

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**TUESDAY, 11 JULY 1922**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 11 JULY, 1922.

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

QUESTIONS.

MUNBILLA-MOUNT EDWARDS RAILWAY  
EXTENSION.

Mr. BELL (*Fassifern*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

“1. What is the number of men now employed on the Munbilla-Mount Edwards Railway extension?”

“2. About what date is it expected that the Munbilla-Mount Edwards section will be opened for traffic?”

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

“1. 159.

“2. About the end of September next.”

COST OF RUNNING SUNDAY EXCURSION TRAINS  
IN CENTRAL-WESTERN QUEENSLAND.

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

“1. What is the average working cost per train mile for the year 1921-22 for the State of Queensland?”

“2. What is the cost per train mile of running Sunday excursion trains from—  
(a) Blackall to Alpha; (b) Blackall to Barcaldine; (c) Barcaldine to Longreach?”

“3. What proportion of the estimated total cost is the body requiring the train required to deposit?”

“4. On what principle does the Railway Department retain all surpluses over and above the guarantee?”

“5. As these excursions are invariably a success, from a financial point of view, will he consider the question of formulating another basis from which guarantees are computed, and apply same to the Western areas, to allow of more frequent intercourse between the isolated communities of the West, by making the cost of the expedition less to the individual or body desiring to make the trip?”

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS replied—

“1. 10s. 1½d.

“2. The cost of running these excursions, including overhead charges, repairs, etc., which are inseparable, is 10s. 1½d. per train mile.

“3. 7s. 6d. per train mile for Sunday trains, but in order to encourage business and allow residents of Western Queensland reasonable excursion facilities, lower guarantees have been accepted.

“4 and 5. See No. 3.”

LENGTH AND COST OF CONSTRUCTION OF  
PROCLAIMED MAIN ROADS.

Mr. KING (*Logan*) asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

“What is the total length of roads

already proclaimed main roads, and the approximate cost of same when completed?"

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

"The total length of roads already proclaimed main roads is 1,110 miles. The approximate cost of completing such roads is £1,930,000."

#### SALES OF CATTLE FROM STATE STATIONS.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*) asked the Minister in Charge of State Enterprises—

"1. What number of cattle have been sold from State stations during the year ended 30th June, 1922?"

"2. How many were sold and passed over to State butchers' shops?"

"3. How many were bought or acquired from other sources than the State stations for use in State butchers' shops?"

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

"1, 2, and 3. The information will be obtained."

#### SCHOOLS CLOSED IN MURILLA ELECTORATE AND THROUGHOUT QUEENSLAND.

Mr. MORGAN asked the Secretary for Public Instruction—

"1. How many schools—(a) State, (b) provisional, (c) half-time—have been closed in the electorate of Murilla during the year ended 30th June, 1922, owing to the average attendance being below nine scholars?"

"2. How many schools of all descriptions have been closed in Queensland during the year ended 30th June, 1922, for a similar reason?"

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. J. Huxham, *Buranda*) replied—

"1. The statement hereunder shows in respect to the electorate of Murilla—(a) the schools closed during the year ended 30th June, 1922, owing to the average attendance being below nine scholars; (b) the schools opened or reopened during the period in question.

#### SCHOOLS CLOSED.

Name of School.	Date of Closing.	Average Attendance at Date of Closing.
State—		
Gilgilgul ...	16th September, 1921	3.6
Juandah ...	31st March, 1922	7.2
Provisional—		
Inglestone ...	31st July, 1921	6.1
Merawa ...	2nd June, 1922	7.0
Part-time—		
Wilbah ...	10th February, 1922	7.6
Byrock ...		
Wattle Park ...		

"Summary: Schools closed—State 2, provisional 2, part-time 1. Grand total of schools closed—5.

#### SCHOOLS OPENED OR REOPENED.

Name of School.	Class of School.	Date of Opening or Re-opening.
Merawa ...	Provisional	Opened 19th September, 1921
Goordiwindi West	State	Reopened 22nd May, 1922
Arubial ...	Part-time	Reopened on full-time basis 1st July, 1921
Gilgilgul ...	State	Reopened as a part-time school 6th February, 1922

"Summary: Schools opened or reopened—State 1, provisional 2, part-time 1. Grand total of schools opened or reopened—4.

"2. Thirty-five; but during the same period 67 new schools of all descriptions were opened in Queensland, and 33 schools were reopened."

#### DISCHARGED SOLDIER SELECTORS.

Mr. MORGAN asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

"1. What is the number of discharged soldiers who have selected Crown lands throughout the State?"

"2. What is the total area selected?"

"3. What is the number that have forfeited their selections?"

"4. What is the area of land thus forfeited?"

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS replied—

"1. The total number of blocks which have been allotted to soldier settlers as Crown selections to 30th June, 1922, is 3,425.

"2. Total area of same, 974,691 acres.

"3. The total number of blocks which have been forfeited by soldier settlers to 30th June, 1922, is 867.

"4. Total area of same, 182,052 acres."

#### GOVERNMENT MOTOR CARS.

Mr. MORGAN asked the Premier—

"How many motor cars were owned by the Government on the 30th June, 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921, and 1922?"

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

"The information will be obtained."

Mr. MORGAN: We got that answer last year.

#### COMPARISON OF STATE AND PRIVATE BUSINESS ENTERPRISES.

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

"In order that a fair comparison may be made between the results shown by businesses conducted by the State and similar businesses conducted by private enterprise, and also in order that the public may realise the actual losses on the various State enterprises, will he issue instructions—

(a) That in respect of those State businesses (exclusive of the railways)

which have since their inception disclosed a profit in any year, the amount of State and Commonwealth income tax shall be charged which would have been payable had each such State business been conducted by a private company at the same rate of profit?

(b) That in respect of all State businesses, all charges, such as State and Commonwealth land tax, interest at current rate for bank overdraft, etc., shall be made which would have been payable had each business respectively been conducted by a private company?

(c) That in respect of State stations, the Land Court shall make such reappraisements of rent as would have been made had the stations not been purchased by the Government, and that in making up the profit and loss account of each State station, the actual rent as so reappraised (including all retrospective rent which would have been payable) shall be charged?"

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

"The results of the State enterprises are very clearly and fully set out in the financial statements given in the report on the department presented to Parliament annually and certified to by the Auditor-General. The honourable member should know that the principle underlying State enterprises is that any profits accruing to the enterprises—after full charges for interest and depreciation have been made—shall be returned to the Treasury. Since their inception, and up to 30th June last, there has been paid to the Treasury in interest a total sum of £365,600; and out of the profits of various enterprises there has been repaid to the Treasury since 1919 the sum of £76,000. In addition, the State stations have paid the full amount charged by the Lands Department for rents (over £76,000) since their inception."

DUPLICATION OF RAILWAY FROM EAGLE JUNCTION TO PINKENBA, AND ENLARGEMENT OF RAILWAY STATIONS.

Mr. PETRIE (*Toombul*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

"Now that branch sidings from the Pinkenba Railway line have been put in to the Hamilton Cold Stores and to the Whinstanes Cotton Ginning Mill, will he consult with the Commissioner for Railways with the view of having the railway line from Eagle Junction to Pinkenba duplicated, and the buildings and platforms at Clayfield, Hendra, Ascot, Doomben, Whinstanes, Eagle Farm, and Pinkenba enlarged and altered to meet the requirements of the people living in those districts, thus preventing accidents that are now more likely to occur from short platforms and other inconveniences that now exist?"

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS replied—

"Yes."

RAILWAY REFRESHMENT-ROOM CHARGES.

Mr. MORGAN asked the Minister for State Enterprises—

"1. Has his attention been drawn to the announcement that the New South

Wales Government has agreed to reduce the charges for meals at refreshment stations to 2s.?

"2. Owing to the cost of living having been considerably reduced, will he bring about a similar reduction in Queensland, and thus give the travelling public an opportunity of obtaining a good meal at a reasonable price?"

HON. W. FORGAN SMITH replied—

"1 and 2. The honourable member does not state the class of meal provided for 2s. in New South Wales, consequently his comparison is of no value. It is customary to review the question of charges at our rooms at the end of each financial year, and this is now being done by the department. I might inform the honourable member, however, that the Queensland Railway Refreshment-rooms—under departmental control—have for the last six years supplied the travelling public with a high quality service at a much lower price than any other similar service in Australia, and, at the same time, returned substantial profits to the Treasury. The Trade Commissioner holds certified statements that the charges made by six representative cafés in Brisbane for a meal similar to that provided in the State Refreshment-rooms for 2s. 6d. were as under—three at 3s.: one at 3s. 5d.; one at 4s. 9d.; one at 6s. 1d. I also wish to inform the honourable member that the syndicate with which he is acquainted has no chance of securing control of this enterprise."

AMOUNT PAID AT STATE CANNERY FOR IMPORTED FRUIT PULP.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*), in the absence of Mr. Sizer (*Nundah*), asked the Minister in Charge of State Enterprises—

"What amount has been paid by the State Cannery for fruit pulp imported from Southern States from 1st July, 1921, to 30th June, 1922?"

HON. W. FORGAN SMITH replied—

"The amount paid was the market price at date of purchase of the various fruit pulps unprocureable in Queensland."

EARNINGS AND EXPENDITURE AT BARALABA STATE COAL MINE; TENDERS FOR CONCRETE SHAFT AT STYX RIVER COALMINE.

Mr. BRAND (*Burrum*) asked the Secretary for Mines—

"1. What was the amount of (a) gross income, (b) gross expenditure, of the State coalmines at Baralaba for the year ended 30th June, 1922?"

"2. Is it a fact that tenders were accepted for putting down a concrete shaft at the Styx coal area?"

"3. If so—(a) who was the successful contractor; (b) what was the contract price?"

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

"1. The information will be disclosed in the Auditor-General's report.

"2. Tenders were not called for sinking a shaft at Styx coal mine.

"3. See answer to No 2."

## SUPER TAX ON INCOME AND LAND TAXES.

Mr. BRAND asked the Treasurer—

"1. Is it his intention to withdraw the imposition of the super tax on income and land taxes payable for the year ended 30th June, 1922?"

"2. If not, will he have included in the proposed amendments of the land and income taxes a provision prohibiting its imposition?"

The TREASURER replied—

"The intentions of the Government will be disclosed in due course."

(Laughter.)

## PROHIBITION OF STREET AND OPEN LANE BETTING.

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

"Will he take the necessary steps to prohibit street and open lane betting?"

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

"The Police have already been instructed to take whatever action is necessary, and are well aware of their duty in the matter."

## SUGGESTED DISPOSAL OF STATE STATIONS.

Mr. MAXWELL asked the Minister in Charge of State Enterprises—

"In the face of the statements made by the Premier about State stations, will he take the necessary steps to dispose of them?"

HON. W. FORGAN SMITH replied—

"The future policy regarding State stations is at present under consideration."

## LOSS ON ROCKHAMPTON-PARKHURST TRAIN: COST OF YEPPON-BYFIELD RAILWAY.

Mr. PETERSON (*Normanby*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

"1. What financial loss has been incurred by the Railway Department in the running of the Rockhampton-Parkhurst train for the period 1st October, 1920, to 30th June, 1922?"

"2. What was the cost of the railway surveys for the proposed Yeppoon-Byfield Railway?"

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS replied—

"1. This information will be made available later. The farmers of Parkhurst and district and the residents of Park avenue and Glenmore use this train, and I do not intend to deprive them of the service.

"2. £1,700 for a distance of 26 miles."

## AGREEMENT BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND BRISBANE TRAMWAYS COMPANY, LIMITED.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) asked the Premier—

"1. Will he lay upon the table of the House the agreement between the Government and the Brisbane Tramways Company relating to the taking over of the trams?"

"2. Does he consider it fair or business-like to ask the local authorities concerned in the proposed trust to consider the question of taking the trams over without knowing the contents of the agreement, and what the terms are, and the cost will be?"

"3. Will a poll be allowed under the Local Authorities Acts, if the electors concerned in the areas apply for same, before the proposed trust is allowed to finalise matters?"

"4. Does he not consider the time opportune to allow the terms of the agreement to become known, seeing that the local authorities have no data to go on?"

The PREMIER replied—

"1 to 4. As these questions are based on the erroneous assumption that there is an agreement between the Government and the Brisbane Tramways Company, the hon. member is advised to await the introduction of the proposed legislation on the subject."

## LIABILITY TO STAMP DUTY ON FEDERAL ALLOWANCE RECEIPTS ISSUED BY FRIENDLY SOCIETIES AND AMBULANCE BRIGADES.

Mr. T. R. ROBERTS (*East Toowoomba*) asked the Attorney-General—

"1. Are receipts issued to a registered friendly society by a member or dependent for funeral allowance subject to stamp duty?"

"Are receipts for donations to ambulance brigades subject to stamp duty?"

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

"1. No.

"2. No."

## USE OF LIGHT STEAM CARS ON RAILWAYS.

Mr. T. R. ROBERTS asked the Secretary for Railways—

"1. In view of the curtailment of railway services in country districts, has money been provided to the Railway Commissioner to enable him to secure a light class of steam car, capable of carrying a few passengers, mails, and cream, and giving it a trial, as mentioned in report of Commissioner for Railways, 1921 (page 18)?"

"2. If money is not available, will he press Cabinet to make available such sum as would enable the Commissioner to provide quicker transit in country districts?"

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS replied—

"1 and 2. Very little alteration has been made in the branch line services during the last three years. Inquiries are being made to secure a suitable car, and money will be made available when necessary."

## RAILWAY FARE CONCESSIONS TO SETTLERS ON MINING HOMESTEAD LEASES.

Mr. FLETCHER (*Port Curtis*) asked the Minister for Mines—

"Will he take steps to make provision for settlers on mining homestead leases to obtain similar concessions as settlers

under the Lands Department receive in the matter of fares for their wives and families when travelling to their selections?"

The SECRETARY FOR MINES replied—

"No. As miners' homestead perpetual leases, except town allotments within a coalmining field, are available only to residents of the gold or mineral field on which the land is situated, the question of granting railway concessions could not apply thereto."

BRISBANE TRAMWAY TRUST BILL.  
INITIATION.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. W. McCormack, *Cairns*) 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 provide for the acquisition, construction, management, and working of tramways in Brisbane."

Question put and passed.

VACANCY IN SENATE OF COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA.

ELECTION OF JOHN VALENTINE MACDONALD, VICE JOHN ADAMSON, DECEASED.

The PREMIER (Hon. E. G. Theodore, *Chillagor*), in moving—

"That John Valentine MacDonald be elected to hold the place in the Senate rendered vacant by the death of Senator John Adamson,"

said: There is no necessity for me particularly to stress the nomination. Mr. MacDonald already has been appointed under the authority of the Executive to fill the vacancy in accordance with the terms of the Commonwealth Constitution Act, and we are asking the Assembly now to confirm the appointment. Mr. John V. MacDonald has the confidence of the Labour organisations of Queensland, and has been duly selected to represent the Labour movement in the Senate. It may be said that the Senator whose place he is taking represented some other political party, but there is an answer to that. It may be pointed out that the representation of the Labour movement in the Senate is indeed very small—far below what it is entitled to, even on the voting at the last general election.

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): I have a nomination to submit. I regret the occasion which makes it necessary for this House to take into consideration the appointment of a successor to the late Senator John Adamson. I think that the whole of this Assembly regrets his tragic end. (Hear, hear!) Senator Adamson was a man whose name will go down to posterity as one who was prepared to set aside personal considerations for the sake of what he considered to be his undoubted national duty. The name that I desire to submit to this Assembly with all respect is that of James Peter Peterson, of "Mardan," Adelaide street, Clayfield, Brisbane.

Mr. BRENNAN: He is your leader.

Mr. VOWLES: I think an anomaly has arisen, so far as the procedure of this House is concerned. We must take it that, when the Federal Government declared the method by

which vacancies in the Senate should be filled, the members of that Government presupposed that the Government of the State for the time being would be representative of the political feeling of the majority of the people in that State. That is not so here. It is a well-known fact that hon. members sitting in Opposition represent a larger number of electors of Queensland than hon. members on the Government side of the House.

The PREMIER: Your party only got 78,000 votes.

Mr. VOWLES: At the last Senate elections, the late Senator Adamson received 163,000 votes, and Mr. Ferricks, who was the highest Labour candidate, only received 134,000 votes.

Mr. POLLOCK: And yet the Labour party got no representation.

Mr. VOWLES: Those figures showed that a very large percentage of the people were not in accord with the doctrines of the Labour party. We are asked by the Government to support a gentleman who is known to be an advocate of communism. (Government laughter.) The gentleman nominated is known from his writings to be an advocate of communism. (Government laughter.) That gentleman was editor of the "Daily Standard," and we take it he must have been responsible for the articles that appeared in that paper, and that he is a straightout advocate of communism.

Mr. BRENNAN: And free love, too. I suppose?

Mr. VOWLES: The hon. member cannot get over the event that is to happen on the 19th. (Laughter.) Presumably, the majority of hon. members sitting on the Government side of the House to-day are not sympathetic towards communism, for, if they were, they would not be bringing into this Chamber the legislation which is foreshadowed. The nomination I propose is that of James Peter Peterson, of "Mardan," Adelaide street, Clayfield, Brisbane, who declares—

"I, James Peter Peterson, of "Mardan," Adelaide street, Clayfield, Brisbane, grazing farmer, hereby declare that I am legally qualified to be a member of the Senate of the Parliament of the Commonwealth, and I hereby consent to be nominated at this election, and to act if elected.

"Dated this third day of July, 1922.

" (Sgd.) JAMES PETER PETERSON."

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): I also have a nomination to submit to the House. The reason why the Nationalist party are submitting this nomination is because the late Senator John Adamson—whose death, I am sure, every hon. member in this Chamber deeply deplors and regrets, irrespective of what his political views may be—was a representative of the Central district as a Nationalist candidate; and we think that at this time Central Queensland should have representation in the Senate. For that reason, I desire to nominate William George Thompson, merchant, of Rockhampton, for the position of Senator.

Mr. STOPFORD: Shoot low.

Mr. POLLOCK: Is there not a nomination from the Northern Country party, too?

Mr. STOPFORD: "Two-gun Jim!"

*Mr. Taylor.*

Question—That John Valentine MacDonald be elected to the vacancy in the Senate—put; and the House divided:—

In division—

The SPEAKER said: Under the Standing Order the Speaker, as the presiding officer, is entitled to vote, and I therefore record my vote with the "Ayes."

AYES, 37.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Jones, A. J.
" Bertram	" Kirwan
" Brennan	" Land
" Bulcock	" Lacombe
" Collins	" McCormack
" Conroy	" Mullan
" Cooper, F.A.	" Payne
" Cooper, W.	" Pease
" Covne	" Pollock
" Dash	" Bordan
" Dunstan	" Ryan
" Ferricks	" Smith
" Foler	" Stopford
" Forde	" Theodore
" Gilday	" Weir
" Gillies	" Wellington
" Gledson	" Wilson
" Hartley	" Winstanley
" Huxham	

Tellers: Mr. Forde and Mr. Pease.

NOES, 34.

Mr. Appel	Mr. King
" Barnes, W. H.	" Logan
" Bebbington	" Macerregor
" Bell	" Maxwell
" Brand	" Moore
" Cattermull	" Morgan
" Clayton	" Nott
" Corser	" Patyson
" Costello	" Petrie
" Deacon	" Roberts, J. H. C.
" Edwards	" Roberts, T. R.
" Elphinstone	" Sizer
" Fletcher	" Swaync
" Fry	" Taylor
" Green	" Vowles
" Jones, J.	" Walker
" Kerr	" Warren

Tellers: Mr. Brand and Mr. Sizer.

Resolved in the affirmative.

MESSAGE TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR.

The PREMIER: I beg to move—

"That Mr. Speaker be requested to forthwith inform His Excellency the Governor that John Valentine MacDonald has been chosen to hold the place in the Senate rendered vacant by the death of Senator John Adamson."

Question put and passed.

## PRIMARY PRODUCERS' ORGANISATION BILL.

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

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

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): I was going into the expenditure of money in connection with this scheme when I was stopped by the operation of the Standing Orders at half-past 4 o'clock on Friday last. It appears [4 p.m.] to me that if this large amount of money is going to be spent, as foreshadowed in the provisions of the Bill and in accordance with the opinion of those who appear to be in the confidence of the Government in this matter, then the money will be expended at the wrong end. I cannot see why it should be necessary to employ such a horde of organisers for a scheme which the farmers have been asking

[Mr. Vowles.

for, and why these organisers should be going round as publicity agents in a semi-political way. I say that advisedly.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You should prove it.

Mr. VOWLES: I am going to prove it. They are going round booting themselves, and claiming credit for things that they have no connection with, and the Government are urging their claims upon existing political organisations in view of this scheme being put into effect.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Do you object to the scheme?

Mr. VOWLES: I do not object to the scheme, but I object to the people being fooled. If this is a genuine scheme, then we are willing to support it. It has been foreshadowed in the Governor's Speech, and referred to in the newspapers. It was referred to by the Secretary for Agriculture as the scheme mentioned by the Premier when he was at Lowood. Hon. members will find in the "Daily Mail" of the 4th instant that some of the publicity agents spoke in reference to the Advisory Board, and, in support of their claim that the existence of the scheme was justified, made this statement—

"Some few weeks ago suppliers to factories were receiving as low as 7d. per lb. for butter fat, while to-day they are receiving from 1s. 1d. to 1s. 2d."

You will find that a publicity agent in another part of the same paper has this paragraph—

"RISE IN BUTTER.

"Mr. W. Kelso, secretary of the Queensland Butter Pool, advises that the price of butter will be 196s. per cwt. (1s. 9d. per lb.), as from to-day. The prolonged dry spell and the consequent rapid decline in the supply of milk are largely responsible for the increase."

There is the proof of a scheme, and, if it is not boosting it up for political purposes, what are they doing it for?

Mr. W. COOPER: You do not want it.

Mr. VOWLES: We do want it.

Mr. W. COOPER: Why do you object to it?

Mr. VOWLES: We do not object to it, but we say it should be done under the supervision of the Agricultural Department. Do hon. members opposite say that it is necessary to create another sub-department, which is going to cost anything up to £50,000 per annum?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Then you are against it?

Mr. VOWLES: I am not against it; but it is a commentary on the department of which the hon. gentleman is in charge.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: If you were in power, would you not do it?

Mr. VOWLES: Don't be silly.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Be logical—connect your remarks.

Mr. VOWLES: I want to be honest about it. I do not want to spend money simply for electioneering purposes. I was talking about the expenditure of this £50,000, or a large proportion of it, in paying these agents £8 a week, and 17s. 6d. a day travelling expenses, to go round the country, presumably for very little purpose. All the expenditure is going

on in the way of advertising and boosting the scheme for political purposes. If the department, or the Government, were to expend their proportion of this money outside Queensland, looking for markets for our surplus produce, they would be acting in a businesslike way. I understand that something has been done in that direction, with a view to trying to create a market for Queensland produce; but I would urge the Government to get busy in other directions and try to establish markets in the East and elsewhere which have not been exploited up to the present time. If money is spent in that way, we can deal with our surplus produce. As regards the future, once the people are satisfied the Government are acting in a businesslike way, and doing something for the money which is being expended, they will be behind the scheme.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That is what I expected of you. Are there not plenty of people who are freetraders for some things and not for others?

