist. We cannot do without a certain amount of compulsion. How does the Premier square himself with the "red ragers"? Is that not something that we have a right to ask? Are we to be lassoed into this scheme simply because the Premier of Queensland has said it is the right thing to do? I am going to watch for the cloven hoof. When hon. members have to resort to the tactics resorted to in this Chamber to-night to strengthen their position we must be very careful. The last speaker made out that the Governments of the past had never done anything. I would point out that I have no connection in any way with any of the old parties in Queensland. I have never had anything to do with them. I came in with a new party absolutely. But, if the old Liberal party did not do more than has been done by the party which has been in power for the last seven years, then they should have their memory erased from history. Those farmers whom the hon. member for Rosewood spoke about were made possible by the old squatter Government. It was the old squatter Government that brought in the free homesteaders of Rosewood, and it is pitiful to think that any man is so depraved and so lost to a sense of what is right as to come here and brand the squatters practically as highwaymen. The Government of the day, no matter what Governments in the past may have done, must do something to solve the two great problems with which the people of Queensland are faced to-day. If that is done, other problems will settle themselves.

I regret to find that there is no reference in the Speech to gambling, which is the greatest evil that is troubling us to-day. I want to enter my protest against the gambling spirit that is prevalent in the community to-day. When anything is mentioned in connection with these raffles and other things, it is usual for the Minister in charge to say, "The hon. member is responsible for some of them." The whole system is wrong. We are breeding a class of loafers and parasites who are not a credit to any country, and it is a disgrace to the Government. What beats me is that there are members on the other side who, in their private lives, are religious and conscientious gentlemen, and yet they steep their political souls in this infamy. It seems to me they can be one thing on one occasion and something else on another occasion.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is your policy.

Mr. WARREN: My policy is to destroy as much of the gambling propensity as possible, as we shall then have a better community of people with a greater desire to work and do their best for the State. I would like, not exactly to back up statements

so far as the soldier settlements are concerned, but to point out one aspect of those settlements which does not appeal to me. I have made my attitude in regard to these settlements fairly clear, and I want to refer to the method which is being employed to get rid of soldiers from the land. The proper method of getting rid of a soldier is not to eject him, even if he is thought to be useless. I am sorry to say that all of the men are not useful settlers. The method employed by the Government is to starve them out. I say that it is a shameful thing to try and starve those men out.

Mr. BRENNAN: The Federal Government are doing that to-day.

Mr. WARREN: The hon. member is very good at shifting the blame to somebody else. He is like the little boy who stole the plums; he wants to shift the blame to someone else. The blame is on the Lands Department. I maintain that the Government should get rid of the settler in the proper way, if it has to be done. I would ask the Government for a more humane treatment of these men.

I want to say a few words with regard to education. We hear hon. members opposite say that they never have any trouble in getting their requests granted by the Department of Public Instruction. We believe that there is more money spent by the department in the electorates of hon. members opposite than in other electorates.

Mr. COLLINS: That is not true. You have a good school at Nambour.

Mr. WARREN: That is so, and we are very proud of the rural school at Nambour, and also thankful to the department for putting it there; but I want to complain about the little shanties of schools with canvas sides that are put up. They have been condemned, but the Government are short of funds and cannot provide better accommodation. I am not saying that the Government willingly allow this state of things to exist. I think no one would more readily give us good schools than the present Minister. These canvas schools are not only uncomfortable, but they are a menace to the children's health. In one place we have a school which is overcrowded, and the department has built a bush shelter outside, and at the end of last summer a snake crawled down on to the heads of the little children. I want the Secretary for Public Instruction to remember that the matter of the enlargement of this school has been before the department for a considerable time.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I won't forget it.

Mr. WARREN: I ask the Minister to put sufficient money on the Estimates to give the country conditions equal to those of the large towns and cities.