Mr. VOWLES: Perhaps the hon. gentleman is like freetraders who are freetraders for some things but not for others. I say that we want this; the farmers want it; we have asked for it; and it is in our platform. It is a part of the platform which was enunciated years ago by the Farmers' party.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: What are you crying over it for?

Mr. VOWLES: I am not crying over it. All I want to impress on the Government is that we are not going to sit here and allow them to make use of the people in the country for political purposes. For the last seven years the Government have had the opportunity of doing something in the interests of the farmers; but, instead of doing something for their benefit, I can point to scores of things that the Government did which were to the disadvantage of the farmers. It is for that reason that I doubt this eleventh hour repentance of the Government, I doubt their sincerity. I know that the Government are not sincere in this matter. It is pure window-dressing. This is another occasion on which the Government are going to use the public funds of Queensland in an illegal way to advertise themselves and try to retain the Treasury benches. I do not propose to say anything further at this stage. When we get the Bill I will criticise it, and, if I can assist the Secretary for Agriculture to put it on the statute-book and make it a better Bill than it is at present, I will do so. We are determined to see that, when the Bill is passed, it is not going to remain a dead letter. At the next general election we are going to make every endeavour to see that members are returned to Parliament who will see that this will become a live measure, and not like some that we have on the statute-book to-day.

Mr. BEBBINGTON (*Drayton*): I would like to tell the Minister in charge of this Bill that the statement that he made about the primary producers not being organised is incorrect. The sugar producers, the butter producers, the cheese producers, and the fruit growers are all organised, and, in addition, we have the wheat pool. That means that 90 per cent. of the primary producers are already organised industrially. I would like to ask the Secretary for Agriculture if only those who are members of the Government organisation will be entitled to vote. Is he

going to give power to levy on all the factories, because it is just like levying on workers' wages, and that is a very serious thing? I had a return given to me by one of our factories in connection with the Federal cheese pool of 1921, showing that levies cost this particular factory 1s. per cwt. That is why I want to know how far this Bill gives power to levy on the producers' wages, which, as I say, is equal to a levy on workers' wages. I maintain that, if we brought a Bill before this Committee giving the Government power to levy on the workmen's wages, we would soon hear about it from outside.

Mr. WARREN: This is another tax.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I want to know if the tax is for the members of the organisation only, and will they be the only ones who will have the vote? Otherwise we shall have thousands of people who are going to have their wages levied on who will not join this organisation at all. If they will not join the Government organisation, do the Government propose to levy on their wages to support their organisation?

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Do you advise them not to join it?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I want to know, if persons will not join the hon. gentleman's organisation, does he propose to levy on their wages? If he does, then he proposes to levy on their wages to support an association which they object to. I maintain that 90 per cent. of the producers are already organised in the big industrial unions, and here we have the Minister coming along and saying that they are disorganised.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Don't come to any conclusion until you have seen the Bill.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I call the Minister's attention to a speech which he made in Dalby, where he said that the show was important, but not so important as the Government's proposition regarding this council would be. Then he went on to say how the fruit industry was disorganised.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Hear, hear!

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Last session the Minister knows that we had foreshadowed in the Governor's Speech certain legislation to deal with important matters in regard to the fruit industry. Did not the people in the Stanthorpe district undertake financial responsibilities on account of that being put in the Governor's Speech? Did not these organisations send their representatives down here week after week?

THE CHAIRMAN: Order! Order! I would point out to the hon. gentleman that there is a resolution before the Committee. I do not wish to interfere with the hon. member's rights, but it is necessary to discuss the resolution and not introduce any extraneous matter.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: We have got to be very careful about this resolution, and we should not be restricted in our discussion. I was pointing out that after these arrangements were made last session to deal with fruit, and the Minister referred to it at Dalby, the hon. gentleman and the other members of the Government simply adjourned Parliament and went away to the Melbourne races and allowed the producers to run in their own fat.

*Mr. Bebbington.]*



Mr. FRY (*Kurilpa*): The Nationalist party will support any Bill that is introduced for the benefit of the man on the land—the man who makes his living out of the soil. We have always supported the man on the land, and our sympathy and agitation for the farmers did not originate during the last couple of months, as is the case with the Government. Ever since I have been in this House I can say that the members on the Opposition benches have always advocated the cause of the farmer, pointing out the difficulties which he had to struggle through in order to make a living, and seeking benefits for him. In season and out of season members on this side have always done all they possibly could for the farmers, and have always endeavoured to convince the Government that they ought to do something in this respect. When I was speaking on the want of confidence motion on 24th August last, I spoke about the elements which existed in our midst, when an attempt was made to upset constitutional government by revolutionary methods, and I made use of these remarks—

“The remedy for unemployment is to restore to Queensland parliamentary control of the affairs of State, and to cut out this exotic growth which is poisoning the minds of the people, as a surgeon would cut out a cancer—cut it out and spare no root of it. Let the Government during the next ten years devote their whole attention to encouraging primary and secondary industries, increasing production by lightening taxation so that with a flourishing State, a beehive of industry, unemployment will cease and there will be plenty of work so that under proper management there will be very little deficiency to make up, and the railways will pay.”

The sentiments then expressed were simply those of anyone who is interested in this State, and who loves his State more than a communistic State. We all know that co-operation has materially helped the farmers and primary producers in various parts of the world, including America, Denmark, France, Germany, and Switzerland. The Minister has informed us that this scheme has been to a very large extent imported from America, that it is experimental, and that the farmers must make a success of it; that, if they put forward proposals, they should have their own way, and, if they make a failure, the Government will not be to blame. That sets out clearly the fact that the Government are going to lose all interest in the matter so soon as the Council of Agriculture puts forward a proposal hostile to them. The Government are responsible for sending throughout the State many organisers, and it naturally follows that we have to analyse the action of the Government to see just how far it has a political touch about it. If it has a political touch, then more is the pity, because, after all, the introduction of a Bill of this kind should be for the welfare of the primary producers generally and of the people living in the cities as well.

We know that this Bill has been delayed for seven years. For seven years the Government have been making the primary producers squeal, and taxing them for the amusement of the industrialists.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Who made that statement?

[*Mr. Fry.*]

Mr. FRY: I am making the statement. I do not want to refer to individuals, but everyone knows who reads at all that the hon. members sitting behind the Government or those who have been associated with the Government either inside or outside the House have always talked about making the producers squeal.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That is deliberately untrue.

Mr. FRY: People do not talk loudly when they are proposing to break and enter a house—these things are done in secret—and the owner who loses his property squeals. The farmer has been taxed to such an extent since the present Government took control of affairs that he is squealing. When the hon. member for Drayton, a prominent member of the Opposition and the representative of a farming constituency, brought forward an amendment to the Profiteering Prevention Bill, the whole of the Government voted against it, although it embodied the very proposals brought forward by the Government to-day.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Don't be silly.

Mr. FRY: I am not silly; and I am not silly enough to believe that there is any difference between the proposal brought forward by that member of the Opposition to constitute a board to advise the Government and a Council of Agriculture for the same purpose. There may be a difference in the magnitude and scope of its operations, but the principle is the same, and the Government in 1919 voted against the proposition which they are making to-day. They have come to their senses and the Nationalist party support them for doing so, but we want to have some proof of sincerity so far as the administration of the measure is concerned.

The Nationalist party have recognised for a long time that the farmer's friends were the men who worked for him, and that the farmers befriended the men in the cities, and in their platform they have the following provisions:—

#### “ENCOURAGEMENT OF PRODUCTION AND MANUFACTURE.

“13. Guaranteeing the right of every citizen to convey and dispose of his or her produce in the open market in any part of the Commonwealth without restriction by any combination or Government, and generally securing to primary producers the full value of their labour.

#### “AGRICULTURE AND STOCK.

“14. (a) The simplification of the existing laws relating to agriculture and stock, and the reorganisation of the Department of Agriculture, so as to obtain the most efficient, scientific, and practical direction and administration, and the highest efficiency in production.

“(b) A vigorous irrigation and conservation of water policy.”

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope the hon. member will quote only those planks relating to the resolution under discussion. I cannot allow him to quote the whole platform.

Mr. FRY: I am not going to do that, because our platform is so extensive that it

covers every individual in the State. I am dealing with the farmers only, and our platform provides—

“(b) A vigorous irrigation and conservation of water policy.

“(c) State assistance in the conservation of fodder.”

The CHAIRMAN: I would point out to the hon. member that he cannot deal at this stage with the contents of the Bill. I suggest that he keep the discussion to the principle involved in the resolution.

Mr. FRY: I shall do that. I quite understand the position. This is the point I want to get at—

“(d) Formation of a Board of Agriculture (to be a consulting and advisory body to the Government), and the establishment of an agricultural bureau.”

That is on all fours with the proposition of the Government, and it is in our platform, which was published to the world some years ago and advocated in 1920 by myself and others of our party. The same remark applies to the other proposition associating the construction of railways with the Council. I am very pleased to see that the Commissioner for Railways is to be a member of the Board, because that again is the adoption of a policy which we previously submitted. It cannot, therefore, be reasonably expected that the Nationalist party will offer any serious objection to the introduction of this measure, and for that reason we will give it all the assistance we possibly can. I for one am happy to see that the Government have awakened to their duty to the community even at the eleventh hour, and have introduced a Bill which is going to make for the betterment of the man on the land and generally for the happiness of the people and the reduction of unemployment.

At 4.30 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN said: Under the operation of Standing Order No. 17, I must now leave the chair and make my report to the House.

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

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY.

##### RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. FORDE (*Rockhampton*): I have to offer my meed of praise and congratulation to the hon. member who moved the Address in Reply, and to the hon. member who seconded that motion. Each [4.30 p.m.] made a thoughtful address, and showed he had a good knowledge of Queensland and her requirements. Any one who is at all a student of politics must feel very grateful to the Government for having brought down such a list of very constructive measures as have been promised in the Governor's Speech. Quite a number of them are calculated to improve the lot of the man on the land. I am very pleased to notice that there is to be a Bill to amend the Workers' Compensation Act, providing for the payment of additional compensation to men suffering from miners' phthisis. That is a measure in which a number of members on this side of the House are interested. It is one in respect of which the hon. member for Mount Morgan and I waited on the Attorney-General, because we had received certain communications from the miners' phthisis committee in Mount Morgan, and

I am pleased to say that we got a sympathetic reply. Many of those men to-day are not getting an adequate allowance. It is desired that, if they die, a lump sum should be paid to their widows.

I, like other hon. members, am very pleased that His Excellency the Governor, during his term of office in Queensland, has taken the trouble to get round this great State to learn its requirements, and to know its people. He has favoured Central Queensland in that direction. I had the privilege of accompanying His Excellency, the Premier, the Secretary for Railways, the hon. member for Fitzroy, and the hon. member for Mount Morgan over the Dawson Valley water conservation and irrigation area. The Governor took a keen interest in everything he saw. I had an opportunity of accompanying him to the cotton farms in the Dawson Valley district. He obtained a fund of information, and was good enough to congratulate the Government for going on with the water conservation and irrigation scheme, because of the way in which it would assist towards the speedy development of Central Queensland. Anyone who travels over the Dawson Valley area is greatly impressed with the wonderful results that will accrue after the big dam has been built on the Dawson River and the irrigation scheme is carried out. According to experts, it will mean greatly increased land settlement; it will mean that people who settle there will not be subjected to the vagaries of the seasons, but will be assured of sufficient water to grow crops even in the driest season. I recently was very much impressed with what the Hon. Frank Clarke, Minister for Works in Victoria, said regarding the possibilities of irrigation. He said—

“Irrigation is one of the means by which Australia will be assisted out of her difficulties. On the Victorian side of the Murray the land is irrigated, and it is worth £20 per acre. £11,000,000 spent on irrigation in Victoria has increased the value of the land served by £89,000,000.”

Can we not expect something of that kind in the Dawson River area? Then, by utilising the waters of the Dawson, experts say we can get cheap power. Cheap power is a necessity in Central Queensland, if we are to become a big manufacturing district. We have all the raw materials—the wool, the coal, the cotton. Why not have secondary industries? Cheap power is the chief essential; and we shall be able to get that by utilising the waters of the Dawson and the Fitzroy rivers. That is another aspect of the great Dawson scheme. Going over that Dawson water conservation area, I was greatly impressed with the scope that our Main Roads Board will have. One could not travel over those areas without feeling that there is absolute necessity for the construction of good roads in Queensland. In many of the areas in Central Queensland to-day the roads are not fit for the farmers to travel over. His Excellency the Governor had an opportunity of seeing that for himself. The Main Roads Board Act passed by this Government has not been long in operation, but the members of the board have already got on the right track, and are doing good work. Over 1,000 miles of roads have been proclaimed main roads, and it would cost £1,000,000 to complete them. I am pleased that I was able to induce the members of the board to come to Central

*Mr. Forde.*

Queensland, and to see there many of the roads which require rebuilding. The result will be that a great deal of road work will be done by the board in Central Queensland.

On reading the newspapers this morning and listening to the debate this afternoon, I find that the National Democratic Council of Central Queensland have selected General W. G. Thompson as the Senate candidate for the vacancy caused by the death of the late John Adamson. I have nothing to say against General Thompson as a citizen; no one could say anything against him. He is a gentleman, but I do not think he would be a fit person to elect to the Senate, as I do not think he would meet with the approval of the majority of the electors of Queensland. The leader of the Nationalist party thinks he would. Of course, General Thompson is the president of the Employers' Federation, and that is sufficient to ensure that he meets with the approval of the leader of the Nationalist party and also of the hon. member for Toowoong. General Thompson has been a political candidate before; he was a candidate at the last State general election, when he was defeated by the Secretary for Railways. General Thompson, as well as another well-known Conservative in Australia, came into prominence recently. Mr. (now Sir Henry) Barwell came into prominence because he advocated black labour for the Northern portions of Australia. General Thompson came into prominence because he inferred that a few mounted infantrymen could drive the workers back in a strike. According to the exposure of the hon. member for Mackay (the Hon. W. Forgan Smith), at a secret meeting of the Queensland Employers' Federation which was held—if I remember rightly—in January of this year, General Thompson said—

“There is another aspect of this, and that is this: Have we any machinery able to provide for armed forces? Is there any machinery to-day by which you can put your hand on some reliable force to put against the force of—

“Mr. R. Bowen: Hooliganism.

“General Thompson: If you have a few regulars, it is wonderful what they can resist. I have seen 500 men in the shearers' strike held up by seventy-five mounted infantry men.”

No doubt General Thompson was voicing the opinions of the Opposition, and of the Nationalist party in particular. No doubt Premier Barwell was doing the same thing. Indeed, Premier Barwell had the courage to come forward and say, “There are thousands and thousands of Conservatives in Australia who think the same as I do, but are not prepared to say it.” No doubt that is what General Thompson thinks, and that is why he was nominated this afternoon by the leader of the Nationalist party—because the hon. gentleman thinks that his views coincide with the views of the Nationalists.

Mr. KING: That is pure assumption.

Mr. FORDE: It is just as well that the people should know the facts.

Mr. KING: So long as they get facts it is all right.

Mr. FORDE: I am giving them the facts; they will not get them from the hon. member for Logan. During my tour of the Dawson Valley area I had an opportunity, with the

hon. member for Mount Morgan and other members of the party, of visiting great cotton areas, meeting the people who grew the cotton, and seeing the cotton under cultivation. I also visited areas in the Bracewell, Yeppoon, Marmor, Bajool and Mount Laram districts and in other places, and had an opportunity of seeing cotton under cultivation and studying the industry. I was one of the first who advocated cotton-growing in Queensland.

Mr. KING: It was grown in Queensland before you were born.

Mr. FORDE: Probably it was; but I was one of the first hon. members in this House to advocate that cotton-growing should be taken up in a large way. The Labour Government, by giving a guaranteed price of 5½d. per lb. for a period of three years ended June, 1923, have placed the cotton industry on its present firm footing. Had it not been for that guarantee there would not be the prosperity in the cotton industry that the farmers now enjoy. To show what effect the guaranteeing of the price by the Labour Government had on the cotton industry, I will give some figures with respect to the Wowan district, where I had the greatest opportunity of studying the industry. During the first year of the guarantee only 238 acres were under cotton cultivation, which in that year returned 868 lb. to the acre, giving an average of £18 10s. 8d. sterling to the grower. In the United States of America for the same year the average was only 500 lb. to the acre, showing that the Dawson Valley district was infinitely better for cotton-growing than America. For the season just closed, cotton was picked from 2,500 acres in the Dawson Valley district as against 238 acres for the previous year. Practically no land was under cotton before the Labour Government came forward with its guaranteed price of 5½d. per lb. for a period of three years.

Mr. CORSER: How was that made possible?

Mr. FORDE: It was made possible by the Labour Premier of Queensland when he was in England.

Mr. CORSER: No—the Agent-General.

Mr. FORDE: The Queensland Labour Premier was responsible for the guaranteed price for cotton as a result of his negotiations with the British Cotton Growers' Association in England. That association promised to compensate for any loss to the extent of £10,000, but that amount has already been absorbed, and any loss in the season just closed will have to be borne by the Labour Government of Queensland—and rightly so—in the interests of the farmers who are engaged in the cotton industry.

Mr. CORSER: No.

Mr. FORDE: I believe that an industry such as the cotton industry should be assisted in the initial stages by way of a guaranteed price. When a man goes out into the Dawson Valley district as I have seen them, and desires to take up cotton-growing, he has to clear land, buy ploughs and farming implements, and horses, etc., and there is a good deal of initial expenditure. If he gets a guaranteed price for a period of five years, he is enabled to recoup himself for his outlay for machinery and farming implements to make a little for himself. The consensus of opinion in the cotton-growing districts is that there should be a fixed guaranteed

[Mr. Forde.

price, and I earnestly plead that the Government give favourable consideration to the request that the guaranteed price be continued at 5½d. per lb. for a period of five years from June, 1923. From what I have heard concerning the large areas that will be put under cotton cultivation in Central Queensland between now and the end of the present year, I anticipate that the cotton crop in Central Queensland next year will be worth £1,000,000 sterling. That shows the wonderful possibilities of the industry. The cotton crop will be worth as much as the annual output of the Mount Morgan mine. Great Britain imports £200,000,000 worth of cotton every year; £50,000,000 of that money goes to Egypt; approximately £140,000,000 goes to the United States of America, and the balance to India. The American crop dropped from 14,000,000 acres to 3,000,000 last year owing to the boll weevil and the soil being worked out, and that gives Queensland a great opportunity. Why can we not obtain a portion of the £140,000,000 that goes annually to America? This is Queensland's opportunity, and I think we owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. Daniel Jones and others who have taken a keen interest in cotton-growing, and who have been responsible for a lot of propaganda work. We are also indebted to Mr. Crawford Vaughan for the part he has played. I am very glad to know that Mr. Vaughan, at the opening of the Whinstanes ginmery, was manly enough to congratulate the Labour Government of Queensland on what they have done to support the cotton industry in Queensland. A few days ago a statement from Melbourne appeared in the Press from Mr. Crawford Vaughan stating that the Australian Cotton Growing Association had not paid the £70,000 to the cotton growers of Queensland, but that the Labour Government had paid that money. We find people trying to take away from the Queensland Government the credit that is due to them for what they have done for the cotton-growers. Why are hon. members opposite not manly enough to stand up and give this Government credit for what they have done for the man on the land and for other sections of the community? The world's requirements of cotton are increasing every year. The annual increase is approximately at the rate of 750,000 bales; and I think that, if the guaranteed price is continued, Queensland and Australia will take the place of the United States of America in supplying Great Britain with cotton. Another reason why I would ask the Government to continue the guaranteed price is that the State Advances Corporation has made loans to farmers in the Dawson Valley district of approximately £80,000, and up to the time the price was guaranteed the farmers there were having a particularly bad time, and many of them would never have been able to repay the loans to the State Advances Corporation but for the guaranteed price of cotton. With the price guaranteed the State Advances Corporation will get its money back without any difficulty, and the Government will be bringing greater prosperity to Central Queensland than that portion of the State has experienced in any previous period of its history. I am very glad to notice that arrangements have been made for the growing of the best variety of cotton. The cotton of the future must be the very best, and we should take steps to produce the very best in the same way as Australia has progressed in the direction of obtaining the type of wool she now

grows. I am told that in 1893 there were more sheep in Australia than there are to-day, but there was less wool grown, because the sheep then here were of an inferior type. There is no reason why we should not have the very best type of cotton with the longest staple, obtaining the highest possible price. I am glad that arrangements have been made for the planting of Durango long-staple cotton, which is considered to be the very best type, and sufficient seed will be available for the planting of 400 acres of that variety during the coming season and 40,000 acres next year.

Mr. MORGAN: How many varieties of cotton are grown at the present time?

Mr. FORDE: At the present time, unfortunately, there are too many varieties grown, and the result is cross fertilisation. One has only to go through the cotton-fields of Queensland to find this out for himself.

Mr. MORGAN: There are over twenty varieties being grown.

Mr. FORDE: At any rate, we want to narrow the number down to the very best. We want the best, and only the best. That is what Australia should aim at. There will be sufficient seed next year to plant 40,000 acres of cotton of the very best kind, and I would ask the Government to pay particular attention to the matter, and see that only the very best seed is sent forward.

Whilst in the Dawson Valley district, I noticed that broom millet was a very common crop. Some of the farmers were sending their millet to Sydney, and getting £51 per ton for it. I was informed that they could not get more than £21 or £22 per ton in Queensland, so I went along to the Department of Agriculture, and I learned from the Deputy Director of Agriculture that the price quoted for broom millet in Brisbane is, approximately, from £51 to £60 per ton. That is something that the farmers in the Dawson Valley will be very pleased to hear.

Another industry in which this party, and the people of Queensland and of Australia generally, are taking a very deep interest at the present time is the sugar industry. The sugar industry is wrapped up with the White Australia policy. It is necessary that there should be a continuance of the sugar agreement, and I have to congratulate the Premier, the Secretary for Agriculture, and the hon. member for Mackay, who, when Acting Secretary for Agriculture, put up a great fight for a continuance of the sugar agreement. It is authoritatively stated that the average price paid for sugar by the consumer in Australia during the past seven years has been, approximately, 4½d. per lb., as against an average price of 7d. per lb. paid by the consumer in England during the same period. The saving to the Australian consumer on these figures is, therefore, approximately, £40,000,000 during the period of seven years, as compared with the amount paid by the consumer in England. It is estimated to-day that 100,000 people depend directly upon the sugar industry for a living, and, in addition, a great army of people who are engaged in other industries are getting a living indirectly out of the industry. Last year one Brisbane firm alone sent £15,000 worth of Victorian farm implements to the sugar districts of Queensland and, approximately, £6,000,000 were distributed in wages amongst the workers by the sugar industry last year.

Mr. Forde.]

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: And many of the workers come from the South.

Mr. FORDE: Every year 4,000 of those who get a living out of the industry keep their wives and families in the Southern States, and yet, unfortunately, the people in the South are opposed to a continuance of the sugar agreement. Think of the money that goes to Victoria for boots and clothes from the sugar-growing districts. I am very sorry to know that a large number of the Nationalist members in the Federal Parliament are opposed to a continuance of the sugar agreement.

Mr. FERRICKS: And of the Country party, too.

Mr. FORDE: The Right Hon. William Morris Hughes quoted the leader of the Country party and others in the South, to show that they are opposed to a continuance of the sugar agreement.

Mr. MORGAN: Not the State Country party.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Hughes said that the very worst enemies the Queensland sugar-growers have are the members of the Country party. These are not my words, but the words of the Prime Minister of Australia. Sugar could be sold to the Australian consumer to-day at 4½d. per lb. if the Commonwealth Government waived the charge of 1½d. per lb. which they are levying at the present time on all consumers of sugar in Australia, in order to make up the loss of £2,000,000 which they incurred in importing sugar when there was a shortage in Australia. People who are in a position to know think that the £2,000,000 have already been raised by the Commonwealth Government. If that imposition were removed, and the consumers given sugar at 4½d. per lb., there would not be the yell that we have at the present time from the consumers in the South, that the sugar agreement be not continued.

Mr. MOORE: Mr. Hughes stated that the amount has not been made up.

Mr. FORDE: The hon. member, of course, is smarting under the rebuke of the Prime Minister, who stated that the leader and other members of the Federal Country party were the worst enemies that the sugar-growers have. I could quote what the Brisbane papers said regarding Mr. Bailey, the hon. member for Oxley in the Federal Parliament, who stated he was opposed to a continuance of the sugar agreement. Mr. Pratten, the member for Parramatta, and Mr. Maxwell, of Victoria, also said they were opposed to a continuance of the agreement. All the big interests in the South are up against it, because the big jam manufacturers' interests are opposed to it.

Mr. MOORE: What did Mr. Charlton say?

Mr. FORDE: He favoured a continuance of the sugar agreement. All those big interests have indicated that they are against a continuance of the agreement, and they have got men like the hon. member who interjected and the leader of the Opposition in the bag. The jam manufacturing companies are out to defeat the efforts of this Government to bring about a continuance of the sugar agreement; and where are their interests politically? They are with the Nationalist party, and the Nationalist party and the Country party vote together in Parliament.

I want to refer to the Longreach-Winton Railway in Central Queensland, and also to

the Alton Downs Railway. I hope the Longreach-Winton Railway will be one of the lines that will be built in the near future. The hon. member for Mitchell frequently put in a strong request to this Government, and to previous Governments, to have that line built. If that line were built, it would be a great boon to Rockhampton, and to the Central district. The length of the proposed line is only 125 miles. The country is level, and, according to the experts, there are no engineering difficulties, and the estimated cost of the work is £531,000.

Mr. PAYNE: The bridge is built over the Thomson River.

Mr. FORDE: Already £36,000 have been spent on the earthworks, and the bridge, costing £3,000, has been built over the Thomson River. There are 30,000 sleepers lying along the line at the present time, and the line would form an important link in the North-South Railway to the Northern Territory, which railway, I hope, will be built through the western portion of Queensland, and not through the desert portion of South Australia. The Longreach-Winton line will greatly improve the trade of Rockhampton; and it is therefore a burning question amongst the people of Rockhampton. It will be of great convenience to the Railway Department in regard to the transference of rolling stock from the Northern Railway system to the Central and Southern Railway systems. In every big drought the pastoralists in the West lose approximately £500,000 through losses of stock, and if they had that railway line to transfer their stock from the drought areas to well-grassed country they would save hundreds of thousands of pounds.

Now for another important point. The East Darr Station country will revert to the Crown in a few years, and the subdivision of that area will mean hundreds

[5 p.m.] of additional settlers, who will require railway communication, as otherwise they would not be able to make a good living on that land, as it is too far from existing railway lines. I sincerely hope that the Government will be able to go on with the Longreach-Winton Railway as one of the new lines to be built in the present financial year. I am not unmindful of the fact that this Government built the Alton Downs Railway line to its present terminus. That line was promised to Central Queensland for years by Tory Governments; it was dangled before the eyes of the people on the eve of the elections.

I must thank the Government for having built the North Coast Railway through to Mackay; for having decided on the Dawson Valley irrigation scheme, together with the Baralaba-Castle Creek Railway, which, when completed, will cost approximately £4,000,000. I have to thank the Government for having approved of the Northern Burnett Railway and land settlement schemes, which will cost approximately £2,000,000. But we want to keep progressing in Central Queensland. We recognise that we have a very rich portion of the State. The Government built the Alton Downs Railway line up to a certain point; but I hope that the line will be extended for a distance of, approximately, 6½ miles, as it will open up good country and make for closer settlement and greater population in Central Queensland. It will open up thousands of acres of good land eminently suited for

[Mr. Forde.]

cotton-growing. The railway, so far as it has gone, has been responsible for 30,000 acres of land being taken up by small settlers, including 10,000 acres taken up by returned soldiers in the Ridgeland district.

In America and Canada the policy for years was to build railways to precede settlement. In many cases railway lines should be built out to remote parts before settlement took place, in order to encourage the settlers to go there. They must have railway communication, and good roads leading to the railways. The proposed Alton Downs line will tap a big timber belt. It was the original intention of the Government to build a railway round the contour of the Fitzroy River to Westwood, and this extension of the line for  $6\frac{1}{2}$  miles will be a link in that proposed line touching the Central Railway at Westwood.

Since Parliament met, hon. members opposite have indulged in a great deal of criticism about the revolutionary party sitting on this side. Some of those hon. members said that this party stood for bloodshed, revolution, Bolshevism, communism, and Sovietism. Those are foolish statements, which emanate from men who are bereft of argument, and who cannot logically criticise this party's administration. They used to tell the farmer that we were going to nationalise his hen roost, and that no one would have a home after a few years of Labour rule. The hon. member for Normanby, in a statement he made in Rockhampton, said that Messrs. Howie and Earsman, with other Australians, went to Russia to attend a conference at Moscow. The hon. member quoted from a Sydney paper, and said that it was evidence of the Labour party being allied with Red Russia and communism. I sent a telegram to Mr. W. Carey, general secretary of the Central Executive of the Labour party in New South Wales, asking him whether those persons went to Russia as accredited delegates of the Labour party, and whether Messrs. Howie and Earsman were in any way allied with the Labour party. This is the reply which I received from Mr. Carey—

"Messrs. Howie and Earsman are not members of the Australian Labour party. They did not go to Russia representing Australian Labour, but as private individuals working their passage. The communist party is not affiliated with Labour."

I knew that that was the reply that Mr. Carey would have to give, because he knows, as well as the hon. member for Normanby knows, that the Nationalist and Country parties are more closely allied with the communist party than the Labour party is, because they are all out condemning Labour. The Communists and the Tories are frequently condemning Labour politicians. It is the same with the hon. member for Toowong at the Employers' Federation meetings. That gives the lie direct to the statements made by the hon. member for Normanby. The Premier rightly put the matter when he said—

"Sovietism in Russia and Toryism in Australia are equally obnoxious to a liberty-loving people in Australia."

We have to deal with a different set of conditions in Australia from those operating in Russia, and there is no association at all between revolutionary Russia and Labour in Australia.

Mr. FLETCHER: What about the last Brisbane Labour Conference?

Mr. FORDE: I will quote from the official report of the last conference of the largest union in Australia—the Australian Workers' Union—held in Sydney, on 27th January, 1922, when one delegate moved—

"That this convention agrees to link up with the Red International."

The motion, after a good deal of discussion, was defeated by 25 votes to 9. The Australian Workers' Union is recognised as one of the militant unions in Australia, but the president of that conference told the gathering that, if the motion were carried, the whole of the policy of the Australian Workers' Union would have to be changed, and that the delegates had to face the question honestly. The acting general secretary of the union, Mr. Barnes, said—

"We would be foolish indeed to entangle ourselves with the Red International, or any other movement that meant the recognition of coloured labour."

The general president of the union, Mr. Blakeley, said—

"Did convention stand for the Red International advocated? It was put to the Trades Union Congress last year and decisively defeated. He was not prepared to see Australian unions submit to any discipline dictated by outsiders."

The resolution that the convention link up with the Red International was defeated by a three-to-one majority of the delegates, and I am pleased to say that the following Queenslanders voted against the motion:—Messrs. W. J. Riordan, Dash, Dunstan, Bruce, Martens, and Martyn. The motion was probably moved by some man who was sent there to do so. However, that resolution was defeated by a three-to-one majority of the accredited delegates at the Australian Workers' Union Conference. This is what appeared in a cable message published in the Sydney "Daily Mail" of 30th June, 1922—

"At the Labour Congress to-day, Mr. Hodges (Labour M.P.), speaking to a proposal to admit the communist party to affiliation, said that the people who proclaimed communism in this country were the intellectual slaves of Moscow. Not only would the communists not be admitted into the Labour party, but their theory of government must be fought by the party."

"Mr. Ramsay MacDonald said it was imperative for the party to tell the communists—

"Whatever your activities are, you cannot belong to us."

"On a card vote the proposal of communism was rejected by 3,087,000 votes to 261,000. The result was received with great cheering."

That is the information given by cablegram from London. Hon. members opposite quote Russia when it suits them, but they do not like us quoting the decisions of Labour unions and conventions against revolution and communism.

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

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): I am very sorry that the hon. member who has just resumed his seat spoilt an interesting address by

*Mr. Morgan.]*

attacking a man who is not in this House, and who is not able to protect himself.

Mr. FORDE: I replied to a statement he made.

Mr. MORGAN: I draw the attention of the hon. member to this fact: He referred to the attitude of the Country party and the Nationalist party in connection with the sugar industry. I have in my hands a copy of the "Daily Standard" which contains a statement which the hon. member will recognise, and which he knows is absolutely true. It refers to a statement made by Mr. Brennan—not our friend the hon. member for Toowoomba—but Mr. Brennan, a Labour member of the House of Representatives. Mr. Brennan attended a meeting of the Housewives' Association held recently in Melbourne, with the object of bringing down the price of sugar, and he attended as the official representative of the Labour party.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MORGAN: When Mr. Higgs attended a meeting of the same body he put up a very strenuous fight in favour of a continuation of the sugar agreement, and he was practically "chucked" out of the meeting. Let me quote here from the "Daily Standard" to show what Mr. Brennan had to say on the question—

"Under the present ideal conditions for the growth of sugar-cane, I consider that 4½d. or 3d. per lb. for sugar should allow a sufficient profit to the grower."

The HOME SECRETARY: Do you really know how much the sugar-grower gets?

Mr. MORGAN: I am not going to enter into that question. I am not a sugar-grower, and I prefer to leave that matter to sugar-growers. It is very gratifying to note, in connection with the Governor's Speech, that there is a total absence of anything pertaining to propaganda material, the same as that which constituted two of the previous Speeches delivered by the Lieutenant-Governor. I am very pleased to know that we have a Governor who is taking a keen interest in the industries of this State. His Excellency has not confined himself to the cities and towns, but is prepared to go into the country amongst the settlers and see the conditions under which the people live, and shake hands with them, and give them a kindly word. That is the kind of Governor we have at the present time. He is prepared to travel and learn for himself, and, in my opinion, he is doing exceptionally good work. I do not wish to deal with the Governor's Speech from a party point of view, but I notice that there is an absence of anything that is likely to bring about a better condition of affairs, so far as the man now on the land is concerned. We hear a great deal from the Government about the people they propose to settle on the land, but we hear very little in respect to assistance being given to the men who have already settled upon the land. We know that in the past, owing to promises that were made to intending selectors that railways would be built to their selections, they took up land in the country districts in the South. Because of the fact that the present Government have not fulfilled the promises that were made to those selectors, they now find themselves 30 or 40 miles from a railway. Owing to the policy of the Government in starving the South and boosting up the North, we have been deprived of necessary railway lines in

the South. I know a great number of settlers who came here and took up land under the promise that they would get railways to their selections. In most cases the lines were passed and the necessary surveys carried out, but the lines have not been built. I know people who have left their selections and gone back to the States whence they came, simply because they were unable to continue any longer without a railway. The policy of the present Government is having the effect of driving people off the land. The man on the land has to pay the highest taxation it is possible to inflict on him; but that is not all. The Government have increased the land rental so enormously that many people on the land find that the burden is too great for them to bear. I am not referring alone to the big pastoralists, but to the small men as well.

Mr. COLLINS: Do you say that the wool-growers are not able to pay the rentals?

Mr. MORGAN: We know that the conditions of the people on the land at the present moment are such that they cannot pay the taxation imposed on them.

Mr. COLLINS: The income tax figures show the position in regard to the wool-growers.

Mr. MORGAN: Australia would have been in a very precarious condition indeed if it were not for the wool-growers. We know that the woolgrower has saved the situation so far as Australia is concerned.

Mr. COLLINS: The sugar-grower has saved it so far as Queensland is concerned.

Mr. MORGAN: It was the wool industry which prevented the complete collapse of the financial position so far as this State and every other State are concerned. The hon. member for Burke made one statement in connection with the land rentals with which I thoroughly agree. That hon. member has had some experience of our country areas, and, although his remarks dealt only with the North, I consider that they apply to other districts as well. He advocated a reduction of rentals, and said that men should be placed on the land in the Gulf without being asked to pay any rental for the first fifteen years. The same privilege should be given to men in other country districts in Queensland. There are numerous other parts of the country where the new settler on the land should receive better treatment than he does at the present time in that respect. We should see that a settler is placed on a sound foundation before we call on him to pay any rental. I am satisfied there are members on the Government side of the House who agree with me that the rentals charged by the Government are too high, and I am sorry there is no mention in the Governor's Speech of a reduction in the rents. The sooner we introduce a Bill reducing the rents on some of the holdings in the country the sooner will Queensland be placed on a sounder footing financially. The burdens placed on the man on the land are too great altogether. The Lands Department, instead of being merely self-supporting, is now a big revenue-producing department. I am one who does not believe in the Lands Department being a revenue-producing department. We can get the revenue from the people in another direction. There is no objection to making the wealthy people pay the income tax. There is nothing that will drive the people out of the cities more

[Mr. Morgan.]

than the fact that the people in the country are in a prosperous condition. Unfortunately, more perhaps in Queensland than in any other part of Australia, the inducement to go on the land does not exist.

Mr. COLLINS: That is not true.

Mr. MORGAN: The inducement is to go into the city. I am sure that, if the hon. member had a son and he came to him and said, "Father, do you advise me to go into the country and take up land and become a producer, or to go into an office in Brisbane or some other place?" the hon. member would have conscientiously to advise his son to remain in the city.

Mr. COLLINS: I would do nothing of the kind.

Mr. MORGAN: I feel sure he would, because the conditions are better in the city than in the country. That state of things is not good for the welfare of Queensland and the rising generation, because 1,000 producers are worth a great deal more than 1,000 men or women in some city in a factory or other work.

Mr. BRENNAN: What about the land that is tied up?

Mr. MORGAN: We have millions of acres not so far away from our railways which are not tied up—land that is held under occupation license or some other tenure—which could be settled. If the Government would give the people fair terms and conditions, it would be settled; but the trouble is that the people are not getting fair terms and conditions, and they recognise that to go on the land means that they immediately become oppressed, and they may have to give it up and leave the whole of the money and work they have put into it. Why is it that to-day on the far-famed Darling Downs—as I used to see it described throughout Australia before I came to Queensland—you can buy freehold land at less than the value of the actual improvements on the land?

Mr. BRENNAN: That is not true.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: It is true.

Mr. BRENNAN: You are defaming the Darling Downs.

Mr. MORGAN: I do not want to make the information public, but if the hon. member cares to meet me privately, I can give him the names of a dozen places of which I could obtain the right of purchase if I so desired at less than the cost of the improvements. That is the position that exists under a Labour Government. They have been responsible for the decrease in the value of land, and the unfortunate settler, who has had to go to a bank and get an advance, now finds that it is practically valueless, and people do not come from other parts of Australia to take up land. I am not going to say that it cannot be shown that sugar land has increased in value up to £40 an acre, for at the present moment sugar-cane growing is profitable. I am not going to say that it cannot be shown that in certain areas where pineapples and bananas are grown land is worth £20, £50, or £100 an acre; but take the banana growers at the Tweed. Owing to the decrease in values the growers, who were supposed to be carrying on a prosperous industry, are practically down and out. And if it were not for the assistance given to the sugar-growers, and the protection they enjoy at the present moment, and the fact that Australia is being asked to pay a certain price for sugar in order

to develop the industry, it would not be anything like the paying proposition it is. The sugar position may be termed artificial: we all realise that for many reasons it is necessary to assist the industry in order that it may be a payable proposition. In my electorate we have thousands of acres within twenty miles of a railway which at present are held under occupation license, although the land is suitable for the growing of cotton, and the reason is that the Government are not prepared to settle it under the conditions the people want. Give them reasonable conditions: give them fair conditions; allow them to take up the land, and occupy it and use it, and do not charge them exorbitant rents and tax them heavily, and it will be settled. If the settlers do make a profit, the Government will get their share by way of income tax. If a man does not make sufficient money to pay income tax, he has no right to be oppressed with the burdens that rest on him at the present moment.

Take the soldier settlements. The figures given to-day by the Secretary for Public Lands show that one in every four of the soldiers who have been placed on the land has left it and it is not being occupied. Those figures speak for themselves. The hon. member for Maranoa could explain that at Mount Hutton—and that is perhaps one of the best of the settlements—the soldiers are leaving gradually in twos and threes, so that it is merely a matter of time before only 10 per cent. will be left.

Mr. CONROY: Why?

Mr. MORGAN: Because they are doing no good.

Mr. CONROY: Why?

Mr. MORGAN: The State was to blame for cutting up the land into areas that were too small. It was not an agricultural proposition: it was a grazing proposition. Hugo blunders have been made in connection with these settlements. Are they a success at Beerburum or Pikedale? Are not the fruit-growers leaving their farms at Pikedale? I do not wish to mention every case, but my contention is borne out by the figures given by the Secretary for Public Lands.

Now I want to say something about the meat question, in which I take a very keen interest. I am very sorry to know that, although there has been a movement to right the position and bring the industry back to a payable state, right throughout we have had very little assistance from the present Government.

Mr. J. JONES: Practically none.

Mr. MORGAN: Practically none. All they have done has been to put the boot in. It is an industry of the utmost importance to the State from all points of view—an industry almost totally confined to Queensland. It cannot be called a Commonwealth industry. There are only three States where cattle—I am speaking of beef cattle—are produced to any extent. Victoria has to go to New South Wales and Queensland for her beef cattle, and so has South Australia. Western Australia, New South Wales, and Queensland are the only three States that produce more meat than they require for their own consumption. Practically three-fourths of the beef cattle of Australia are in Queensland, so that it is almost exclusively a Queensland industry, and the position affects practically every person in the State. Go right out to

*Mr. Morgan.*



Charleville or into Central or North Queensland and you will find depression in every town, owing to the fact that the principal industry, which represents £4,500,000 per annum in normal times, has been practically wiped out of existence; and, when we asked the Government for help, they gave us practically nothing. They did reduce the railway freights on cattle for export by 20 per cent., but since 1914 they have raised the freights on all our cattle, both stores and fats, by 63 per cent., so that at the present moment, although the industry is down and out, we are still paying in freights 30 per cent. more than before the war.

Mr. POLLOCK: What is the comparison with other States?

Mr. MORGAN: I am not going to compare Queensland with other States, because the industry is practically confined to Queensland. Had there been an industry confined to Victoria, do you mean to say that the Victorian Government would have waited for the Commonwealth to assist them? No. They would have said, "This is something peculiar to Victoria, and we are

[5.30 p.m.] going to do all we possibly can."

It has been like drawing teeth to get the Government to reduce the freight by 20 per cent., which still leaves it 30 per cent. greater than it was in 1914. I see that within the last day or two the Government have agreed to make the reduction applicable to store cattle. That is practically all they have done in the direction of assisting this industry. They are the largest owners of beef cattle in Queensland; no individual or firm possesses more. They have spent millions in the industry, and all that money is likely to disappear owing to the downfall of the industry. What have the Government done? Supposing a large business firm possessed the cattle stations which the Government possess, would they not have immediately set out to try and revive the industry so that the losses would not have been as great as they are likely to be under present conditions? The Government sat still and did absolutely nothing. The Premier admitted that the Government had made a mistake in purchasing the cattle stations—that they were bought on a high market, and were likely to be sold on a low market. That does not apply only to State stations; it applies to all State industries. There is only one way in which this industry is likely to be revived and bring prosperity to Queensland. That is by creating markets so that the price of our cattle will once again reach such a figure as will allow us to work under profitable conditions. The Government can assist by bringing down the rents and lightening the taxation generally. From information we have obtained, we must look for fresh markets. We cannot expect the British market to right itself so that our beef will once again be placed there under profitable conditions. An important proposition is to supply chilled meat to India, China, and Japan—three nations who are wanting our meat, and who eventually will become large beef-eaters. We can send chilled beef there when we cannot send it to Great Britain. The Government should assist in providing cold storage, so that, when the meat arrives in India, China, or Japan, there will be refrigerating chambers for it to go into before distribution. Unfortunately, the Government are doing nothing, but are again leaving the matter to private enterprise. I had a unique experience this morn-

ing. I went to Pinkenba and saw the loading of 625 breeding heifers—the largest shipment of live cattle that has ever left Queensland—which were being sent to New Guinea. That is an instance of what can be done. There are opportunities of trade in the Pacific Islands which, if availed of, would relieve the situation enormously. But the Government are not behind us in that. The information I have received is that, at present prices, those cattle could be bought for not more than £2 per head. I was informed that they are costing £8 a head to ship, the freight amounting to £5,000 for a journey of seven days. In buying State stations, the Government have taken up country which already was carrying cattle, giving employment, and paying taxes. Had the Government used that money to build ships to help in the development of the Island trade—which is a new industry—they would not have been competing with private enterprise, or with some industry which already was established. They spent money in an industry which was already in existence, and the whole of that money was wasted so far as the development of the State is concerned. I hope the Government will do something in the direction of assisting us with cold storage in the countries I have named. The Western Australian Government have done good work. They got three ships and established a good trade, and are using those ships to take live cattle and frozen beef to certain islands. We have that important gentleman, the price-fixer, yet meat is sold all over Brisbane at a lower price than he has fixed. Owing to the fact that we have the State butcher shops, beef to-day is selling at a higher price than would have been the case had those shops not been in existence.

Mr. POLLOCK: That is very doubtful.

Mr. MORGAN: It is not doubtful; it is, unfortunately, a fact.

I also want to deal with the cotton industry. I would like to point out that the growing of cotton is not confined to one particular portion of the State. A great deal was grown in my electorate this year, and there are thousands of acres there suitable for its growth. It is regrettable that this State has not thought it advisable to bring to Queensland an expert cotton-grower, so that advice can be given to those who are undertaking this particular work. We write to the Department of Agriculture and ask that they send up a cotton expert to give advice. We receive a reply stating that the department are very sorry that they do not possess an expert, but they will send up somebody who knows something about it. The people they send do their best to impart information, but, unfortunately, they have not the knowledge, ability, or experience necessary to enable them to afford the assistance needed. Some growers have discovered things in connection with the growth of cotton that these gentlemen know very little, or nothing, about. This industry we look upon as likely to do an enormous amount of good. What are we doing to guard against disease? We know that diseases in America have practically meant the ruination of the cotton industry. Here, at any moment, disease may break out and get a big hold, because the cotton-growers are ignorant of the results of such disease. We are told a great deal about the success of the industry at the present time, but we all know that forty years ago a larger quantity of cotton was grown in Queensland than is grown to-day. Why has cotton ceased

[Mr. Morgan.

to be grown? At that time, the price was 4½d. per lb., but, owing to market fluctuations, the price in England was reduced to 1½d. per lb., and the industry went out. That is exactly what is going to happen again in Queensland. If we know we are going to get sufficient remuneration for our labour and that it will be a payable proposition, we will continue to grow it. If the Americans so desired it, they could "rig" the market as they did before. They may enter into a trade war, as they have done in connection with the beef industry, and thus ruin the cotton industry of Queensland by forcing the price down to 2d. or 3d. per lb.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: They cannot do that. They have not got the supplies.