So far as agricultural matters are concerned, we are very much behind in this State. I do not believe in crying "stinking fish," but there is only one product that we have made much advance in regard to, and that is sugar. It is time that our Department of Agriculture woke up. Many of the duties which are falling on the Council of Agriculture are duties which should have been carried out by the department. There was an example of the value of what experts can do in the prevention of disease in coping with the recent plague in Brisbane,

Mr. Warren.]

which was stamped out by the work of scientific men. We want experts in the Department of Agriculture to help us to combat the troubles in the agricultural industry. We have had the fruit-fly pest for seven years, and it is only during the last few months that the question of dealing with it has been seriously taken up. There are many other troubles that fruitgrowers are faced with, and they should be helped in every possible way by the department. With regard to citrus fruits, many of the oranges grown along the coast are of an almost useless variety, and they are not profitable. Much of the fruit grown in the Stanthorpe district is also of unmarketable quality. The people there are planting orchards with trees the fruit of which will not be of a really profitable nature, and it is the bounden duty of the Department of Agriculture to try and remedy these matters. I hope that the Minister will attend to what I have said. If we had a better system of cultivation of our land in other branches of agriculture, we could easily produce 30 per cent. more than we are now doing.

Mr. BEBBINGTON (*Drayton*): I would first like to ask the Secretary for Agriculture if he will give us an explanation on Tuesday as to why this £2,500, or services equivalent to that amount, was offered to an association to come into the Government agricultural scheme. If the scheme is to be any benefit to the people who will come into it, why was it necessary to make this offer, as on the face of it it looks nothing more nor less than a bribe? If the benefits of the scheme are not sufficient to induce people to go into it without offering them a monetary reward, it does not say much for the scheme. I hope the Minister will give some explanation of that on Tuesday, because this statement has been published in the Press, and the Government are silent on the matter. If the statement was correct, the Government should own up and say so. The statement has been published long enough for the Government to own or disown it.

Mr. W. COOPER: What paper was it published in?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: It was published in the "Daily Mail," and it was signed by an hon. member of this House. The programme of the Government for this session is a very mild one. It is suited to a Government with a majority of one. If they had a majority of fourteen or fifteen like they had in 1915 and 1916, then, instead of being a policy to give something to the producer, it would have been a policy to take something from him. The Government have only a majority of one, and their policy is like the policy of the leader of a dying party.

Mr. W. COOPER: Then why be so concerned about it?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: It is something like the policy of the dying Scotchman. He had a difference with one of the members of the church, and the minister brought them together in the bedroom, and made them shake hands. Just as the friend was going out of the door, the dying Scotchman said, "If I die, we will be reconciled; but, if I get better, we will be as we are." (Laughter.) It is the same with the Government. If they come back with a majority, they will be communists and the communist platform will go on the statute-book. If the Government die—and they are going to

die politically—they want to be friends with the farmer before they die. We have no evidence of repentance on the part of the Government—not one bit. They are only offering to return some little part of what they have taken from us, and they are returning very little. They offer us communism with the one hand and something for the farmer in the other. The more the farmer produces the more there will be for the commune to take over. I want to compare the policies of the two parties. (Laughter.) The Country party is the one that the country is looking to to right matters in Queensland. Our first objective is to develop the interior of Queensland by co-operative methods extending from the producer to the consumer. We want to enable the producer to stabilise the markets and to feed the markets in such a way that there will be no waste. The present haphazard system of flooding the markets one day and starving them the next gives no security to the producer at all. If the market is starved one day, the merchant who buys our produce from us is afraid to give a big price, because to-morrow the market may be flooded. In that way there is no security for the producer, the merchant, or the consumer. We want the markets stabilised, so that the consumer will have exactly what he is able to consume. We do not want the price of commodities fixed irrespective of what it costs to produce them. Under our present auction system, that is what happens. The industrial worker has his industrial value fixed. When we buy a mowing machine, or a binder, or anything else, we are charged the price it will cost to bring that machine into the country. The fair thing would be to fix the price of produce on the same lines as the industrialist's wages, and pay for it according to the price it would cost to bring it into the country.

Mr. BRENNAN: You cannot fix it that way.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Our second objective is to apply the same principle to the secondary industries. If we can manufacture only 30 per cent. of our raw material into saleable goods, we shall be able to employ a number of the boys and girls whom we have been educating in our high schools, and for whom to-day it is most difficult to find employment. That is our second objective in regard to secondary industries. To do that we intend to extend the Co-operative Agricultural Production Act of 1914 to secondary industries. There has not been one penny loss in the advances made to the farmers under that Act. I believe the industrial workers are just as honest as the farmers, and we can assist them if our proposal is carried out. Our idea is to bring capital and labour together. There are four powers necessary in connection with production. There is the brain power, labour, capital, and credit. We intend to bring these four together, and give the best reward to each of them. That is the only way that the labour difficulty will be solved. As we intend to assist the industrial workers to build up the industries, we contend that they should own those industries. The worker has the right to own the industry that he builds up. He has the right to own the means of wealth production, not by socialisation, not by robbery, and not by taxation, so that he can buy it cheaply, but by building it up with his own brains and his own labour, just as the farmer and dairyman

[Mr. Warren.

have built up their own industries and their own factories which they own to-day. We believe it is possible for the worker to own his own means of industry, and it is just as possible for the manufacturer of the raw material to own his industry, as it is for the dairyman to own the manufacture of his products.

At 10 p.m.,

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: In doing that, by a process of evolution, he is lifting himself, with his wife and family, from the position of a wage-earner to that of a factory owner—practically the owner of the means of wealth production. The Premier has shown some signs of repentance; but his party

[10 p.m.] has shown none; but if the Premier were thoroughly repentant, the first thing he would do would be to rescind the communistic legislation which that party have placed on the statute-book. The very first thing this party would do, if we got the reins of power, would be to repeal all those Acts and sections of Acts which give the Government power to seize citizens' goods. Why did the Government not stick to sugar in their Sugar Acquisition Act? Only a short Act was required to allow the Federal Government to take over the sugar industry, but this Government of Queensland had the fever of seizure; they had a big majority behind them, and they wanted all the power they could get. Hon. members opposite have got the fever of socialisation and communalisation. They laid their hands on everything they could get, and, after describing in the Sugar Acquisition Bill as many things as they could think of, they were not satisfied that something might not have been left out, so they added the words, "and other commodities." Those three words gave them the power to lay their hands on everything—to take the shirt off a man's back—and the very first act of this party when they get into power, if I have anything to do with it, will be to rescind those three words. I am rather sorry that a man like the Premier should find himself in the company of the party opposite. If he is truly repentant for his actions and those of the Government, for which he was, perhaps, not altogether responsible, he should remember that there is no repentance without undoing what he has done; but he cannot repent of those actions and remain with the party. If he will leave them and come over here, I will give him the hand of friendship. (Laughter.) The Premier cannot carry out the programme he is offering to the farmers and remain in his present company. It is absolutely impossible, because the platforms of the Federal, the State, and the municipal Labour parties are the same—all three controlled by the Australian Labour party, which goes in practically for internationalism. We see that the same party, wherever they get a hold or make any headway, bring nothing but desolation and bloodshed. One has only to look at what happened in South Africa and the part that the Australian Labour party took in that. Here is a resolution passed by the Australian Labour party, of which the people on the other side form a part.

Mr. BRENNAN: A cowardly assault!

Mr. BEBBINGTON: The hon. member must admit that he is part of the Australian Labour party.

Mr. BRENNAN: Absolutely one of them, and always will be.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: The New South Wales Labour Council in Sydney is reported to have adopted the following motion:—

"This council, representing over 100,000 Australian trades unionists, expresses whole-hearted sympathy with the trades unionists of South Africa in their courageous fight against the armed forces of capitalism, and will render them any support that may be possible."

Mr. BRENNAN: Hear, hear! Quite right, too. They shot them down in the sunlight.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: That has been acknowledged then on the other side. I want to know how they and the Premier are in a position to carry out their promises to the farmer to help the agricultural industry. I want to know what the present Government have done for the farmer. They have only added insult to insult.