Mr. MORGAN: They have not got the supplies at the present moment, but we all know that the Americans are very progressive. Science and brains will discover a remedy for the cotton disease in America, the same as was done in Victoria when the vines were attacked by phylloxera. We were told that the vine growers of Victoria were to be ruined, but in a very short time the disease was successfully exterminated and the industry flourished again. We have to look forward to the prospect of our cotton industry again becoming unprofitable. Although Mr. Jones has done a lot of preaching in season and out of season, and although the hon. member for Rockhampton says he was the first cotton expert in this House—(Opposition laughter)—and although Mr. Jones and the hon. member for Rockhampton may be right in what they have stated in connection with the industry, it is all of no avail unless the industry is a payable proposition. I hope that the industry will succeed in getting a guaranteed price for its product for a period of five years. I do not care by what Government or person it is accomplished. There is nothing to be gained by seeking to be praised for what you do in this respect. If we obtain a guaranteed price for five years, then we are going to grow cotton for that period, provided the industry is not attacked by that disease known as the "A.W.U." That is the trouble. The very moment we get the industry established the Australian Workers' Union will come in and, with a temperamentally fitted judge, may succeed in getting an award that will stagger the industry, not only as a result of the wages fixed, but as a result of the conditions generally. If we are not careful, we shall find that the cotton industry, notwithstanding the keen interest displayed in its establishment, will be wiped out because of the interference of the Australian Workers' Union or some other political organisation. As a true co-operative I am very sorry that the Government have not succeeded in having the ginneries established under co-operative control. Why should they be controlled by private companies? The ginneries should be established so that they will eventually become the property of the farmers. In the sugar industry certain mills were established with State assistance, and eventually those mills became the property of the farmers. They were established on a co-operative basis. Why was that not done with respect to the cotton ginneries? Why were they established on proprietary lines—a form of control which the Labour Government profess to have no sympathy for, and a method which they say they desire to exterminate? If they were

established on co-operative lines, they would become the property of the producers, who would get any profits made at the ginneries. These companies are not established in Queensland for the good of their health. They have done good work in taking over the machinery that the Government have brought to Queensland. They are here to make a certain amount of profit. That profit could have been used to better advantage had the ginneries been established under co-operative control. The hon. member for Rockhampton stated that there were four varieties of cotton grown in Queensland at the present time, but I have it on the authority of Mr. Jones—and I think he knows more about the industry than the hon. member for Rockhampton—that there are about twenty varieties amongst the seed cotton, and that every variety is a good one.

Mr. BULLOCK: Is not cultivation restricted to about six varieties in Queensland?

Mr. MORGAN: The seed that is distributed contains about twenty varieties. It is all mixed up. As we progress with the present scheme we should receive seed of a certain quality distinct from any other quality.

The PREMIER: Mr. Jones said they were all good varieties?

Mr. MORGAN: Yes.

The PREMIER: The difficulty is that there is no uniformity in the texture of the material made from the cotton grown here.

Mr. MORGAN: I quite admit that. The lint is bringing a very fair price at the present moment, but we want to grow the very best cotton. I hope that the Government's scheme will prove successful, and that the mixed seed will be all withdrawn and that eventually one good variety will be distributed. As we have done with our wool, we desire to get a good name in Australia for cotton, so that people will say that we grow the very best cotton that can be grown in any part of the world. The Premier has stated that Queensland is in a prosperous condition, but I think the figures that he gave this House went to show that the State unfortunately is not in a prosperous condition. I am a Queensland, and everything I possess is in Queensland. How can we claim that Queensland is in a prosperous condition when the figures supplied by the Home Secretary went to show that £170,000 was given away to keep the people of Queensland from actual starvation. Does the Premier judge the prosperity of Queensland by the people who go to the races or by the well-dressed prosperous looking people—the nicely dressed and rosy-cheeked ladies—who turned up at the opening of Parliament? (Laughter.) If anyone had walked into this Chamber on that occasion, he might have said, "What a fine, prosperous looking lot of people they are." But you cannot judge the prosperity of Queensland in that way. You want to go to the country, and conditions in the country are deplorable.

The PREMIER: You are not suggesting that I am not keeping in touch with the conditions in the country?

Mr. MORGAN: The hon. gentleman may be keeping in touch, and he may also be sympathetic; but keeping in touch and being sympathetic are not sufficient. Sympathy will not fill the people's stomachs. When speaking of the condition of the country, we are

*Mr. Morgan.]*

always told what is going to happen in the future. It is always the future. I have been in Queensland for fifteen years now, and everybody who gets up on a platform says, "Look at the future there is ahead of Queensland." But it has not eventuated yet. The future is still in front of us, and will always be deferred. (Laughter.)

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Do you want the future to be behind us? (Renewed laughter.)

Mr. MORGAN: I suppose the people in thirty or forty years will be talking about the future of Queensland the same as they are doing now. There can be no doubt that Queensland is in a very bad way at the present time. We blame the Government for the present deplorable state of affairs. We say it is because there is a Labour Government in power, and that things are so bad because they have not done their duty. The Premier, no doubt, has other excuses. He says it is because of the drought, and because of the aftermath of the war. But no matter what excuse he may give, he must admit that Queensland, financially and otherwise, is in a deplorable condition.

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

Mr. COLLINS (*Bowen*): We have now entered upon the third day of this debate on the Address in Reply. I can safely say that I have listened carefully to every speech delivered on the other side of the House, expecting that hon. members opposite would offer some solution of the problems facing Queensland, and, probably, the whole world at the present time, but so far I have only listened to carping criticism of the Government in regard to what is known as their agricultural policy. One would have expected that the hon. member who was appointed to lead off for the Country party—the hon. member for Oxley—would have dealt with the Governor's Speech. Instead of doing that, he did my friend, the hon. member for Leichhardt, a great honour by devoting a great deal of his time to criticising his speech. In the Governor's Speech we find this statement—

"For the purpose of bettering the condition and prospects of those who make their living out of the soil, my advisers have already taken steps to promote a completely unified national organisation of the primary producers. The Queensland Producers' Association has been established, and, with the view of its embracing all directly connected with any branch of agriculture, is open to cotton-growers, dairymen, fruitgrowers, general farmers, small graziers, sugar-producers, and wheatgrowers. It consists of a provisional council of agriculture, district councils, and local producers' associations. There are very gratifying indications that the producers welcome the new organisation, and although the council of agriculture has only recently been constituted, it has already done much good work. Amongst the measures to be submitted to you will, therefore, be a Producers' Organisation Bill."

One would have naturally expected from hon. members who claim to represent the Country party, words of praise in connection with the Government's proposal to organise the primary producers. All my life—even when I was an industrial organiser—I have

[*Mr. Morgan.*

advocated the claims of the cultivator of the soil, recognising that the greatness of any nation or State depends upon the prosperity of the people settled on its lands, and on intense cultivation. In order to prove my contention that I have been consistent right through, I want to quote what I said in this House when speaking on the Address in Reply in 1911-1912, as reported on page 155, volume CVIII. of "Hansard," where I used these words—

"The farmers and the workers should be side by side."

In 1915, speaking on the Regulation of Sugar Cane Prices Bill, I said—

"I am pleased that I have lived to see a Bill introduced to do something for the primary producers. I have said for years that the only hope of the Queensland farmer was by joining hands with the Labour party."

Mr. BEBBINGTON: And that is the year your party robbed them most.

Mr. COLLINS: Speaking on the Regulation of Sugar Cane Prices Acts Amendment Bill last year, I used these words—

"As time goes on, I hope they will take a wider outlook—not a wider outlook by members sitting on this side of the House, because we have always advocated it—and that the same principles may be applied to other agricultural products."

I not only said that, but I have said on more than one occasion in this House that something would have to be done to see that the man on the land got that which he produces. That has always been in accordance with the platform of the Labour party. That is no new doctrine. I am one of those who believe that everyone should be paid for his labour. John Ruskin, long before I was born, taught that everyone should be paid for his labour. I do not say that a man working on railway construction work in the North should receive 17s. 6d. per day, and that the man who is producing the wheat from which we make our bread should only receive 10s. per day. I am not one of those who believe in that. I believe that the wheatgrower, the sugar-grower, and every man who labours should be paid for his labour; but up to the present time, notwithstanding the advent of the Labour party, the Government have not had an opportunity of dealing with the problem, which, I admit, is a very difficult one. Up to the present time there is no Government in the world, so far as I have been able to learn, who have solved this problem; and therefore the Labour Government should get credit for making an attempt in this connection, even supposing it is not as successful as some of us would like it to be. At any rate, it is something done. Listening to hon. members on the other side, one would think they represented all the farmers in Queensland.

Very little reference has been made up to the present time to the most important agricultural industry we have in the whole State. While we may have a few thousand wheat-growers, we have one industry in our State—that is, the sugar industry—in connection with which the land has to be cultivated before it will produce a crop. I am very pleased to be able to say a few words in connection with this industry, because the question of a renewal of the agreement in

connection with that industry has not yet been settled. I wish to quote a few remarks that were made by H. C. Morrow, of Morrows Limited, as reported in "The Australasian Confectioner and Soda Fountain Journal," of 19th June, 1922. Mr. Morrow attended a conference of the manufacturing confectioners in Melbourne, and at that conference he made one of the best speeches in defence of the sugar industry of this State that it has ever been my lot to read. I hope the hon. member for Mirani will take the opportunity of reading it. It would pay hon. members who claim to be members of the Country party to read this speech, especially those who represent sugar districts. Mr. Morrow said—

"From 1910-11 to 1914-15 net exports of jams and jellies were to the value of £138,387. From 1915-16 to 1919-20 these were valued at £5,835,746. The preserved milk trade has grown from nil in 1915 to over £2,000,000 sterling last year. It is clear from these figures that the export trade requires an abundant supply of cheap sugar."

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Is that a good speech?

Mr. COLLINS: It is a good speech.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: He is a Nationalist.

Mr. COLLINS: I do not care what he is. The truth is the truth, whether it comes from a Nationalist, a member of the Country party, or whether it comes from a Labour man. I understand that Mr.

[7 p.m.] Morrow is the head of a very large firm which had occasion to use large quantities of Queensland sugar during the war. Mr. Morrow went on to say—

"The recent slump in the jam and tinned fruit trade has been unjustly attributed to the price of sugar. The factors were: General collapse of oversea markets; high price paid for tin plates; and loss of reputation due to some firms' bad grading and packing. That it was not due to the price of sugar is proved by the growth of the condensed milk export trade.

#### "THE RESULT OF COMMONWEALTH CONTROL.

"To sum up, the sugar industry claims that as a result of Commonwealth control and the sugar agreements—(a) The manufacturers built up a vast export trade in Australian jam, preserved fruit, and milk; (b) receiving in effect an export duty of about £2,000,000; (c) the foundation making this possible was the supply of Australian sugar during the years 1916-21, amounting to nearly 1,250,000 tons; (d) until 1920 the sugar-growers received a barely payable price for their product.

"It is generally agreed that Queensland sugar is the best in the world. Those who have tried the imported article have found it of lower grade. As quality is of first importance to manufacturing confectioners. I feel sure they wish nothing to be done to imperil the supply of Australian-grown sugar.

"In conclusion, I wish to express the hope that Australians in the North will not have to appeal to Australians in the South not to be geographical Australians and geographical protectionists.

The sugar industry should receive no less consideration, even if it is in the North of the continent, than if it were established near Sydney, Melbourne, or Adelaide, and should receive no less protection than if it were a Southern industry. I appeal for a Federal spirit in consideration of this matter. (Applause.)

The speech is a very lengthy one, but it is one of the most useful contributions to this important question which is now before the public—the renewal of the sugar agreement. Listening to our friends opposite—especially members of the Country party—as I said earlier in my remarks, one would think there was no agriculture carried on outside the Darling Downs or around Brisbane. They do not seem to realise that the sugar industry is the most important agricultural industry in Queensland, and last year in raw sugar alone it produced about £9,000,000, of which £6,000,000 went in wages. We have not got the figures with regard to the total wealth production of the whole of the State; but, judging from the figures supplied to us from year to year, I am prepared to say that the sugar industry has produced one-fifth of the total wealth derived from all sources of production in this State. To listen to hon. members opposite, you would imagine that there was no sugar industry in this State. They argue that this Government have done nothing for the man on the land. Surely, if this is the principal agricultural industry, they have done something for the men on the land in connection with it—that is the sugar growers. According to the latest figures, there are 4,269 sugar growers in this State, and there is no other industry in Queensland where the wealth is so well distributed amongst the mass of the people as in connection with this national industry. The pastoral industry, with its great wealth production—especially the wool industry—with the few thousand persons it employs, is nothing compared to the sugar industry in proportion to the wealth produced and the amount distributed amongst the workers. Therefore the sugar industry is of more importance to Queensland than any other industry. I have here the average price of sugar-cane in 1914, the year before this Government took office. The average price was £1 3s. per ton. I have also the estimated average price for the two years 1920 and 1921, and I am satisfied that, when the figures are finalised, the average will work out at £2 10s. per ton. While we do not claim that the Regulation of Sugar Cane Prices Act is responsible for the whole of the increase, we do claim that that Act has been one of the best measures ever passed in this House for the cultivator of sugar-cane. That is realised by the sugar growers themselves. The point I wish to make is that what we have done for the sugar growers we must try to do for every primary producer. It may be a difficult task. Other Governments in different parts of the world have never attempted to solve this problem, but it has been left to the Labour Government in Queensland to make some effort in that direction. We should receive full support from every hon. member opposite, who should sink their party politics for the time being. If these proposals of ours are going to increase production and prosperity for the man on the land, and to be an inducement for more people to go on the land, I have no hesitation in saying that, unless

Mr. Collins.]

more settlement takes place in the State and Commonwealth, this country can never become a really great country. We can talk about our wealth production, which I know is very great. I know from my study that the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, with populations similar to our own, produce double the amount of wealth, and that is because they have settled upon their soil a much larger number of settlers than we have in this State. It does not matter what Government is in power, the solution of the problem—especially in reference to unemployment, to which I shall make reference later on—lies in settling people on the land. I was preaching the same doctrine at the street corner before hon. members opposite ever heard it. I never hesitate to tell the truth, and that is the great truth which I learnt, being a student of John Stuart Mill and Henry George long before I came into this House—that from the land we derive all our wealth. We must make the conditions better than they are at the present time. It is all very well to say that this Government should have moved in that and other directions. The Government tackled the position in this respect, and as a result we have more men in a prosperous condition now than we had in 1914.

Mr. J. JONES: More unemployed.

Mr. COLLINS: I come now to another important matter—that is this statement in the Governor's Speech—

“Considerable attention is being paid to irrigation. The first section of the Inkerman scheme was completed and pumping commenced in May last. Electric power and pumping plant will be provided capable of watering approximately 16,000 acres. Though the cost will be largely in excess of the estimate, it is believed that the benefits will more than compensate for the expenditure, and that the undertaking will prove a financial success.”

This scheme has been criticised both inside and outside the House. Not that I object to criticism; but I do object to criticism which has a tendency to depreciate the electorate which I represent. I was there in May with the Premier, when he had the pleasure of turning the handle of the turbine which set the pumps going. I want to illustrate the effect it had upon even some of the farmers in that locality. I have said that the Government are doing such big things that it requires big minds to grasp them. When we set the pumps going, the water at one particular well nearly washed away the farm, as it were, inasmuch as the farmer had not made a big enough drain to carry the water. He did not realise what it really meant, just as hon. members opposite do not realise. When he saw a stream of water at the rate of 1,000 gallons per minute, and 60,000 gallons an hour, he wondered for a few minutes what it would do to his farm, because the drain was not large enough and it overflowed. That is what is being done at Inkerman, and the starting of the scheme in May last has drowned all the criticism pretty well so far as the local residents are concerned. A few wandering politicians may go along there, and they may meet a few disgruntled people from whom they may get a statement or two, but the local opinion is that the scheme is a success. In speaking the other night, the hon. member for Oxley said—

“The figures which no doubt will

shortly be placed before us will indicate that this scheme has cost nearly £500,000, or nearly four times the estimated cost.”

“Mr. Collins: That is not true; stick to the truth.”

I would like to know from whom the hon. member for Oxley got his authority for stating that the scheme would cost £500,000. The scheme is not going to cost anything of the kind. The engineer in charge estimates that he will be able to complete the scheme for an expenditure of £400,000. There is a great difference between £400,000 and £500,000. The hon. member for Oxley is so much accustomed to dealing with millions of pounds that £100,000 is neither here nor there with him.

Mr. MOORE: What was the original estimate?—£130,000.

Mr. COLLINS: Who will control the scheme when it is completed? I will tell you. Under the constitution the board consists of three members, two of whom are elected by the ratepayers in the area, and one is appointed by the Governor in Council. Each member holds office for a period of three years. The present members are—Lester James Dowse and Fergus Ferguson elected by the ratepayers in March, 1921, and S. R. McMeekin appointed by the Governor in April, 1921, in the room of H. E. Eklund. The completion of the works is to be notified by the Minister in the “Gazette,” and the board thereupon takes over the control and management and the interest charges commence to run. The cost of the works as determined by the Treasurer shall be accepted by the board as final and conclusive and shall be treated as a loan to the board. The expenditure to 30th June, 1922, on the works is £330,560, and the acting hydraulic engineer still holds the opinion that the completed cost will not exceed £400,000.

Mr. GREEN: Who will pay for it?

Mr. COLLINS: The scheme will be controlled by the farmers.

Mr. GREEN: But who will pay for it?

Mr. COLLINS: The farmers themselves. Would you say that the farmers should not pay interest and redemption?

Mr. GREEN: The general public will have to pay.

Mr. COLLINS: The loan and interest are to be liquidated within twenty-eight years at the rate of £6 per centum per annum—being £4 for interest and £2 for redemption. The first payment of interest and redemption is not to be made to the Treasury until eighteen months after the “Gazette” notification of completion of the works; thereafter payments are to be made yearly.

A reply to those critics who are always predicting dismal failure of the scheme is the fact that recent applications have been received from others than those originally in the scheme to be allowed to come in. The board will determine what rate is to be struck upon the land, and they must determine what amount must be raised to pay interest and redemption to the Treasury on the loan and also to provide for working expenses. Both the present executive engineer and his predecessor (Mr. H. E. Eklund) are sanguine that the scheme will be a complete success.

[Mr. Collins.

Is there anything wrong in that proposal? Not at all. The farmers will control the whole scheme.

Mr. VOWLES: They want to get out of it.

Mr. COLLINS: I question very much whether the hon. gentleman has got enough to buy a farm up there. Does the hon. gentleman know that a 100-acre block at Inkerman costs from £3,000 to £6,000? The hon. gentleman has no idea what intense cultivation in the North means. When I went through that district a few years ago, we could see where the irrigated blocks were, because they were the only places which could grow a good crop. They were growing 50 tons of sugar-cane to the acre under irrigation, while alongside, on the land where there was no irrigation, they could not grow a blade of grass. The people mostly concerned in this matter, the farmers on the Inkerman Estate themselves, are not complaining. There may be one or two disgruntled farmers here and there who met the hon. member for Townsville when he was up there. At any rate, the hon. member for Townsville has not been in that centre since. (Government laughter.) The Premier made the following statement to the Inkerman farmers:—

“In reference to the cost of the irrigation scheme, the Premier has stated ‘the matter will be considered when the works are about to be handed over to the trust and a burden will not be placed on the farmers which they will be unable to bear.’”

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. COLLINS: The Premier repeated that statement in May last in reply to a deputation. He told them that, after the scheme had been in operation for a time, if they found they were carrying too big a burden, the State would come to their rescue. (Opposition laughter.) There is the leader of the Opposition smiling. How many times have we had to come to the relief of the Jimbour settlers in his electorate?

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and laughter.

Mr. COLLINS: How many times have we had to come to the relief of settlers in other parts of the State? Yet hon. members opposite tell us that the Government have done nothing for the man on the land. When they say that, they are saying something that is not true. Have we not supplied them with cane plants when they asked for them? Have we not supplied them with seed wheat? Have we not supplied them with many other things so that they would not go off the land? I have often said to my farmer friends, “Tell us what we can do for you. Let us know what you require us to do.” and very often, I get no answer. I am satisfied that the irrigation scheme is going to be a success. This State will become great in time—not in my time, perhaps—but in the time of the children now growing up. It will only become great by harnessing our forces in the State in the shape of big irrigation works. In other words, we have to dam our rivers. We have lived long enough in Queensland to have sufficient records to know that the seasons are very disappointing from time to time, and if we are going to have close settlement in the future in this State, then it can only be done by irrigation. (Hear, hear!) Anyone who has read that fine work dealing with the irrigation system in the United States,

will know what I say is true. It is pointed out there, and anyone can read it in the Parliamentary Library, that, if you want to go to the districts with closer settlement, you will have to go to the districts with big irrigated areas. I am pleased with what the Government have done in that direction at Inkerman.

Coming to another part of the programme, I heard someone say that we had deserted the industrial workers. I say we have done nothing of the kind. We have on the programme a Bill to provide insurance against unemployment.

Mr. VOWLES: Is it the “Loafers’ Paradise Bill?”

Mr. COLLINS: This unemployment problem affects not only the State or the Commonwealth, but the whole of the civilised world will have to tackle it sooner or later. If not, then it will swallow up all the different Governments of the world. It is not an easy matter to deal with the unemployment problem. At any rate, we are going to introduce a Bill here. I am not going to outline what the Bill will contain. I do say that something must be done in that direction. I am not one of those who believe that every man out of work is an unemployable person. (Hear, hear!) I know what it is to be out of work myself for six months at a time, and I can say that there is nothing more deplorable in modern society than for a man to be seeking work and unable to obtain it. It is no use hon. gentlemen blaming the Government for the unemployed, because we know that in the United Kingdom they have an army of 2,000,000 unemployed, and last year they spent in relief alone over £60,000,000. We know that in the United Kingdom the men who are governing there are men who come from Oxford, Cambridge, and other great universities, and they have not been able to solve the problem. We who belong to the working classes have made some attempt in the direction of solving it, and even supposing our attempt is not successful, we ought to get credit for having tackled a problem that men of the different countries of the world have shirked up to the present time. The men who are governing mankind elsewhere will not tackle it. I am one of those who believe that to stand still means death. That applies to the individual, to the State, and to the nation. This Labour party cannot live on what it has done. It has to keep moving on. It must keep marching with the times, and must make an attempt to deal with this unemployed problem. And I say it can be dealt with. What is it that brought about the spending in relief last year of £174,094 11s. 10d.? That has not been brought about simply because we are a Labour Government. Hon. members on that side cried out “War! War! War!” Now there is practically an industrial war to be faced. The war, and the aftermath of the war, brought about a lot of problems for the different Governments of the civilised world to solve. We are not responsible for the dislocation of the different industries of the world. The war brought about that dislocation, and only for the madness that existed in your Federal arena in the government of this country—the madness which said, “We will not trade with Germany: we will not trade with Russia”—we might not have been in the deplorable condition we are to-day. Our industries might not have been

Mr. Collins.]

languishing if we had had at the head of affairs men who would say, "We will now trade with Germany, and we will now trade with Russia also, if necessary, no matter who the peoples of Germany and Russia say shall govern them." You have a slump in your meat industry, of which, by the way, the other side of the House have up to the present offered no solution. That has helped to bring about unemployment. No one imagines for one moment that it improves a man to be out of work and receiving rations for six months at a time. Nothing demoralises any human being so much as being out of work and not being able to get it. Everyone realises that, or ought to realise it. What is the use of continually criticising the Government, and saying that we are responsible, when in countries that are governed by purely Tory Governments they have the same problem, and have not solved it or made any attempt to solve it?

Mr. MAXWELL: You said you could solve it.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You would solve it by shooting down the workers.

Mr. COLLINS: We will make an attempt to solve it, at any rate. To say that we are doing nothing for the industrial workers is not true. We have done a great deal for them with our Workers' Compensation Act and our miners' phthisis provisions—one of the most humanitarian pieces of legislation to be found on our statute-book, which it is proposed to amend this session—and many other Acts. Surely we deserve some credit for these measures? Our friends opposite, especially the leader of the Opposition, sat for a long time behind a Tory Government and did not exercise much influence on them, because at that time they did very little in the interests of the worker.

Mr. STOFFORD: Or of the farmer either.

Mr. COLLINS: Or of the farmer either. We find that the Government have come to the assistance of the cattle industry. The railway rates on fat cattle, store cattle, dairy produce, pigs, and so forth, have been reduced.

Mr. J. JONES: How generous you are!

Mr. COLLINS: At any rate, I am not one of those who complain about the unemployed receiving what are called doles. Surely these pastoralists, who were getting £12 or £14 per head for their cattle when the war was on, could have lived righteous lives! (Laughter.) But, no; they would not ride in a plain Ford car, but must get the most up-to-date Buick or Napier. Now they come along and say, "Those prosperous times have passed away. We can no longer get good prices for our cattle." So they come to the Government and cry, "Socialistic Government, come to our rescue! Save us! Give us reduced freights to get our cattle to the meatworks." What is the difference between that and the request of the unemployed? The unemployed man says, "Owing to something over which I have no control—the war took place without consulting me; the slump in the meat trade took place without my consent—I am now out of work. Find me work; and, until you do find me work, give me—like the pastoralist—something to eat." What is the difference? The difference is that, during the

[Mr. Collins.

war, when the cattle-owner was selling his cattle for £12 or £14 per head the worker was not able to get big wages. What is the use of being hypocritical? If it is good to give assistance to these cattlemen during these bad times, it is good to do something for men who are out of work to tide them over the bad times. It is just as well to consider these things when people say all the favours are going to the out-of-work man. The hon. member for Kennedy has always complained that this Government are responsible. Does he hold them responsible for the economic conditions throughout the whole world? Does he hold them responsible because he cannot sell his meat in London? What did Mr. Jowett tell him and his friends in one of his reports the other day? Did he not tell them that on a visit to Liverpool he found that their organisation was out of date, and that was why they were pushed from the markets of Great Britain?

Mr. J. JONES: The Government are out of date.

Mr. COLLINS: No, this Government are not out of date. This Government are the most up-to-date Government. They believe in marching ahead one step at a time towards their goal.

And here I want to say one word in reply to those people who have been talking about communism and sneering at men whom they call communists. I claim—without speaking for communism, because I think it is an ideal which we shall fail to reach in a thousand years from now—that the hon. member for Townsville and the hon. member for Bulimba—both men who have occupied pulpits—have, when they denounced communism, also denounced Christianity. They are practically one and the same thing, and I refer the hon. member for Townsville, who is a high authority on the Scriptures, to the Acts of the Apostles, and the hon. member for Bulimba likewise. We would want no communism if we had the real type of Christians we should have. At any rate, this continual sneering by the Opposition at communism is, in my opinion, sneering at the best that there is in Christianity. I myself do not stand for it, because I say that it is an ideal which I believe may be realised a thousand years hence. We in our times have to strive for the ideal, and some of us have lived to see many of our ideals realised. When I was a young man, one of our ideals was, "One adult, one vote." We have lived to see that realised. We have lived to see workers' compensation placed on the statute-book. We have lived to see old-age pensions paid, and many other big reforms that were considered impossible at that time. I am tired of this continual crying out against the objective of the Labour party as being revolutionary. The Labour party is not revolutionary; it is evolutionary. And if hon. members on the other side do not change their tactics, they will remain in opposition for ever and ever.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MAXWELL, (Togong): I wish first of all, to contradict a statement made by the Secretary for Railways in connection with the shooting down of men. I was never connected with any concern that advocated anything of the kind, and I want to say to the hon. member that if this newspaper is correct, if anybody sent men to shoot down

the workers, it was hon. members on the other side—

“The roar of Mr. Forgan Smith against the employers, when his Government, through its agents, asked that organisation to find special constables, savours of the hypocritical. The special constables were sworn in and actually began to drill before they were disbanded.”

Mr. STOPFORD: What are you quoting from?

Mr. MAXWELL: From the “Brisbane Sun” of 26th February, 1922.

[7.30 p.m.]

The HOME SECRETARY: Can you vouch for the accuracy of that?

Mr. MAXWELL: I will vouch for the fact that it is here, and there is not a man on the other side who is game to contradict it. Concerning the speech that was made by me, I will say that, if the other is as accurate as the statement that has been made by the hon. Minister, the hon. member for Mackay, a more deliberate lie was never told.

The SPEAKER: Order! order!

Mr. MAXWELL: We have had nothing but misrepresentation from a section on that side. I want to quote what has been said this afternoon by the hon. member for Rockhampton, to show the tactics that are adopted by a section of the hon. members over there. That hon. member did not read the statement correctly. It appears in the “Daily Standard” of to-day, and reads—

“There is another aspect of this strike matter and that is this: Have we any machinery able to provide for armed forces? Is there any machinery to-day by which you can put your hand on some reliable force to put against the force of—

“Mr. Bowen: Hooliganism.”

“The hon. member for Rockhampton said:—“Reliable force to put against the force of the workers.” I say it is a disgrace for any man who occupies a position in this House to make a statement like that and to attribute to a man remarks he never made. The statement was made by the Minister, that at a meeting I was supposed to have said—

“Mr. Edkins told me that he wanted an army for defence, not defiance. I am not too sure that the time has not arrived when we have to attack.”

I want to give that a contradiction; I never made a statement like that. At nearly every Criminal Court sittings you will hear the judges of the court say that if there were no receivers there would be no thieves. It is a disgrace for any Minister to take documents of that character, which have been stolen, and which, so far as I am concerned, are unreliable and untrue.

Mr. FORDE: General Thompson did not deny it; he admitted it.

Mr. MAXWELL: I had a high opinion of the hon. member for Rockhampton, but I had no idea that that hon. gentleman, representing such a constituency as he is supposed to represent, who is aiming for higher honours, was prepared to attribute to a man something he did not say.

Mr. FORDE: He did say it, and you know it.

Mr. MAXWELL: I do not know what General Thompson said. I was not at that meeting. I read to-day's “Daily Standard,” and draw the hon. gentleman's attention to it. These are charges which have been made against the Government by one of our Brisbane newspapers in connection with the Northern Railway strike, and, if the Home Secretary says they are not true, let him deal with the man who has made them—

(1) Sworn in special constables at a time of industrial unrest.

(2) Poured lead into a mob of workers who stood outside a lock-up and howled about the internment of comrades.

(3) Sent a battalion of police, post haste, overland, to strike terror into the hearts of strikers.”

We have heard the statement that the Premier has been “doing” the North. He “did” it very well indeed. Judging by his remarks, a large number of promises have been made by the hon. gentleman to people in the North. The people in the South and in Central Queensland cannot get from the hon. gentleman such promises as those.

Mr. STOPFORD: There are no complaints from Central Queensland.

Mr. FORDE: What about the Burnett scheme?

Mr. MAXWELL: There have been local authorities in and around Brisbane who have interviewed the Treasurer for certain moneys for the purpose of carrying out improvements in connection with their areas.

Mr. PEASE: Concrete roads!

Mr. MAXWELL: They have had no consideration from the Government in the direction of getting any money from them.

Mr. GILDAY: That is absolutely wrong.

Mr. MAXWELL: I know what I am talking about.

The HOME SECRETARY: What local authority?

Mr. MAXWELL: I will give it to you in a moment. They have been told that the Government have not got the money, but that they will not prevent the local authority from going to the Commonwealth Bank; that they will issue an Order in Council to enable them to get the money from the Commonwealth Bank.

Mr. DUNSTAN: What is wrong about that?

Mr. MAXWELL: This is wrong—that the Government can find money for the people around Cairns, but cannot find it for this portion of the State. (Government interruption.)

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MAXWELL: I am rather glad if I have caused a little excitement on the other side. It is only fair to point out that the people of the North and Central Queensland are just as much entitled to consideration as the people of the metropolis or of the South-eastern division. What tickles me is that there is no money from the Government to do certain things down here, yet in connection with an electric lighting scheme for Cairns—to cost £40,000—the Government are prepared to advance a certain amount of money, provided the Local Authorities Act is complied with—that is, that a poll is taken.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: There is good security.

*Mr. Maxwell.]*



Mr. MAXWELL: I only mention that in passing. Reading the newspaper reports on the travels of the Premier throughout the Northern and Central districts, it seems to me that a good many promises have been made. I tried to calculate the other day how much money was promised. If the Government want to give effect to those promises, they will have to go to "Uncle Sam" and get another loan. A very great compliment was paid to "Uncle Sam" in calling Parliament together on 4th July. Seeing the Government got their money from America, the least they could do was to take their hats off to "Uncle Sam" and call Parliament together on that day, which they did.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: A day of rejoicing.

Mr. MAXWELL: Mind it is not a day of atonement, or a day of regret. (Government interruption.)

Mr. STOPFORD: We got rid of the Upper House on that day.

Mr. MAXWELL: No Government which ever occupied the Treasury benches lost the confidence of the State to such an extent as the present Government have. I was under the impression that the Primary Producers' Organisation Bill was really something for the man on the land. I find the Premier saying this—

"That is the policy of the Government. It is not a class policy. When we talk about the workers we do not adopt the narrow conception of that term which is adopted by hon. members on the other side; but we speak of them from the broadest conception. Every man who has to toil, whether he is an employer or an employee, is a worker. It does not matter whether he toils for himself or works for others; it does not matter if he works in the city or if he is toiling and mulling in the country, he is entitled to get protection and assistance, and this Government is going to ensure that for him."

That is the greatest hypocrisy that was ever enunciated, because it is window-dressing. We have had experience of the Government promising the people of this State certain things. How have they kept those promises? What did they do with the public service? There was to be no reduction and no retrenchment. There was no retrenchment, according to them, but there was deflation, and a number of men were thrown out of employment. The Government have now approached the Arbitration Court seeking a reduction in wages and salaries, and God help the Government when they go before the electors. The electors will show them no mercy.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: What will you do about it?

Mr. MAXWELL: I will refer them to the supposed friends of the working man and to what they have done for them. How they "did" them! How they gulled them! Here is something that was produced in Ipswich some time ago—

"RED LIGHT.

"*Nationalist Signals against you  
- Railway Workers.*

"If you disregard the red light you must expect a smash. The Nationalists have put the signals against you, and if you persist in running on that track you will bump the dead end of retrench-

[Mr. Maxwell.

ment. Speaking in Parliament, Mr. R. Hodge, Tory member for Nanango, said—

We don't quite realise why all the spoon-feeding was going on, particularly in the Railway Department benevolent institution.

"Mr. Hodge went on to say that he would like to see the railway employees give a fair day's work for a fair day's pay, but the railway employees were not doing it. He went on to say he would like to see the railway men doing something for their money, and not as they seemed to be doing at present—establishing a benevolent institution."

Further the article states—

"These utterances commit the anti-Labour parties to retrenchment in the railways. If you have been thinking of running along Nationalist lines, turn over the points and run along the safe well-cared-for Labour lines which lead to happiness and prosperity."

Was there ever a more hypocritical document issued to a body of working men? What for? So that the Government could retain office. What attempts have the Government made to reduce the burden of taxation upon the people of this State? Opportunities were given to them but they have done nothing. We find in the Speech from the Throne that another Official in Parliament Bill is to be introduced in order that another Minister may be appointed. The Government, who pose as the friends of the working class, should be reducing the number of Ministers and their salaries, and should also reduce the number of members of Parliament and their salaries, and should also do something in the way of reducing the public expenditure incurred by the number of jaunts taken by Ministers around the State.

We were told by the Secretary for Mines during the recent Paddington by-election that there would be no unemployment after the expiration of three months. I am very sorry that that gentleman's wishes have not been accomplished. I can sympathise with him, because I believe that he thought at the time that, if he was returned, there was a possibility of throwing his weight in with his colleagues in the Ministry, and possibly turning the scales to such an extent that they would be able to see the light and create the confidence that is so essential. The Secretary for Mines also stated during that election—

"The Government stood for a big developmental policy, equality of opportunity, and the more equal distribution of wealth."

I want to see a more equal distribution of wealth in the Ministry. I want to see the hon. gentlemen game to tell the people, "We are going to start at the top of the tree and cut down our own salaries, and we are going to give you encouragement and let you go on with your work, and so create the confidence that is so essential for the advancement of a State such as ours." Again, we were told by the Secretary for Mines at the last May Day celebrations—

"That brings me to another side of the political and industrial movement, and probably the most burning question of the day, and a question I do not intend to shrink, is the question of wages."

There is no doubt it is a burning question, but, unfortunately, there is a number of people who cannot get the bare necessities of life. The Secretary for Mines further stated—

“We, as a Government, state definitely and unhesitatingly that we are a high-wage Government.”

The Government claim to be the “high-wage Government,” yet to-day they are doing things contrary to the promises on which they were elected in 1920. How is it possible for any individual member of this Government to go before the electors and say they were in favour of high wages, and then sit back as if being done to-day? There is a way out of the difficulty, and hon. gentlemen opposite know it. This policy of the socialisation of industry, and all this communistic rubbish, should be set aside. The hon. member for Rockhampton made an apologetic speech in connection with the communistic society with which he is associated.

Mr. FORDE: I refuted the misleading statements made by your party.

Mr. MAXWELL: I will tell the House what some of the Southern papers think of the new socialisation of industry objective of the Government. An article in the Sydney “Sun” of the 28th May, 1922, reads—

“MOSCOW FIRST.

“AUSTRALIAN IDEALS CHALLENGED.

“STORM IN A.L.P.

“*Opposition to Socialisation.*”

“The doctrine of the Moscow International replaced the principle of a white Australia in the Australian Labour party’s objective, as adopted by the Interstate Labour Conference held at Brisbane.

“This has caused a howl of protest amongst the native-born in the New South Wales Labour leagues and unions, and will be the subject of a contest at the annual conference on Saturday next.”

Mr. BRENNAN: The “Bulletin” is a “rat.”

Mr. MAXWELL: Those papers were not “rats” when they advocated some of the rubbish advocated by hon. members opposite. The official report of the Australian Trades Union Conference, held at the Trades Hall, Melbourne, on 20th to 25th June, 1922, says—

“REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO DEVISE WAYS AND MEANS OF BRINGING ABOUT THE OBJECTIVE—SOCIALISATION OF INDUSTRY, PRODUCTION, DISTRIBUTION, AND EXCHANGE.

“1. That, for the purpose of achieving the objective, industrial and parliamentary machinery shall be utilised.

“2. That, in recognition of the fact that this is an era of social production, this conference declares that craft organisation, as a working-class weapon, is obsolete, and pledges itself, and all its future representatives, to organisation of the workers along the lines of industry, as shall be decided by the organisation committee of this conference.

“3. The nationalisation of banking and all principal industries, and the municipalisation of such services and supplies as can best be operated in limited areas; adult franchise and extended powers to be granted municipalities for this purpose.

“4. The government of nationalised industries by boards, upon which the workers in the industry and the community shall have representation.

“5. The establishment of an elective supreme economic council by all nationalised industries.

“6. The setting up of labour research and information bureaux and of Labour educational institutions, in which the workers shall be trained in the management of nationalised industries.

“7. That the foregoing be sent to the Australian and New Zealand Labour parties, as a recommendation that it be the fighting plank of the platform, believing that only by the abolition of the capitalist system can working-class emancipation be achieved.

“8. That all parliamentary representatives be required to function as active propagandists of the objective and methods of the movement.

“9. That this congress expresses the earnest hope that, just as all schools of working-class thought have been usefully represented at this congress, to the advantage of the movement as a whole, the Labour party immediately endeavour to unite politically all the said elements in the common fight, and that all men, who have been officially disconnected with the Australian Labour party, but who have continued fighting for working-class interests, be included, if they desire, in the Australian Labour party without loss of continuity of membership.”

That was agreed to by that conference. It came on to the Brisbane conference, and the Brisbane conference, as our friends on the other side know, was held at the Trades Hall, and there was nearly a big burst up at it. What has been termed “The Red Rag element” or the “extremist section” coloured the movement. That is the term used by a section of the Press. The conference was held at the Trades Hall, Brisbane, on Monday, 10th October, 1921.

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: Read the resolutions.

Mr. MAXWELL: I will leave it to some genius on the other side to read the resolutions. I have already read what “socialisation of industry” means, and what their objective is. Amongst other things, the Premier, in dealing with the socialisation of industry, said—

“Delegates would be very foolish if they did not realise they were deciding a crucial part of their programme. If they gave the words the meaning which was sought to give them in section 2, he wanted to announce that so far from bringing harmony into the Labour movement, they were going to burst it up. The Labour movement was going to be split in twain. If the interpretation given yesterday was re-affirmed by the series of resolutions they were going to deal with, there was no use delegates ignoring the importance of that question. They were going to vote something which would disrupt the Labour movement. If they were going to carry the vital elements in section 2, paragraphs 1 to 9, the critical points of which were in 4 and 5, setting out the meaning of socialism, it was going to be the end of the Labour movement. If they set

Mr. Maxwell.]

that out it was no longer the Labour movement of Australia. Why not call it the Communist party? Is there any difference in that and the policy of the communists? Is there any difference in their methods? The methods of the Labour party were political action co-operating with the Labour movement. The communists had a different line of action which it was now proposed to adopt."

That is their leader, and yet the resolution was adopted notwithstanding that the leader of the Government, the Home Secretary, and other Queensland delegates opposed it.

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: Why don't you read the resolutions?

Mr. MAXWELL: I think I have read too much for the hon. gentleman. I want to ask the Government where they stand. Do they stand for this policy that has been framed for them in Melbourne?

Mr. BRENNAN: We stand for the platform.

Mr. MAXWELL: It was confirmed in Brisbane, and ratified again in Melbourne, and yet the Premier stands up in this Chamber and wants to gull hon. members on this side, and the people outside, into believing that he stands to assist not only one class, but every class. It is a death-bed repentance, but it is too late. From the beginning of the 1920 session, there has been nothing but repudiation on the part of the Government. They can well go out of office, or go to the electors to receive their knockout, as a repudiatory Government. They repudiated the agreement that was made with the pastoralists by another Premier, backed up by thirty-five Labour men. They repudiated the contracts they made with the public servants in this regard—they said they were not going to increase the hours of labour and that there would be a reduction in wages. But what did they do? They made the public servants work longer hours for the same money. How did they treat one of their public servants the other day? I refer to the Government Printer. I know I may be asked what I would do in connection with a matter of that kind. I want to show the discrimination that exists between a Government and the ordinary employer. If I did that—and I would not do it—I give to the men working for me the same privileges and the same rights that I have got myself. (Government laughter.)

Mr. BRENNAN: What did he do in Ryan's case?

Mr. MAXWELL: Mr. Ryan's case settled him! The hon. member for Toowoomba is not as smart as he thought he was. I am glad I got that. If I had dismissed a member of a union for anything he said I would have been summoned before an industrial magistrate to show cause for daring to discharge a man for expressing his mind. Not only have the Government repudiated contracts such as I have mentioned, but they have also repudiated the arrangements that had been entered into with judges of the court. I do not want to say these gentlemen did it to make billets for some of their friends; but it is suspicious. I do not say the Government Printer has been discharged to make a position for somebody else; but it is suspicious. I leave it to the public to judge. We have heard also on various occasions in this House questions asked in con-

nection with the Labour plank—"Produce for use and not for profit." I want to draw attention to the fact that a system such as that was put into operation in Russia.

When the Soviet Government came into existence, these individuals were told by the Soviet rulers—and may God save us in Australia from such rulers—"You take all the land you want and till it, and you can do what you like with it." Subsequently, after they had tilled the land, these rulers came along and said, "You are to take what you can use for yourselves, and that alone—nothing else—we will take the rest." What happened next season? The farmers grew that year only what they could use for themselves. I do not say that that is the cause of the whole of the trouble in Russia to-day, but it is largely the cause of the trouble; and yet we see men with the intelligence of the Secretary for Agriculture saying that the farmer should produce for use and not for profit. I do not propose to quote what the Premier said at one of these conferences, but he said that some people do not seem to understand what it means, and that, no matter what the farmer does, he must produce to some extent for profit.

I now want to say something in connection with the Burnett lands. We are told that the Burnett lands are going to solve the problem of the settlement of the people of Queensland, and I hope they will. I am going to be perfectly frank about this. I see evidence of a little political vindictiveness at the same time in connection with some of the Government schemes for land settlement. Quoting from the Rockhampton "Morning Bulletin," this is what the Home Secretary said with reference to the hon. member for Normanby—

"But we will sink him. The day that it appeared in the Press that we could go on with these schemes of railway construction and irrigation, some of which will be in his district, that sounded his death-knell."

A great deal of talking has been done in connection with the Burnett lands, and the Federal Government have been blamed because they could not advance the money for the domestic policy of this Government.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Mr. Hughes lied to us about it.

Mr. MAXWELL: What did Mr. Hughes offer? He said, "I have £2,000,000 to advance conditionally upon your settling people from overseas on the land." I believe in the settlement of our own people—that is a domestic policy. Why did not the Premier accept the offer made by Mr. Hughes?

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: That offer was never made.

Mr. MAXWELL: I say that it was made.

Mr. KIRWAN: I say it was not made.

Mr. BRENNAN: The hon. member for Toowoomba must accept the Minister's denial.

Mr. MAXWELL: The Federal Prime Minister was at the conference of the New Settlers' League of Australia, and he said, at the close of the morning's address—

"It was because Mr. Theodore was unable to and declined to give an assurance that the money advanced would be used for immigration and not used for the settlement of his own political friends

[Mr. Maxwell.]

that I felt compelled to refrain from entering into an agreement with him. It is the business of the State to settle its own citizens upon the land. We supplement them. We have to find the money. They cannot use our money for their purposes, and we only ask for that authority and those assurances which will enable us to give a guarantee to the Commonwealth and the British Government and the investor that these moneys are to be used for a definite purpose, and that the immigrant will get employment and will get a block of land. So that involves an agreement entered into between us and the State Governments guaranteeing those very things."