Mr. BRENNAN: You are an old twister.

Mr. VOWLES: I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. member in order in calling the hon. member for Drayton "an old twister"?

The SPEAKER: The hon. member is not in order, and I ask him to withdraw the words.

Mr. BRENNAN: If the hon. member objects, I am prepared to withdraw.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I take no notice of him.

The SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member to withdraw.

Mr. BRENNAN: I withdraw.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I take no notice of him; he is not responsible.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I want to know what the present Government are going to do for the farmers. With a big majority behind them they subjected him to every possible insult. When they were fixing prices and seizing the farmer's goods I asked the following question on behalf of this party—

"Seeing that the price board fixes a maximum price on dairy produce, will he give instructions to the board to fix a minimum price which will give those engaged in the industry a living wage?"

Here is what the Premier said—

"The Chief Secretary has no power to give any such direction."

He had the power to seize the farmers' goods, to take what he liked at his own price, but he had no power to give a living wage. Those are the conditions under which the producers worked in those days. Here is another case. The Secretary for Agriculture admitted having seized all butter in cold stores at 140s. per cwt. The Minister said—

"The Government had, in the public interests, purchased at the proclaimed price—140s. per cwt.—all butter in cold stores available for export."

That butter, at that time, was worth 200s. per cwt. These were the days when the Government had a big majority. If you look up "Hansard" for 1915, page 761, you will see where the Government seized a certain number of sheep. I do not know

Mr. Bebbington.]

what price they paid for them, but I presume they got them on their own terms. In November, 1915, they fixed two prices for flour. One was £19 10s. per ton for imported flour, grown by semi-black labour, and the other was £9 10s. per ton for flour made from wheat grown by our own Queensland farmers. The Minister at the time, Mr. Hunter, admitted that I was right, and said that the price had been fixed in order to cover the price paid by the Government for the imported wheat.

You cannot offer a greater insult to any person than to disfranchise him. We had an ambassador from India here the other day practically pleading the cause of the Indians. Yet we find the Government practically disfranchising 20,000 country electors and putting them into other electorates, making country electorates of 6,000 or 7,000 people, and those in the city less, in order to have more electorates in the city, where they think they are in greater favour. As regards what is called the Government's "pet lamb"—that is the organisation of the farmers—compulsory organisation, I presume it is—

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: Do you advocate that?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I am in favour of any organisation which will put anything in the farmers' pockets. The first advisory board was appointed by the Queensland Cheese Manufacturers' Association, something like twelve years ago. At that time, in order to live, we were compelled to close the whole of the cheese factories, and not take any order under a rise of 25 per cent.; otherwise there would have been no cheese industry to-day. Yet we have hon. members opposite coming along now and stating what they have done for the industry.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: What did you do?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: We closed all the factories until we got our own price. I was the first president of the association, and I know what I am talking about.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I will put Mr. Harris on to you.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: The hon. gentleman says he will put Mr. Harris on to me. In putting Mr. Harris off the Advisory Board the hon. gentleman put off a very good man—a man who was secretary to the Butter Factories' Association, and who might have done a lot more good than some of those who remained on.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I have your apology here.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I ask the Minister to read it, or let him give it to me and I will read it. I want to tell the Minister that, instead of this association being non-political, it is political. So far as the apology is concerned, I said the man was a "camouflaged socialist," and it so offended him—he was so ashamed of the name—that he asked me to apologise, and I did. (Laughter.) If the word is so distasteful to anyone else that I call a socialist, I will apologise to him. I am very sorry the Minister has left the Chamber, because I was going to prove that the association he is forming is political. In the first place, the Government claim the right to nominate 25 per cent. of the members. Then the

[Mr. Bebbington.

Minister nominates other persons. I can give him proof that the men he nominated were political appointments and also proof that the Wheat Board wanted one man to represent them and the Minister nominated a Press representative. I suppose the hon. gentleman thought that the Press representative was more important from the Government's point of view than a practical wheatgrower would be to the wheatgrowers. When it was proposed to reduce the number on the council, the matter was left to the Government to nominate six other members on the council. I am not complaining about the members that were chosen.