In connection with this scheme of immigration, I hope that the Government are sincere in regard to the immigrants they are going to bring out to Queensland. We have in existence a New Settlers' League, whose aims and objects are to assist the Government in every possible way. I have been in close touch with the Secretary for Public Lands in this matter, and I have information in connection with the settlement of people on the land. The unfortunate part of it is that there are insufficient people coming into Queensland. In saying that, I believe it is necessary for me to disabuse the minds of a section of the community who appear to think that it is my sole aim, with others, to dump people on the streets of this community. Nothing is further from the aim of the New Settlers' League than that. We have asked the Premier and the Secretary for Public Lands to assist us in every possible way. We have asked them to appoint a Government officer to help us, and it is not the intention of the league to bring about industrial congestion.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: You belong to the Employers' Federation.

Mr. MAXWELL: It would be all right if I belonged to a federation like the hon. member belongs to and if I stood under the communistic flag; but because I band myself with others to protect ourselves against the unscrupulous attacks made upon us, it is all wrong. The honorary Minister is now in the House, and I want to tell him that his information, so far as my speech is concerned, from the gentleman that he got it from is false. I never made a speech like that.

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: I have got your speech.

Mr. MAXWELL: The hon. gentleman can have it. As I said before, the receiver is worse than the thief. If there were no receivers there would be no thieves. I congratulate the hon. gentleman upon the dirty tools he has to use to try and accomplish the object which he has set about achieving. If that sort of thing has to be done by a Minister of the Crown, I do not want to be one. (Government laughter.) The writing is on the wall, and whether I am a Minister or not, it matters little to me. The New Settlers' League were desirous of settling people on the Burnett lands for the purpose of doing something good for Queensland, but the Premier tries to make political capital out of his visit with the Prime Minister, because, as he says, the Prime Minister would not advance the £2,000,000 for him to spend on domestic settlement, and he states that the Prime Minister does not want us to settle people on the land in Queensland. The

Prime Minister is just as keen as the Premier for land settlement.

With reference to returned soldiers, I want to draw attention to a deputation from the Trades Hall Council, which waited on the Secretary for Public Works and asked him to intervene with the Arbitration Court to wipe out preference to "diggers" over unionists, and the Minister agreed to it.

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: That is not true.

Mr. MAXWELL: It was said that the Minister was sympathetic.

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: That is absolutely wrong.

Mr. MAXWELL: That is what was said.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must accept the Minister's denial.

Mr. MAXWELL: I was going to do so.

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

Mr. BULCOCK (*Barcoo*): In the "Courier" of this morning is to be found a subleader which states that the duty of the Opposition is to oppose, and it seems that that is the attitude to be adopted by the Opposition during this session, quite apart from the merits that any measure introduced by this Government may have. The "Courier" is living up to its reputation of the past, and no doubt will continue to do so in the future. I have before me a cutting from the issue of the "Courier" of the 10th May of the present year. In that issue is a subleader entitled "The Federal Shearing Award," which reads—

"It is somewhat disconcerting to learn that a feeling of unrest is said to have been caused in union circles in the South by the award for the pastoral industry which was given in the Federal Arbitration Court on Friday last."

Without entering into a discussion of the merits or demerits of this award, which the "Courier" is so alarmed about, I may say that it was an award that, within a week of its delivery, the very gentleman who gave it, the President of the Federal Arbitration Court, had to alter and increase. The subleader goes on—

"The court decided on a reversion to the rates imposed by Mr. Justice Higgins in 1917, except as regards the standard of working hours, which it reduced, subject to a reference to the Full High Court, from forty-eight to forty-four. This decision involved an all-round reduction of wages. The shearing rates are to come down from 40s. per 100 sheep to 30s., and the wages for shed hands from £4 10s. per week to £3."

Then the article goes on—

"Prices are now showing a tendency to rise, but the opinion is generally held that the present levels may not be sustained."

As a matter of fact, they were more than sustained, because there was an increase in the successive sales after this subleader appeared. Then the article continues—

"Mr. Justice Powers said he was satisfied that the 30s. rate would give the shearers a much better return now than

*Mr. Bulcock.]*

it was estimated by the court to give when the 1917 award came into existence."

The whole effect of this article was to influence public opinion, in view of the fact that the award of the shearers and shed workers, and the pastoral workers generally, had to come before the State Arbitration Court, and that decision was pending. Here is a very significant string in the tail of this article—

"It is difficult to see how the members of the union can consistently take exception to the findings of the court. The pastoral industry in Queensland is not affected by the Southern award. But the principle at stake is the same throughout the Commonwealth. The decision of the court ought to be equally binding on all parties concerned."

That means that the members of the Australian Workers' Union, who have access to the State Arbitration Court in Queensland, should be prevented from going into the State Arbitration Court, but that the Federal award should be made binding generally throughout the whole Commonwealth. There is a distinct expression of opinion that where the Federal Arbitration Court has jurisdiction over an industry the State Arbitration Court should not have any jurisdiction at all. It is well for the workers in the pastoral areas to know that hon. gentlemen opposite will be prepared to put that into effect if they manage to gain control of power again, and that they will utilise the class-biased Federal court to gain their own ends. I might refer to some litigation that is going on in the Southern States at the present time arising out of this award given by the Federal Arbitration Court. It is significant that several individuals in New South Wales, recognising that the Queensland award is a fair one, agreed to pay their employees in their shearing-holds the rates prescribed by the Queensland Arbitration Court. No sooner did they decide to do that than we find that the Pastoralists and Graziers' Association of New South Wales started litigation against them, and applied for an injunction to restrain them from paying a higher rate than that prescribed by Mr. Justice Powers in the Federal Arbitration Court. What does that mean? We know that hon. members opposite have always contended that, when the Arbitration Court fixed a certain rate, that minimum became the maximum. Hon. members opposite have always told us that under the Arbitration Court awards everyone would be reduced to the one level. The litigation going on in New South Wales at the present time is certainly reducing everybody to the same level, irrespective of the justice of the claim, and irrespective of whether the employees have a legitimate claim or not. The Pastoralists' Association, responsible for the litigation in New South Wales, lays it down that no employer shall be allowed to pay more than the award prescribed. If they succeed in making it illegal for an employer to pay more than the award prescribed, it means that the minimum will become the maximum. It is well that the pastoral workers should recognise this. The Opposition are always talking about the Labour party not making any recognition of merit or ability. That is what they themselves want to do in connection with the shearing award to-day. It does not matter whether the individuals engaged in the pastoral industry have special ability or not,

[Mr. Bulcock.

that ability must not be recognised. That article in the "Courier" suggests that the pastoral industry is a broken down and tottering industry, incapable of financing itself, and one that requires the removal of the burden of wages placed upon it, and that is why the "Courier" sympathises with the pastoralist. But, if we turn to another part of the same issue of 10th May, we will find a letter written by Mr. W. J. Wheeler, in which he says, regarding Mr. Magoffin's wool—

"This safe and fine policy was reflected in the wool sales rooms last week, when his wool realised the record for Queensland price of 51d. per lb."

That raises a very interesting point. If the clip from a certain station in the North-west is worth 51d. per lb., then wool of the same quality can be grown on other stations. Are the workers to have their wages reduced just because of the want of ability on the part of managers of stations? We know that certain wools cannot be produced in certain country, but it is a fact that there is a big margin of improvement possible in the flocks of Queensland at the present time. If one station can produce wool worth 51d. per lb., then many other stations can do it also, and the workers should not be penalised because the pastoralists cannot produce the highest quality of wool. There is a third article in this same "Courier" of 10th May which I might also refer to. There are three consecutive articles which deal with the question, all appearing in the "Courier" of the same date. The first deals with the Federal award for the pastoral industry. The second shows that the squatter need not be afraid of ruin when wool fetches 51d. per lb. To show that that is not an isolated case, I will quote a telegram in the same issue, relating to the wool sales which took place in Sydney on 9th May—

"Sydney, 9th May.

"Wool sales were held at the Sydney Wool Exchange to-day, when the quantity catalogued totalled 8,448 bales, and the sales, including private transactions, amounted to 10,220 bales. A very strong market ruled, and, if anything, the recently reported advance was accentuated, largely as a result of a keen demand on the American account for super lines. The Continental and Yorkshire sections also showed much activity, and the Japanese section operated with great freedom for suitable lines of skirtings. Crossbreds sold well at the improved level quoted the previous day, the demand running keenly on the finer descriptions. Skirtings also made enhanced values, but coarse burry lots were still neglected. Greasy merino wool sold to 29½d."

Now we go a little further and find a report of the wool sales of a day earlier—

"A poor selection of wool was offered at the 'Bawra' sale. There was strong general competition at last week's closing rates. Quotations—Freshwater, to 37½d., T.C.T. over P., to 29d.; Glenfield, to 29d.; O.P., to 27d."

Dalgety's report says—

"Wool sales continue very animated, with a hardening tendency. Excluding super merino wools, prices, as compared with the closing rates of the previous London series of sales, for merino wools.

are from 10 per cent. to 15 per cent. higher, and for coarse crossbred wools 15 per cent. to 20 per cent. higher. Home trade and Continental buyers are very active, and American buyers are again operating."

Now we turn to a subleader appearing in the "Courier" of yesterday—

"The sale in Brisbane during the period from 28th June to 6th July, inclusive, of over 74,000 bales of wool means to the State about £1,500,000 of new money."

Does that look like poverty? Does it look as if the industry is unable to bear the burdens that the Labour Government are supposed to have placed on them? Does it look as if the pastoral industry were tottering to ruin? No. The "Courier" itself admits it is not—

"The 1921-22 wool season in Australia has gone with all our yesterdays, and it is satisfactory to know that the prices and clearances have been good."

That, to a large extent, discounts the arguments which have been advanced from time to time concerning want of prosperity in the wool industry.

Having discoursed on that, I want to say something about the political activities of the squatters here, about the influence the squatters have wielded in matters political, and the influence they would wield again if they had the power to do so. Turning to the pages of the ancient political history of Queensland, we find the very striking fact that in the majority of cases squatters absolutely predominated in the early Parliaments. For instance, Sir Joshua Peter Bell was in the Assembly from 1853 to 1879, and was President of the Council till his death. He was frequently a Minister. Another squatter, Sir R. R. Mackenzie, was Premier. Then there were Messrs. Coxon, Wienholt, Gilbert Elliott (Speaker for sixteen sessions), Arthur Macalister, Murray-Prior, Gore, Archer, A. Hodgson, Oscar de Saige, Sir A. Palmer (Premier), B. B. Morehead (another Premier), and C. B. Dutton. These individuals influenced the politics of Queensland for several decades, and influenced them in the interests of the squatters, as a perusal of "Hansard" and the Land Acts will clearly show.

Mr. FLETCHER: You are talking bosh.

Mr. BULCOCK: The hon. member will have an opportunity of proving his statement when I have finished. It is significant that these gentlemen occupied very high positions in the political history of this State. In 1831, to take a case in point, the squatting interest in the Government was represented by no fewer than twenty members out of a total of twenty-five. But with the coming into office of Sir Thomas Mellwraith the power of the squatters was, to a large extent, destroyed, and, when it was destroyed in this Chamber, they had a pass to another Chamber and entrench their interests in the stronghold of Conservatism, and they have since more logically carried out their activities in the Legislative Council. For many years they were entrenched there and dictated, or attempted to dictate, every political settlement that came before this Chamber. To every political problem that was entangled with the interests of the pastoralists they attempted to provide the

answer. The hon. member for Port Curtis suggested that I am talking bosh. What about the 1920 Land Act Amendment Bill? Who attempted to dictate the settlement in that instance? Who has always attempted to dictate the settlement of Queensland's land policy? No answer to that question is possible other than that the squatters have, in the main, tried to dictate the policy of the Government. I make these remarks because, now that the Council has gone and the dead hand of the squatter is removed from public life, they have had to burrow, and undermine, to form another party in order that they may get representation for their interests in this Chamber. They know that, with their political record and the happenings of the past, it is impossible for them to come out as a party of their own. They know that not one of them could survive an appeal to a constituency, and, because they know that, they have fallen behind the Country party, and are the most dominant interest in it. No wonder that the Queensland Farmers' Union is breaking away from the Country party—breaking away from the domination of the pastoralists and the big squatters. The Country party say that they do not stand for the big interests. In my electorate all the big landholders who were Nationalists a few years ago now belong to the Country party. In every centre of the Barcoo and other pastoral electorates also you find those who were previously associated with the Nationalist or Liberal interests now active members of this self-same Country party, but I want to assure the House that the Western people have "taken a tumble to them." Quite recently they sent an organiser round my electorate, and in two of the principal towns he was unable to get a chairman. That is how much they think in the West of this precious Country party. They are absolutely convinced that they are subservient to the squatting interest, and they have had a taste of the legislation they would dish out to them and of what they are prepared to do to damn Queensland or a Labour Administration in Queensland. If it were not for the action of this Government and the land laws this Government have passed, there is no doubt that to-day we would be on the way towards the formation of squatting trusts. You see it going on in the other States. You see certain individuals acquiring huge areas in other States; but, because this Government believe in closer settlement and have legislation drafted to give effect to it, there is very little possibility of the squatter realising his aspiration and being able to hand down from father to son large areas of land and so prevent closer settlement. It used to be said that the interests of the squatter and selector could not be identical, and there was a feud, born of much bitterness and hatred and struggle, between the two; but now this Country party, representing the big squatters and the big moneyed interests, ask the elector to send them in behind their hereditary enemies. He is not going to do it, and it has only served to strengthen his allegiance to the Labour party.

I remember that a few days ago the leader of the Opposition put up his "man Friday," the hon. member for Oxley, to state the case from the Opposition point of view, and I remember that in his remarks he said that the hon. member for Leichhardt, like other members on this side, was in the

Mr. Bulcock.]

habit of skimming the surface of truth, taking certain things that suited him and giving them out as glorious truths. If the hon. member for Leichhardt did that, then the hon. member for Oxley was guilty of a greater sin, because he must have known what he was doing. He said, in effect, that a comparison between our taxation and that of Victoria favoured the Victorian Government. He failed to say that the Victorian Government taxed a person for having children. He forgot to tell this House also that the Victorian Government allows no exemption. I will give some figures to show whether we do this same thing or whether we do not.

[8.30 p.m.]

In the first place, let us take the exemptions in the Commonwealth and in the various States. For a single man they are—

	£
Commonwealth ... ..	100
New South Wales ... ..	250
Victoria ... ..	200
Queensland ... ..	200
South Australia ... ..	100
Western Australia ... ..	100
Tasmania ... ..	126

You will notice that Victoria and Queensland have the same exemption for a single man. For a married man the exemptions are—

	£
Commonwealth ... ..	156
New South Wales ... ..	250
Victoria ... ..	200
Queensland ... ..	226
South Australia ... ..	150
Western Australia ... ..	155
Tasmania ... ..	157

Now take the deductions in respect of each child—

	£
Commonwealth ... ..	26
New South Wales ... ..	50
Victoria ... ..	Nil
Queensland ... ..	26
South Australia ... ..	15
Western Australia ... ..	26
Tasmania ... ..	Nil

That taxation basis is in accord with the highest ideal of the Labour party—that the man who has the greatest obligations shall have the least amount of taxation to pay. Let us go a little further, and see how a married man with no children, earning £225 per annum, would fare so far as State and Federal taxation are concerned—

	State.	State and Federal.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
New South Wales ... ..	Nil.	2 5 9
Victoria ... ..	0 18 9	3 2 6
Queensland ... ..	Nil.	2 3 9
South Australia ... ..	1 19 9	4 2 9
Western Australia ... ..	2 11 7	4 15 4
Tasmania ... ..	3 7 10	5 11 7

A married man with three children, on an income of £225 per year, would not pay any income tax in New South Wales, Queensland, and Western Australia; but in this much-vaunted State of Victoria, he would be penalised to the extent of 18s. 9d. because he had children. In South Australia, he would be penalised to the extent of 15s. 7d., and in Tasmania to the extent of £2 9s. 7d.

Now I will attempt to show why the hon. member for Oxley and various other members

[Mr. Bulcock,

on that side are squealing. We have said that the incidence of taxation should fall on those most capable of bearing it, and I have taken out a table which shows how much a married man without children, earning £1,000 a year, would have to pay—

	State.	State and Federal.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
England ... ..	195 15 0	...
Victoria ... ..	18 15 0	66 14 9
Queensland ... ..	69 0 0	107 19 9
South Australia ... ..	28 7 9	76 7 5
Western Australia ... ..	30 16 8	78 16 5
Tasmania ... ..	31 12 6	79 12 3
New South Wales ... ..	47 1 8	95 1 5

That discloses the reason for the wrath the Opposition pour on the Government, because we have made the incidence fall on those on whom it should fall.

The hon. member for Oxley was very caustic in his reference to the financial condition of Queensland. Referring to the contention of the hon. member for Leichhardt that the financial position of Queensland was a very satisfactory one, whereas there was bankruptcy in Europe, the hon. member for Oxley said there was bankruptcy only in those countries that were governed by communists. Has that hon. member read in to-day's paper of the fall of the mark in Austria and Germany? You can buy a hatful of marks for 1s. of our currency in either of those countries.

Mr. SIZER: Have they not both Governments of the workers?

Mr. BULCOCK: We know quite well that the Government of Germany is faithfully reproduced and represented in the minds and political convictions of hon. gentlemen opposite. The same applies to Austria.

Mr. SIZER: But did they not have revolutions there?

Mr. BULCOCK: What did they assassinate Rathenau for the other day in Germany?

Going a little further, the hon. member for Oxley said it is the intention of this Government to exterminate the farmer. At a later stage in the debate the hon. member for Nanango said, "I am pleased that after seven years the Government have seen fit to attempt, at least, to do something for the primary producers." I would like to draw attention to some things which the Government have done for the farmers. I am inclined to think that, if hon. gentlemen gave more attention to what the Government have done and less attention to carping criticism and misrepresentation of facts, they would arrive at a far better understanding of the position. Let us see what Bills have been passed by this Government to assist the farmers. There are the Checco Pool Bill, the Regulation of Sugar Cane Prices Act Bill, the Banana Industry Preservation Bill, the Wheat Advances Agreement Ratification Bill, Income Tax Act Amendment Bill, Dairy Produce Bill, Stock Foods Bill, Co-operative and Agricultural Production Act Amendment Bill, and the Wheat Pool Bill. We intend to submit this session the Primary Producers' Organisation Bill, Fruit Cases Act Amendment Bill, Co-operative Agricultural Production Act Amendment Bill, Irrigation and Conservation Bill, Agricultural Education Bill, and Closer Settlement Bill, all of which are designed for the benefit of the farmer. The

hon. member for Oxley said the farmer needs attention, help, guidance, sympathy. Has he, like a Rip Van Winkle, been asleep on the National Opposition benches for the past few years and suddenly been rudely awakened, opened his eyes, and rushed into the nearest camp—the Country party camp—and, having found himself there, has he looked round and found he is in the wrong party? Is he aware that this State is spending at the rate of £130,000 per annum to encourage agriculture? (Opposition laughter.) Shortly after we assumed office we distributed seed wheat, maize, and fodder to the value of no less a sum than £47,000. In 1918 we distributed £8,000 worth of seed wheat. We gave a cotton guarantee, and we have our experimental activities. All these things, of course, have been for the benefit of the farmer. Evidently, it is the function of the Country party to establish, if possible, a popular belief that the Labour party are opposed to the farmer. If they can establish that belief, well and good; because it is well recognised that a belief, once established, tends to become traditional—it is repeated without thought, and accepted without reflection. But, fortunately, the farmers are beginning to reflect, and the enthusiasm that has greeted the Premier's announcement of an agricultural policy is a sufficient indication that the farmers are awake to the fact that their class interests lie in the direction of supporting this Government rather than a Government who are opposed to them.

Let us look again to the value of the products that were produced before this Government came into power, and those which are being produced to-day. In 1915, the year the Labour party came into power, the milk produced in Queensland was 17,093,674 gallons; butter, 25,456,714 lb.; and cheese, 4,383,410 lb., to a value of £2,041,668.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: You do not take the credit for that?

MR. BULCOCK: Queensland produced in 1921, 581,653,521 lb. of butter, 13,075,124 lb. cheese, and 14,400,000 lb. condensed milk, to a total value of £7,259,891, or an increase during the time that this Labour Government have been driving the farmer to damnation and ruin of £5,218,125. In 1915, 1,152,516 tons of sugar-cane, to a value of £1,524,057 was produced in Queensland, and in 1921 this had increased to £9,380,000. Do those figures not speak for themselves? That indicates that the Labour Government have done a good deal to encourage agriculture in this State.

I will now take cotton. Prior to 1918 the advance was 1½d. per lb., and now it is 5½d. per lb., due again to the activities of the Labour Government. The value of wool produced in 1915 was £5,112,000, and in 1920, £8,371,580. The value of crops in 1915 was £5,023,304, and in 1920, £10,326,233, indicating conclusively that the farmers have had confidence in this Government. The amount of wheat produced in 1915 was only £113,970, whereas in 1920 it was £1,745,547. The latter amount was produced under legislation initiated and passed by this Government.

Now the question of capital. I wish to discourse on every possible phase, so as to arrive at some honest understanding. In 1915, the capital invested in machinery, implements for farming, dairying, irrigation, and travelling machinery was £1,856,192, and in 1920, £2,884,340. Would that indicate that the farming industry is suffering, and that the

Government were driving individuals off the land? Does that indicate that the people were not prepared to advance capital for investment in the farming industry? In 1915 the number of persons engaged in farming and dairying was 59,140, and in 1920, 64,228.

The hon. member for Oxley suggested that the people who were coming to Queensland were the flotsam and jetsam of Australia, and that they were coming here for the rations that they might obtain. Are the people who have gone on to the farming lands, and who are producing the wealth of Queensland, flotsam and jetsam? The hon. member also stated that this Government were driving capital out of the country, but, according to the figures of the Bureau of Science and Industry, as published in the "Courier" on 27th September, 1921, £22,000,000 in new capital found its way into Queensland in 1920. That would indicate that the hon. member's contention that capital was being driven from the country is false, untrue, and ridiculous.

The hon. member also stated that he did not wish to see an increase in Savings Bank deposits. The argument that depositors in Queensland had a greater amount to their credit than in any other State in the Commonwealth was irrefutable, and, as the hon. member could not deny it, he thought he would ridicule it, and went on to say that the workers had big deposits, and that industry was the best custodian of their savings. The hon. member has often taken upon himself to lecture hon. members on this side of the House about their faulty knowledge of economics. He knows as well as I do, and we all know that the more money that finds its way into the coffers of the bank, the more money there is for investment in the industries of the country. Would he suggest that the workers should go to the stock exchange with their savings, and buy a parcel of shares? He must know that that is a duty devolving on the banks. The banks are the custodian of the people's savings. It is in that way that the savings of the workers are invested. The workers of Queensland put their money into the banks. They have such complete confidence in the Government of Queensland that they know their money will be safe when invested in industrial enterprises. The hon. member for Oxley also said, "I want to be quite clear where I stand: I stand for a forty-eight-hour week." I am glad that he has made that admission. I stand for a forty-four-hour week. I would like to ask the hon. member for Oxley if he stands for a forty-eight-hour week in shearing-sheds and the canefields, and if he is going to develop the North under a forty-eight-hour week? It is well for the people, especially the people working outback on the railway lines, and in the shearing-sheds, the canefields, and developing the North, to know that a man of the standing of the hon. member for Oxley, who has big political ambitions, stands for a forty-eight-hour week, which he would inflict on those workers in the event of being able to have his will gratified.

Last, but not least, in the indictment of the hon. member for Oxley is the charge that the Labour Government are compelling certain unionists throughout Queensland to pay 10s. per annum towards the establishment of a chain of Labour papers throughout the Commonwealth. In the first place, I would like to assure the hon. gentleman, who appears to have such a faulty knowledge of the position.

Mr. Bulcock.]



that this is a levy self-imposed by the various unions throughout the Commonwealth. If that is such a dastardly thing, why does he not condemn the action of the executive of the party to which he belongs, which compels every member, under pain of not being able to market his produce satisfactorily, to contribute so much per head for every 100 head of cattle he possesses?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No.

Mr. BULCOCK: And so much for every 1,000 sheep possessed. Hon. members opposite shake their heads and say, "No." But they know as well as I do that it is true. They know they have got Country party organisers like Gallagher, whom the Government "sacked" because he was not honest, and various other individuals organising in order to raise funds; otherwise why are they sending them to elections that they have got no hope of winning? Merely with the intention of making the small man contribute so much per 100 head of cattle, and so much per 1,000 head of sheep that he has running. Why did the hon. member not tell hon. members about that?

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

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mirani*): In reference to the Speech delivered by His Excellency in this Chamber last Tuesday, of course no objection can be taken to the wording, and one sentence certainly deserves special mention. I notice that on the first page His Excellency uses these words—

"While I have nothing but admiration for the people whom I met in small communities, remote from town, railway, and port, bearing bravely their isolation and its attendant hardships. I could not help hoping that before many years have passed new settlers will join them in such numbers as to make possible the comforts, the conveniences, and the social life that obtain only where there is a population large enough to provide them."

His Excellency, since he has been in Queensland, has used his opportunities well. There is not much to cavil at in the other portions of the Speech. Reference is made to agricultural production, to the pastoral industry, to the need for immigration, and so on, and nobody can disagree on those matters.

We all realise the necessities of Queensland, but have the Government, who have been in power during the past six or seven years, given any indication of their ability or their willingness to put into effect the promises that are contained in their programme? We have only to look back to 1915, and see the promises that were made on that occasion, and how many of them remain unfulfilled, to enable us to gauge the value of any promise that is made at the present time by the Government.

So far as the agricultural policy is concerned, which seems to be the Premier's sheet anchor, I have devoted a considerable portion of my life to organising the farmers, and I think I can claim to have been fairly successful. I took part in the initiation of the two large organisations in connection with the sugar industry, and all I can say is, that every member on this side of the House would be only too willing to help the Premier in his efforts in that direction. But I think it is about time that the hon. gentle-

man defined his position, and that he told us where he really was; or, rather, where he really is. We know where he was. I have here the Labour platform as published in the "Worker" in 1909, the year he was elected, and at the foot is the pledge signed by all Labour candidates. I presume that the Premier signed this pledge—

"I hereby pledge myself not to oppose candidates selected by the recognised political organisation, and to do my utmost to carry out the principles embodied in the Australian Labour Party's platform, and on all questions affecting the platform to vote as a majority of the parliamentary party may decide at a duly constituted caucus meeting."

That shows that the Labour party is purely a sectional party, with purely sectional aims, and we would like to know where the Premier now stands in that regard—whether he is his own master or whether he is not. I would like to point out that the first item in the objective is the socialisation of industry, the means of production and exchange—in other words, the entire extinction of anything in the shape of private ownership. The State is to own everything, and the individual to own nothing.

At 8.55 p.m.,

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

Mr. SWAYNE: In order to make the position clear, I intend to read some quotations from a speech that I made some four years after the Premier was first elected to this House. In 1913, as reported in "Hansard" for that year, page 397, I quoted from a book issued from the "Worker" office, entitled "What the Labour Platform Means," and written by "Qui Vive," and therefore I think we may take it as emanating from a source that is authoritative. It says—

"That is why the Labour movement should be class-conscious—that we may by our own deliberate effort and our calculated enthusiasm accelerate—"

Hon. members will mark the word "accelerate"—

"the process of transformation from private ownership to common ownership for the community good."

That means that those who have been working all their lives to provide for their old age will have to surrender everything to the common stock. The book goes on—

"The process will be a gradual one, but it need not be a slow one."

The Secretary for Agriculture was in the House at the time, and I notice that, when I quoted those words, he interjected, "Hear, hear!" It goes on—

"It will be step by step, but the steps will follow quickly upon one another if we are so minded."

Then it goes on to speak of the wage question. We have been told that the Labour party are not in favour of wages at all, nor are they in favour of production for profit. However, this explanation of the platform says—

"The workers would demand higher wages. That is to say, a higher and even higher proportion of the wealth they create until at last the margin of

[Mr. Bulcock.

profit would be so small that the system based on profit would collapse into irrevocable ruin."

I ask where the farmer comes in with such a policy as that? Later on, I quoted what Mr. Thomas said at Broken Hill—and we must remember that the aims and objects of the Labour party are the same from one end of Australia to the other; they boast of their solidarity. At that time Mr. Thomas said—

"This, then, is what the Labour movement means. In one precise, pregnant word it means socialism. Well, socialism is your scheme as apart from all other schemes. It is based on social growth. It is the common holding of land, and the means of production and exchange, and the holding of them for the equal benefit of all."

If the farmer is to own nothing of his own, there is no room for him behind the party which advocates a policy such as that. Again, in 1919, when the hon. member for Drayton moved a resolution, the object of which was to increase production in secondary industries, the hon. member for Mackay moved an amendment to this effect—

"That a full standard of living will be reached by securing the full results of their labour to all workers; and to secure this it is necessary that the workers own and control the means of production, distribution, and exchange; that production be for use and not for profit; and that this desirable end can best be reached by the realisation of the objective of the Australian Labour Party."

There is no deception on the part of members of the party outside this House. They know that their policy means the extinction of everything in connection with private ownership. Of course, members of this House are politicians, and they do their best to sidestep the issue. They never mention it. I have never seen one of them bold enough to get up and avow what their objective is, and then attempt to justify socialism and common ownership. I think I have said enough to show the people that, while the Premier still remains a member of the Labour party which stands for this policy, he can support nothing in the shape of private enterprise. The scheme embodied in their policy has been tried over and over again as far back as history goes, and we know that socialism has been nothing but a failure. He may talk as he

[9 p.m.] likes about accepting the help of the Country party. He says he is disappointed that we did not assist him in carrying out his agricultural scheme, but he should realise that it is only reasonable on our part, before we give him the help he asks, to require a plain declaration from him as to whether he is still a party to the confiscatory policy which is embodied in the platform of the Labour party. I think that is a very fair request. In regard to this late development of his, it is an old saying that imitation is one of the sincerest tributes you can pay to the capacity of someone else. That being the case, his adoption of this scheme of organisation is one of the greatest tributes that have been paid to the Country party. I find in the Country party's platform the genesis or the foundation of this scheme.

I have here the foreword of the policy and platform of the Queensland Country party—

"The Primary Producers' Union aims at—

A reconciliation of capital and labour in manner acceptable to reasonable men on both sides.

Financing industries that are essential, believing that the country which can raise millions of pounds for defence can just as readily raise money for reproductive work to add to the production of the country; organising the country's system of distributing, realising that an efficient system of distributing and handling is one of the big problems of the primary producer.

Encouraging greater efficiency in industry and greater development, realising that greater development depends upon an assurance that the producers will obtain an adequate and fair reward for their labour."

There is nothing like that in the Labour platform; yet it is essential for the welfare of the country—

"A more scientific conservation of water, fodder, and all foodstuffs, believing that the Government should co-operate, not merely in supplying full information about crops, market, supply and demand, but that it should assist in building cold stores, preserving plant, silos, and other scientific methods of storage."

You will find the whole groundwork of the Premier's scheme embodied in the platform of the Country party. The Premier says that he was expecting great things from the Country party, and that he was disappointed because he received no help. Did he ever ask our help? I know, from my own experience, that he simply refuses to have anything to do with us—even to see us sometimes. His attitude is indicated by the fact that the Land Settlement Committee, which is specially appointed to handle the subject of settling soldiers on the land, does not contain a member of the Country party, although there is a member of the Nationalist party upon it. Many of the members of the Country party are men who have gone on the land in its virgin state, and brought it to a productive point, but not one of us has been offered a seat on the committee. That is a fair sample of the Premier's attitude towards the Country party; he has never given us the slightest chance of assisting him. If any hon. member on this side ventures to move a resolution on private members' day, having for its object the welfare of the farmer, what treatment does he receive from the other side? As showing where the scheme came from, I have here an amendment which was moved by the hon. member for Drayton on the Profiteering Prevention Bill, which is a still more detailed beginning for the scheme which the Premier is so proud of. The hon. member for Drayton moved in Committee an amendment in these words—

"Without prejudice to the last preceding provisions, there shall be constituted a board of advice, consisting of six representatives of cheese, butter, and bacon industries chosen in the manner and for the term of office prescribed by the regulations by the respective industries as follows:—

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

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

*Mr. Swannc.]*

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

One representative shall be chosen by the proprietary bacon factories.

One representative of suppliers to condensed milk factories."

Would it not have been a right thing on the Premier's part to have given some little credit to the party from whom he got the idea in the first place? The amendment goes on—

"It shall be the duty of the Commissioner to obtain the advice of the said board upon matters relating to the fixing of declared prices for any of the aforesaid commodities, and he may obtain such advice by calling a meeting of the said board or by such other means as he thinks proper, and these shall have power to accept or reject any advice so obtained."

I think I have said enough to show that the Premier is indebted to us, although he does not acknowledge the fact. As to the good wishes expressed by the party opposite for the success of the farmer, I do not want to repeat what has been said over and over again by hon. members on this side—that the farmers have been treated disgracefully by the present Government in regard to the fixation of the prices of their products and in other ways. Through the recent alteration of the boundaries of the electorates, the farmers will be deprived of four seats in Parliament. We know that all the world over it is only the strong that can receive consideration; and we know the necessity for being politically strong. By the taking away of four farmers' seats the Country party has been made politically weak, and less able in future to stand up for the rights of the farmers, in regard to whom the Government are expressing their good wishes. I was disappointed by the Premier's speech on this question. All who come in contact with the Premier will recognise that, big as he is physically, he is sometimes rather a small man. (Laughter.) Anyone reading his speech and seeing the large amount of time he devoted to a personal attack on the hon. member for Oxley will, I think, agree with what I say. The Premier took considerable umbrage to his soul because certain stocks of ours realised a fair price in the share markets on the other side of the world. It has been pointed out that these institutions had left this State on account of the high income tax that had been imposed. What amused me most was this little extract—

"The loan expenditure per head during the financial year 1920-21 was £7 for New South Wales, £7 5s. for Victoria, and £5 for Queensland. What about reckless extravagance?"

The Premier refers to the fact that the expenditure per head was lower in Queensland than the other two States. The reason for that was that the Government could not borrow, and the Premier could not help himself. He reminds me of the saying—

"When the devil was sick,  
The devil a saint would be.  
When the devil was well,  
The devil a saint was he."

(Opposition laughter.) The figures show that at the present time the public indebtedness

[Mr. Swayne.

per head in Queensland is £104, New South Wales £75, and Victoria £58.

The PREMIER: Why not quote Western Australia?

Mr. SWAYNE: They are the States you quoted. When the present Government took office the public indebtedness was £54 per head. During the fifty-five years previous Governments had control in Queensland before the Labour Government took charge, the taxation amounted to £1 8s. 2d. per head, but in the six years that the Labour party have been in power they increased it to £4 19s. 9d. per head. The trouble has been that the Labour party have not kept to their platform. Nobody expects them to keep to their platform in its good points; but, if they had kept to the plank of the platform which provides that money shall only be borrowed for reproductive work, no one would growl at the increase in the public indebtedness. However, there is scarcely any enterprise in which the Government money was invested that has not proved to be a failure. Take the railways, for instance. When this Government took office the railways were paying £4 3s. 6d. per cent., and now they are only paying 9s. 10d. When the Premier was dealing with this he tried to put us into a wrong position by asking if anyone wanted to make the railways pay by increasing the freights. No one in the Country party wants to pay more freights, and I am sure we do not want to balance the ledger in that way. The present position of the railways is due to bad management, and if the present Parliament runs to its full term, we shall find that the accumulated deficit on the railways during the term of the Labour party will amount to £7,000,000.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Might I suggest to hon. members not to converse in such loud tones. Conversation carried on in such loud tones is not only a distraction to the speaker, but it interferes with the correct reporting of his speech by the "Hansard" staff.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. SWAYNE: During the present Labour regime the earning capacity of the railway employees, which in 1914 was £102 per annum per man, was reduced in 1918 to £17 per man. We know that the present Government increased the number of employees by 33 per cent., and almost immediately there was a decrease in the amount of work done. That is shown by the number of train miles run, which works out at 1,403,000 miles less than under the previous Administration. I find, also, that, while the numbers of employees were increased by 33 per cent., the length of railways opened only increased by 16 per cent., during the first four or five years that the Government were in office, and the railways were greatly overmanned; but, although there was a great increase in the number of hands employed, there was a decrease in the amount of work done. Many of those who were put on during the time of boom, borrow, and burst no doubt have since regretted that they were taken from other avenues in life and boosted up by the belief that they would have soft jobs in the Railway Department. Now these men are turned out into the cold world. I think I have said enough to show that, if the Country party had the opportunity, it would make a better showing of our railways than the present Government have done. What I have said clearly indicates that the present Government are unable to carry out the

policy that is contained in the Governor's Speech. The only party in Queensland at the present time which is able to carry out a broad, comprehensive, progressive policy, and one which makes for prosperity in Queensland is the Country party.

Mr. PEASE: Mr. Hughes does not say that.

Mr. SWAYNE: There is no State in Australia that depends so much on primary production as Queensland, and as nearly every member of this party is directly engaged in primary production, and as most of us have been able to make a success of our farms, it stands to reason that we would show the same ability and make a success of government if we had the control of the affairs of this State. I notice a reference in the Governor's Speech to the amount of public works in view, including railways, irrigation works, and so on. I was naturally anxious to know the method under which the money voted for public works was being spent. We all know that the interest charge on loan indebtedness is increasing every year. When this Government took office the interest bill was £1,900,000 per annum, and it is now £3,250,000. It is our duty to see that this money is properly spent, and that the people get fair value for it. That is not so with this Government, because they are not getting fair value for the money spent. I asked the Minister in charge of the Department of Public Works a question last week in reference to the method of carrying out public works. I pointed out that the excessive cost of our railways and other public works brought about by construction under day labour, and the huge load of unproductive indebtedness already piled up, was a heavy burden on the producers. The hon. gentleman in replying said that my question was based on wrong premises, and on misleading and inaccurate grounds. One has only to remember that under the day labour system things have so degenerated that the State gets about £2,000,000 worth of work for the expenditure of about £3,000,000 of loan money. Seeing that about £7,000,000 of loan money has been spent on public works such as railways, erection of school buildings, and other public buildings since this Government came into office, I am prepared to say that, under a proper method of carrying out the work, the people of Queensland would have got as much done for £4,500,000 as has been done by the present Government for £7,000,000. As an example, a small railway is being built in my electorate, and, by the way, the money for the purpose was subscribed by a local loan—although that does not excuse the Government, whose duty it is to see that they get full value for the people's money. I find, according to the best information I can get, that 5 miles 40 chains have been built at a cost of about £49,600, or about £9,000 a mile, for a small agricultural line with 42-lb. rails and sleepers, many of which, I should say from the look of them—and I know something of the matter—are rejects. Moreover, a bridge has yet to be built. If that is what happens in the case of a small line of that description, what must our main routes be costing, with 61-lb. rails, heavy sleepers, and so on? The cost must be absolutely prohibitive. It simply means that the freight from the few dozen farmers for whom the line has been built and who could pay interest on a fair cost of construction, will find it impossible to meet the charges on a heavy capitalisation like that, and there will have to be another

charge on the consolidated revenue. The consolidated revenue can stand a certain amount; but, if every line is built in such a manner, is it any wonder that the taxable margin of the people is exhausted and the consolidated revenue cannot stand the strain? That is what happens under the present Government. Take as another instance this Inkerman irrigation scheme. We know that many of the farmers are simply appalled at the heavy charges they will have to meet. If what we hear is correct, it will altogether alter the value of their farms. I have a letter here from one of them, in which he says—

“Firstly, may I say that you are at liberty to use my name and to say that I am owner of a block in the irrigation area, and publicly offered to Mr. Theodore the sum of £500, payable at the rate of £100 per annum for five years, to be allowed to withdraw from the scheme and install my own plant to irrigate my own farm in my own way. My objection to the scheme, apart from its cost, is the fact that no provision has been made for a period of general drought throughout the district, and although your cane may be dying, you have to wait your turn to water, and by the time you get the water the cane may be too far gone to recover.”

That is from Mr. John Mann, who used to be a Labour member of this House, and who is worthy of hon. member's confidence, and is now, I believe, a successful farmer.

These things bring to one's mind the injustice and the hardship that are being piled upon the settlers in the back blocks. Take the schools. I venture to say, without fear of contradiction, that they are costing £600 where they should cost but £400, and £900 where they should cost but £600; and the consequence is that many of our bush children are going without education, or they are so crowded together that they are being educated under insanitary conditions. Here is a case which came under my own notice: There is a little school in my electorate which needed a veranda. The people were told they could not have it because the estimated cost was prohibitive. It was £96 for a veranda 21 feet by 8 feet. Some years previously, when galvanised iron and everything else were at their highest prices, I had a veranda 47 feet by 9 feet, with an 11-foot room at one end of it, built here by contract for £92. Under the present system of carrying out Government works we find that it costs more to build a veranda less than half the size. When we ask for schools and additions we are told that the money has been voted by Parliament and expended. This is no reflection on the Minister in charge of the Department of Public Instruction, because this work is not in his hands. Yet, under this wretched system, these are the things that happen, and I am told by the Minister at the head of the Department of Public Works, who, I think, is a tradesman, that I am proceeding on false premises when I suggest that all this extra cost will fall on the producers. It will have to do so, because it must come out of the land in the long run. All I can do is to commend the hon. gentleman's answer to his own constituents. I would like to refer, also, to the township of Mackay, and the way in which the State butchers' shops were erected. I notice, also, that forestry is mentioned in the Governor's

*Mr. Swayne.]*

Speech, and, if the way in which the forest reserve in my district is managed is any criterion of the general management of our State forests, then all I can say is that it must be very bad indeed.

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

Mr. BRENNAN (*Toowoomba*): It is very interesting to know that so many speeches have been made by our opponents which only go to show that they are very annoyed at what the Government are attempting to do. We heard a speech from the hon. member for Toowong, in which he talked about the credit of Queensland, and commented on the fact that the session was opened on 4th July. I think it will be interesting to American financiers to know that we did begin business on the 4th July, because that hon. member attended the meeting which sent home the Philp delegation to condemn Queensland and deprive her of assistance when she was sorely needing it.

Mr. WARREN: We have heard all that.

Mr. BRENNAN: Yes; but it is true, and it will bear repeating. The Premier then was driven to apply to America for a loan, and successfully negotiated, not one, but two loans, and may probably negotiate further loans, which, with the way Queensland stock is selling, shows that the credit of Queensland is better than that of any other State in Australia. New South Wales, with the loyal Fuller Administration in office, put a loan of £5,000,000 on the English market, but it was a failure, and they had to withdraw it. After all, what does loyalty mean in these things? The only kind of loyalty the financiers who have charge of the market in London recognise is loyalty to themselves. The English people are not to blame, but the politicians are in league with these financiers in such a way that they have to work their will. I think this Government set an example to Australia for [9.30 p.m.] her own security, because the financiers of London were so disloyal to a country like Australia, which did so much during the war. We supplied meat at cost price, whilst the Argentine got full price. We sacrificed Australia by supplying our metals, our wool, our beef, and our wheat at a price practically below the cost of production. The profits which could have been made had we received world's parity would have been greater than the war debt in Australia to-day—£425,000,000.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Do you say we supplied meat below the cost of production?

Mr. BRENNAN: I say practically below the cost of production.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: At what price did the State butcher shops get it, then?

Mr. BRENNAN: In the Federal Parliament, Mr. Hughes would not allow a commission to inquire into the metal industry. Our loss, on world's parity, was more than the cost of the war. The hon. member for Oxley prates about all these things. We know very well where he stood during those times.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: We know where you will stand next Wednesday. (Laughter.)

Mr. BRENNAN: A complaint has been lodged to-night that the Government have not played the game regarding Anthony Cumming. What do the people on the other

side care about him? They only make the reference because they think it may work to their political advantages.

Mr. VOWLES: Freedom of speech; that is all.

Mr. BRENNAN: Honesty is greater than freedom. If I had had my way, at the time he went down South on the Ryan case, I would have sacked him. That is the time he should have been sacked. If any man in Queensland ever gave reason for dismissal from his position, not because of his utterances, but because of his conduct, it was Cumming. He was very rarely in his office. The hon. member for Bulimba, when Treasurer, had him on the carpet and wanted to dismiss him.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: Oh, no!

Mr. BRENNAN: You know that. We hear a great deal about the condition of affairs in Australia, and wonder what has caused them. The conditions which are operating in Australia have been brought about by the fact that Russia, after the war, was blockaded. Those who were responsible for the blockade starved millions of innocent little children. We hear talk about a death-bed repentance. I have seen friends of hon. members opposite going about with boxes collecting for the starving children of Russia, after their friends in England had blockaded Russia, and allowed our surplus meat to rot on the wharves of London. The Premier, after his visit, said the chilled meat from Australia was black.

Mr. MORGAN: There was no chilled meat. (Laughter.)

Mr. BRENNAN: I say there was chilled meat from Australia.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: There was not.

Mr. BRENNAN: I will grant that at the time to which I am referring it was frozen meat. We have a factory built on the Brisbane River to handle chilled meat.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: No.

Mr. BRENNAN: I have been through the factory; it is built for chilling meat, and we can trade with the East in chilled meat. The Premier saw that meat in a black condition in London, due to the fact that it was allowed to remain for months on the wharves of London, and to remain in the cold storage chambers with the storage batteries out, when it could have been sent to the children of Russia.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Did the Premier say the meat lay on the wharves for months? I am sure he did not.

Mr. BRENNAN: Hon. members opposite know very well that their own statesmen in England, by their blockade, allowed those Russians to starve; and, because Russia was starving, there was no market for Australian products. We could not get meat into Russia or Germany because of that; therefore, our industry is languishing, the graziers are in the hands of the banks, and the banks are carrying those graziers on to-day out of the profits made from the sugar, wheat, and butter industries. During the war they were getting 45s. per 100 lb. for their meat, and to-day they cannot get more than 13s. or 14s.

Mr. MORGAN: We cannot get that.