The PREMIER: They were elected by the farmers' representatives.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: The final choice of the men was left to the Secretary for Agriculture. These six men are chosen by the Government, in addition to the 25 per cent. of Government representation, so I leave it to anyone to judge whether that body is free from politics or not.

The PREMIER: Are you against the scheme?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I am of the same opinion as Mr. Harris—so long as the scheme is free from politics, I am in favour of it.

The PREMIER: Then why are you attacking it?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I want to show the Minister how foolish he has made the council look. The Minister appointed a Press representative on the Advisory Council to the Wheat Board. The members of the Wheat Board are all practical men. We have farmers who have grown thousands of tons of ensilage and thousands of bags of wheat, yet they were not required on the Council of Agriculture. This Press representative was sent with two Government experts to Toowoomba to advise the Wheat Board. The man the Government nominated was Mr. McAnally.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I do not know what you are talking about.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: The Wheat Board wanted a man who was returned unopposed to the Wheat Board as their representative on the council, but the Minister immediately got up and nominated Mr. McAnally. Did the Minister not nominate that man?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: No.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: The hon. gentleman did. It is his word against mine. This man was rejected by the wheatgrowers.

The PREMIER: He was elected by the Dairy Conference.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: No.

The PREMIER: 110 delegates selected him at the Dairy Conference.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Did the Minister not nominate Mr. McAnally?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: He was not nominated at all. He was elected by the Dairy Conference.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: You are talking about one meeting and I am talking about another. The members of the Darling Downs Wheat Board are a lot of practical men elected by the wheatgrowers, and they know their business. This action of nominating Mr. McAnally and sending him with two Government experts to Toowoomba to meet

the Wheat Board brings the Government's new agricultural policy into contempt. If the scheme is free of politics, I am in favour of it. The Advisory Council which was part of the Farmers' Union platform, practically speaking, and which the hon. member for Pittsworth advocated ten years ago, and which was already in existence in connection with the Cheese Manufacturers' Association, was absolutely non-political. They elected their own chairman, struck their own levies, and controlled their own affairs, and indicated their wishes to the Government. That is far preferable to the Government's present scheme. The sugar-growers are 98 per cent. organised. These men know their business, and, when they meet, they know what they are talking about. The Government propose to bring the sugar-growers into a conference with men who do not know what they are talking about. The Cheese Manufacturers' Association has got practically all that it requires from this House. They are 100 per cent. organised, and they know their business. The Cheese Manufacturers' Association and the Cheese Pool control the whole industry. The Government propose to bring these men to meet a lot of other men who do not know their business. How is that going to be beneficial to the industry? The hon. member for Murrumba said that the Fruit Growers' Association works better than any other organisation. The men know their business. They have developed the industry to its present stage. The Government want the farmers to abandon these organisations or be swallowed up by their organisation, which is composed of men who do not know what they are talking about. I ask the Secretary for Agriculture "What offer was made to the Fruit Growers' Association," and how does he account for a letter being sent to them offering them £2,500 to adopt the Government's agricultural policy? The statement has been published in the Press, and the letter was seen on the Association's table by an hon. member, and yet the hon. gentleman lets the question pass by without any reply. If there is nothing in it, why does he not say there is nothing in it? Why did he leave these men under a cloud and allow it to be said that they had practically been offered a bribe?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Look at the clock.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: It is the hon. gentleman's duty to stand up here to-night, irrespective of the time, and say he did not offer it.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: What about the Standing Orders?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Never mind about the Standing Orders. How can the Association the hon. gentleman upholds be of any value to the producer if he has to bribe its members to come in?

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

At 10.30 p.m.,

The SPEAKER said: Under new Standing Order No. 17 the debate now stands adjourned.

The resumption of the debate was made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

The House adjourned at 10.31 p.m.