Mr. BRENNAN: We hear a great deal about the workers combining into one big union. We know that the Employers' Federation is one big union. The same can be said of this scheme for the organisation of

[*Mr. Swaync.*]

the primary producers. The industrialist is entitled to one big union as well. Only by organisation can the workers get their rights. Regarding the one big union of farmers, here is what the Melbourne "Age" says in its issue of 19th August, 1921—

"The farmers' proposal for a compulsory pool, controlled by the wheatgrowers themselves, is syndicalism, one of the aims of which is to bring about the complete control of every industry by the persons engaged in that industry."

The Melbourne "Argus," under the heading "Sovietism in Australia," said—

"The Farmers' Union members, in their advocacy of a compulsory wheat pool, champion the most objectionable feature of militant unionism. . . . The people are expected to guarantee a scheme which they are not permitted to control. No better illustration of Sovietism has ever been given to the Australian people."

The Melbourne "Age," on 24th August, also said—

"Mr. Lawson, Premier, speaking at Seymour in reference to the wheat pool, said: 'The Government did not disclose the greedy, sectional, and selfish aims of any section, whether farmers or not. It was foolish, arrogant, and conceded for the Farmers' Union to claim credit for everything that had been done for the producer. It was colossal impertinence. The Nationalist party was the true Country party. There were some members of the Farmers' Union who excelled everyone else at coercion, tyranny, and boycott.'"

At 9.35 p.m.,

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Mr. GREEN: Do you believe that?

Mr. BRENNAN: I say the farmers are moving in the right direction by going in for communism. The "Age" and the "Argus" call it communism. Then why should we take notice of the rambling statements of the hon. member for Oxley and others about communism? It is only a political expedient to try and draw a veil over the eyes of the public. We know what it means. We stand for co-operative methods—in other words, socialisation—in connection with industry in every branch. The "Argus" and "Age" call it communism, and so do we.

The hon. member for Rockhampton referred to statements made by Brigadier General Thompson. The Nationalist party were forced to pass a resolution registering the nomination of Brigadier General Thompson for election to the Senate. That gentleman wanted direct action because the people opposed the capitalistic welfare. He made a certain statement. He did not finish the expression, and the hon. member for Toowong said that the hon. member for Rockhampton was a fair because he put the word "workers" in the blank, referring to those who, Brigadier General Thompson said, should be shot down. Now, in regard to this matter, Brigadier General Thompson on the 7th March in Rockhampton said—

"My anxiety for defensive measures against mob violence for the protection of employers and the public is more than justified and confirmed by the pronouncement of the Labour delegates at the Hughes Conference just concluded.

"He regretted that some of the papers had adopted an apologetic attitude. This was not helpful to the interests of Nationalism, as an inquiry as to the full context would surely mean justification in their articles rather than apology. However, if it was thought that his statements endangered Nationalism in any way, he was quite prepared to tender his resignation."

Brigadier General Thompson was more honest than the hon. member for Toowong. He said that he meant by the expression that, if the workers or the industrialists got in the way of the employers, they should do as they did in South Africa, where unfortunate men on a bright sunny day were shot down because they were standing out for better conditions for the benefit of the workers. (Opposition laughter.) The newspaper reports stated that the brothers, sisters, and children of the workers were on a hill and saw returned soldiers put into armoured cars and drive down on defenceless workers and shoot them like dogs.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: You wanted to shoot them down at Townsville.

Mr. KIRWAN: What did you do in 1912? You bateded them.

Mr. BRENNAN: The recent South African industrial trouble is the best example of direct action by the Employers' Federation. We hear a lot in the newspapers about the exposure of direct action, and we know what direct action was like in South Africa. What was done in Brisbane in 1912 during the tramway strike? Hon. members opposite would have liked Fisher's gunboats to fire down Queen street and shoot down the workers. This is the exposure of the Employers' Federation—the one big union of the employers which objects to the one big union of the industrialists. I advise the industrialists to get the one big union together as soon as possible to protect their own interest.

Mr. KING: And make you leader.

Mr. BRENNAN: I will be leader if I am given the opportunity.

Mr. KING: No chance!

Mr. BRENNAN: We will see.

Mr. BUBBINGTON: What about Wyreema?

Mr. BRENNAN: We have heard very little about Wyreema.

Mr. BUBBINGTON: You were ordered out of Nestle's office in Sydney.

Mr. BRENNAN: The hon. member for Drayton says that I was ordered out of the Nestle's company's office in Sydney. That is practically true. I am going through the history of that case now. An article in the "Darling Downs Gazette" of 22nd December, 1921, reads—

STATEMENT BY MR. BRENNAN.

"Mr. F. T. Brennan, M.L.A., who returned from the South yesterday afternoon stated that when in Sydney he met a farmer from the Glendon district of New South Wales, who complained bitterly at the fact that Nestle's were closing down their condensed milk factories at Bomaderry and Glendon, where the milk supplies were very heavy. It was pointed out that the notice to close down was extremely short and the alternative suggested by the directors of Nestle's was that the farmers should try to get a market for their milk in Sydney."

Mr. Brennan.]

Mr. BEBBINGTON interjected.

Mr. BRENNAN: Why did not the hon. member tell the farmers?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: What was the good of telling the farmers when the place was closed down?

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. member for Drayton to restrain himself.

Mr. BRENNAN: I am touching the hon. member on the quick. The hon. member for Drayton says that he knew about Bomaderry and Glendon closing down. On the 6th December, the "Brisbane Courier" contained a statement received from a reporter at Toowoomba stating that they were not closing down.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: I told the farmers in Wyreema.

Mr. BRENNAN: The hon. member told the farmers nothing. On the 3rd January last the Wyreema milk factory employees received notice of dismissal, and on the 5th January the Nestles directors came to Toowoomba and stated the factory was closing down because of the accumulation of milk in London and the depressed state of the markets. Before that, the Standard company, a local company operating in the district, had sold out for over £100,000 to the Nestles company.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: How do you know that?

Mr. BRENNAN: We all know that. The milk combine paid £10,000 to keep the Gowrie Junction factory closed for five years. The hon. member for Drayton knows that.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: You are not game to make that statement outside.

Mr. BRENNAN: I have already made it. The Gowrie Junction factory took first prize at the Franco-British Exhibition in 1907 for condensed milk, and was closed down the year after, and paid at the rate of £1,000 a year for a period of either five or ten years. I am not certain of the time, but I know that the amount was £10,000. The machinery is lying there still, and has never been operated since.

Mr. MOORE: You say Nestles bought that?

Mr. BRENNAN: The Nestle combine took over the liability of the Gowrie Junction factory. It was intended that the Wyreema factory should be shifted to Nerang, after all the farmers of the district had spent their money to bring it up to date under most rigorous conditions—far greater than the Department of Agriculture would put on any farmer by regulations, and they built up a beautiful factory, and then all the suppliers were spared by the Wyreema factory.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: Not all of them.

Mr. BRENNAN: Most of them. When the factory had closed down, this Government came along and gave an order for £10,000. This was done by the Premier.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: It was done by the Honorary Minister.

Mr. BRENNAN: The Treasurer was asked for £10,000 for the purchase of milk to be supplied.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear!

Mr. BRENNAN: After this order the factory was kept going for a fortnight. Here is where I come in. (Opposition laughter.) The hon. member for Pittsworth said to the

farmers of Wyreema, "You cannot do anything. Send all your milk down to Brisbane or Toowoomba and get the milk boys to cart it round." Although all the milk suppliers in Brisbane and Toowoomba were fully supplied on account of the good seasons and had their regular customers, he wanted to double-bank them and put on the milk boys. The hon. member for Drayton cried and said, "I am sorry for you. I never thought it would happen." (Laughter.) The Federal member for Darling Downs said, "I am very sorry for you, but we can do nothing." The Toowoomba Chamber of Commerce moved a vote of sympathy. It was just like a wake, but I came along and I woke them all up. (Loud laughter.) If hon. members doubt my word, I will refer them to Mr. Nott, the hon. member for Stanley. He knows all about it, and, if he makes a speech on the subject, he will put you all to shame. Mr. Nott congratulated me on the stand I took. Before that I wanted to address the suppliers of the Wyreema factory, and they wrote back and said, "You will have to pay 10s. for the hall." I paid 10s. for the hall, and I addressed them, and the workers refunded the amount to me. Then I went to Sydney, and called at Nestle's office. It is an office built of mahogany, oak, maple, and other fine classes of timber. It is a beautiful office, and every employee there is in uniform and smoothes to you as you walk in. (Laughter.) I walked in and met a big man about 6 feet 3 inches in height, and the others were all running about like mice. When I went in one said, "Here is this Brennan from Queensland." (Renewed laughter.) Hon. members opposite do not like it. I said, "Are these reports appearing in the Toowoomba papers, that you are closing down, correct?" They said, "No." "Well," I said, "Your representative said so. Bring him here." They brought him in, and the big fellow then said, "Look here, do you think with our capital of £10,000,000 we are going to allow your Queensland Government, or you, or anyone else to interfere with us? We will do as we like. We will close if we like, and we are going to close." I said, "If you do close, you will get it in the neck, where the chicken got the axe. You will get the same treatment that the New Zealand Government meted out to you when they ordered you out of New Zealand." The Nestles company are not allowed to trade in New Zealand. He asked, "How will you do it?" I said, "If you don't open, the Premier and the Government are going to swing on to you the Sugar Acquisition Act and open for you." (Laughter and interruption.)

The SPEAKER: Order! I would ask the hon. member to address the Chair.

Mr. BRENNAN: These people opposite were so weak-kneed that they could not stand up against a great trust and combine and were going to allow a big factory like Wyreema to be winded out by these millionaires. I say no Government should be allowed to exist in Queensland unless Nestle's were forced to keep going. They then said, "What can you do?" I said, "A Government with a majority of one can do a great deal."

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: You didn't get a judgeship. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. BRENNAN: I do not want a judgeship. I said, "If the Labour Government in

[Mr. Brennan.]

Queensland stood for the trust and combines and the Nestle's factory in Queensland, they could have my resignation as a protest, and make the closing down of your factory at Wyreema an issue." Nestle's sent a wire to open up the factory, and it has been going ever since. There is no thanks at all due to hon. members opposite, because there was not one of them had an idea; not one of them was game to swing the axe on them. There were sixty employees in Toowoomba working at that factory. They had a special train to go and return from work at Wyreema and I was behind those sixty men. The wire from William Morris Hughes is worth repeating, and I propose to get it into "Hansard." I sent Mr. Hughes this wire—

"Majority suppliers Wyreema adopted my telegram 13th to you as basis negotiations to continue operations. I will approach suppliers ascertain cost price. Will you kindly approach Nestles obtain their acceptance proposal. Reply meanwhile to secretary suppliers, Wyreema Leaving for Sydney to-morrow."

And "little Billy" was decent about it. (Laughter.)

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Mr. Groom had sent a wire before you did.

Mr. BRENNAN: The telegram that Mr. Groom sent to the hon. member for Drayton did not state the position. The Prime Minister sent this reply—

"Your wire 13th re Wyreema factory. If company will make formal offer in writing will be pleased to submit through High Commissioner to Red Cross Commission as desired by you."

And there you find these people, the supposed farmers' friends, coming here and saying this party is not genuine in its desire to assist the farmer. If it had not been for this Government granting the assistance of £10,000, where would the Wyreema factory be to-day?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: That was only for a fortnight. The Federal Government kept the factory open.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: Absolute rot!

Mr. BEBBINGTON: So it was.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the hon. member to obey my call to order. The hon. member for Drayton has already made his speech, and I trust he will allow the hon. member for Toowoomba to proceed without interruption.

Mr. BRENNAN: This question of the Wyreema factory is one of the things for which the Government have been praised throughout the district of Toowoomba and elsewhere. They first of all offered £10,000 to the suppliers of milk, and the action of the Government in supporting the farmers and workers in regard to that factory will not be forgotten for many years. If you meet the farmers up there they will say to you, "The member for Babbling Brook, what good is he? He is no good at all."

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! The hon. member is not in order in referring to a member of the House in those terms.

Mr. VOWLES: I thought he was referring to himself.

Mr. BRENNAN: We cannot accuse the leader of the Opposition of being a babbling brook in so far as Wyreema is concerned,

because he was out of town and never appeared while the trouble was on. He is the leader of the farmers' party, and, although a trust and combine was strangling the farmers, he never appeared at all.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: Littleton Groom attended to them.

Mr. BRENNAN: Littleton Groom did nothing of the sort. Hon. members opposite talk about what they are doing for the farmers and about the honesty of this Government. Wyreema is a standing example of our determination to do the fair thing by the farmers.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: What other example have you got?

Mr. BRENNAN: We do not want to talk about examples. We talk about what this party have been doing, and I say I am very proud to be a member of the Labour party to-day.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: The Labour party must be very proud of you.

Mr. BRENNAN: They are very proud to have me. (Laughter.) I cannot read all the reports that appeared in the Press. All I can say is that the whole of the correspondence dealing with that matter, the utterances

by the members of the Chamber [10 p.m.] of Commerce, by the hon. member for Pittsworth, the hon. member for Drayton, and the Federal member for the Darling Downs, only go to show the ineptitude of these gentlemen in handling the crisis. As soon as the crisis came, they immediately formed themselves into a committee, and all expressed sympathy and sorrow; but they did nothing further. Then they talk about constructive ideas.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: Did not the manager threaten to put you out of the room down there?

Mr. BRENNAN: It would not have worried me if I had been put out. The Farmers' party for the last fifty years have been saying what they would do for the poor, unfortunate farmer, but because the Premier has evolved a scheme to do something they are now saying, "Are you sincere?" That is what we get after what we have done during the last seven years, and after what we have done in connection with Wyreema.

Mr. MOORE: What have you done in those seven years?

Mr. BRENNAN: I say that anything I have asked for I have got. This Government have evolved a constructive scheme, and because they have done that the Opposition, who have no constructive ideas, are trying to raise all the side-issues they can to put the Government off the track in doing something for the butter producers of Queensland.

The Burnett settlement scheme is a great idea. The Dawson Valley irrigation scheme is the greatest in Australia; it is greater than the Burrinjuck or the Murrumbidgee scheme.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: It is a scheme for spending money.

Mr. BRENNAN: Money will have to be spent to develop it. We can also spend a good deal more money in finding employment for the unemployed. There is no harm in spending money on reproductive schemes. The Government are acting in the right way in spending money which will give a big increase in land settlement.

*Mr. Brennan.]*



Let me refer to the State stations. What would have been the condition of the people during the last seven years if we had not gone in for State stations? Compare the prices which would have had to be paid for meat during that time but for that policy. The loss on the State stations is not commensurate with what the people in Queensland would have had to pay for meat, and what the people in Sydney had to pay for meat during the war. We do not worry about the State stations, but we worry about the Opposition forming an organisation against us. The hon. member for Toowong, according to the "Daily Standard" of 15th February, said—

"Mr. Edkins told us that he wanted an army for defence and not defiance."

Mr. MAXWELL: He did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. BRENNAN: This is the report.

Mr. MAXWELL: I do not care what the report is.

Mr. BRENNAN: The report continues—

"I am not too sure that the time has not arrived when we have got to attack."

The hon. member for Toowong also said—

"My experience amongst a section of the employers is that they are afraid to speak out. We are told by the 'Daily Standard' that unless some of our employers advertise in the 'Daily Standard' they will be boycotted, and there are some who are afraid of that. In the face of what is going on—in the face of the lies right through that paper—and they are sowing seeds of disease, because it is worse than a cancer—sowing disease among a number of the working men, is it not time to stop this kind of thing?"

We find that conduct reflected in the South African strike. We find them shooting the workers down there. When that time comes it is up to the workers to see where they stand.

Mr. MORGAN: Would you starve them?

Mr. BRENNAN: I say that the workers of to-day are not in the position they should be in by any means. We are not telling the Opposition what we would do for the workers. If they got control of the workers it would be like throwing a lamb to a pack of wolves. I ask the workers to beware of the speeches of hon. members opposite, because bad as we may be—(Opposition laughter and interruption)—we have not reached the millennium for the workers by any means, because the policy of hon. members opposite will not permit that. They can block us from getting capital, like they blocked our loan in London; but, as a soul said of Purgatory, "One might go further and fare worse."

Mr. FRY (*Kurilpa*): I am sure that hon. members were very much interested in the entertainment provided by the hon. member for Toowoomba; but his speech conveyed very little to us. I wish to comment on some of the statements made by members of the Government. So many of the statements have been of such a contradictory nature that it is difficult to pick out which statements to go for, as, on comparing them, we find them to be so contradictory. For instance, the hon. member for Rockhampton tried to convince the House that his party

were not communists, and not associated with communism, but later on the hon. member for Toowoomba told us that he is a communist, and he referred to his party as a communist party. His remarks showed that there is a confusion in the minds of hon. members opposite as to what they actually are. I intend to deal with the Labour party in regard to its pledge and platform, with the object of linking the matter up with the Address in Reply. When speaking previously to another motion before the House, I pointed out that the Nationalist party and the Country party had outlined a scheme for the development of the country on agricultural lines similar to the scheme proposed by the Government, and the hon. member for Mirani has quoted a platform which was put before the country some time ago which covers the whole scheme of the Government. This is the point I want to make. The Secretary for Agriculture tells us that he borrowed it from America; but why go to America for a scheme which has been put before the Government for the last seven years? In accordance with the inconsistency of the Government, either they have been inattentive to the requirements of the country and the agriculturists, or else they are telling us something that is not altogether true. This inoculation with extreme doctrines and dollar loans has got mixed up, and accounts for the confusion that exists at present. It is just as well that we should go into this matter and see the pledges which all hon. members opposite have signed. It is public property that the Premier and his Ministers and every member sitting on the Government side have had to pledge themselves to the new doctrine of communism. The position which is occupying the attention of the public to-day is this—that, whilst hon. members opposite were elected to this Chamber on their old platform, they have since adopted communism, and do not intend to go to the people for an expression of opinion with regard to the new policy. They were elected on the old Australian objective, and, without consulting the people who elected them, they pledged themselves to another policy altogether. That is another inconsistency on the part of the Government. It makes the position of the Opposition stronger in questioning the sincerity of the Government so far as their agricultural policy is concerned. I hold in my hand a copy of the Labour party's platform, which all members opposite have signed, and it sets out the method by which they are going to accomplish this new objective. If hon. members will follow here the course set out to accomplish this objective, they will see that it is very interesting, and it raises the question as to whether the Government can agree with this objective and at the same time be the friends of the farmer. The hon. member for Toowoomba referred to the One Big Union to-night. I have in my possession a copy of the authority for the One Big Union written by "Jack Cade," who is Mr. Ernest H. Lane, and edited by the Honourable J. Hanlon, formerly a member of the Upper House of Queensland. It sets out that co-operation, profit-sharing, and the payment of wages is entirely contrary to the platform of the One Big Union. It states that the co-operative scheme is entirely contrary to their pledges, to their platform, and to their objectives. How can members opposite expect this House to say

[Mr. Brennan.

that they are sincere in trying to bring about a co-operative arrangement with the primary producer in face of that statement? That brings me down to a more memorable speech delivered by the Premier last year. The "Daily Mail" of 21st August, 1921, points out that the Premier, in commenting upon the trouble at Innisfail, said—

"If the Labour movement is to survive, the unions, the Australian Labour party, and the Government must cooperate to rid the community of this ruinous organisation (the International Workers of the World). As leader of the Labour party, I call upon all affiliated unions to uphold the policy of industrial arbitration and political action."

The Premier calls upon them to uphold these things, and the response to that appeal will be seen later on. Evidently, it was not satisfactory.

Mr. PEARCE: It was satisfactory.

Mr. FRY: I am pleased to have the admission from the hon. member that it was satisfactory. Then the Premier goes on to say—

#### "CRIMINAL ELEMENTS."

"The I.W.W. have attracted to their organisation the reckless and extreme, and, in some cases, the criminal, elements of society. It is these who are carrying on the fatal propaganda of sabotage and violence in North Queensland to-day. The members of the I.W.W. are the avowed opponents of the Labour party. They denounce political action, are hostile to industrial arbitration, and every other legislative reform. The policy and methods of the I.W.W. differ from those of the Labour movement as chalk does from cheese.

#### "WHITE ANT POLICY."

"Yet these men have wormed their way into some of the Labour unions affiliated with the Labour party, and carry out their poisonous propaganda from within. In carrying on this 'white ant' policy, it is the avowed intention of the I.W.W. to discredit and destroy the industrial unions and the Labour movement. One of the I.W.W. leaders from the South visited North Queensland a few months ago on an organising tour. On his return to the South he boasted that he had started in the North a conflagration which would cause the Labour movement much trouble to extinguish. The recent happenings at Innisfail are a direct result of the threatened outbreak."

That is the straightforward, candid, and matured statement of the Premier, because he realised that those elements in the community were tending, as he said, to white-ant the foundations of the movement. You all know what the white ant does. The white ant eats the centre of the wood right out, upward and downward, and weakens the foundation. The Premier realised that these people would weaken the foundations of the party, and he raised his voice against it. What do we find? We find that the official organ—the "Daily Standard"—over the pen-name of "Jack Cade," sets out that the O.B.U., the I.W.W., and Bolshevism are the same thing, carried out under different names. I am quoting from their own party organ, so that they cannot question my statement in any way. The poisonous propa-

ganda which the Premier protested against was seen at the All-Australia Congress, held in Brisbane last October, when they voted for the new objective by twenty-two votes to ten. That shows that the extremist white ants I have already referred to had the upper hand by twenty-two votes to ten. These men sowed the seed. They inoculated the movement and did their deadly work, and seized control of the party, and they sent their delegates, who by twenty-two votes to ten, voted out the Australian objective on which the party grew, and took to itself the communistic or Russian policy. They adopted this preamble—

"Capitalism," says this preamble, "could only be abolished by the workers uniting in one class-conscious economic organisation to take and hold the means of production by revolutionary, industrial, and political action. Revolutionary action meant action to secure complete change—viz., the abolition of capitalistic ownership of the means of production—whether privately or through the State—and the establishment in its place of social ownership by the whole community."

That has been admitted in this House, and that is what is desired. Then we go on to find out that this same objective was endorsed again by the Australian Trade Union Congress which was held in Melbourne.

The PREMIER: What you read out was not admitted.

Mr. FRY: What I read out was true, and I will give a little more extra emphasis to what I said before when dealing with the methods which are proposed by the party to carry out these things. There is a key to every door, and, if one follows through the platform, he will find that the key is contained in one word. When you know that key, the whole thing becomes an open book. The Premier, when he was addressing this conference, was so seriously concerned about the adoption of this new objective, and so convinced about the effects of the extremist or white ant policy that he said—

"I take a serious view of the position because I can see the possible outcome of the conference. If the conference adopted the principles mentioned in section (11), that action would mean the end of the Labour movement. They had changed the objective; they might as well have changed the name of the party and called it the communist party."

That is a straightforward statement that bears out the hon. member for Toowoomba when he says that he is a communist, and contradicts the hon. member for Rockhampton when he says he is not. The Premier went on to say—

"If what is contained in this clause is carried for the ostensible purpose of pampering certain extreme industrialists you will not benefit the Labour movement, but will terminate it."

That, again, is a very definite statement by a Premier of a State which is one of the most important in the Commonwealth, and a man who would not, I believe, make a statement of that sort unless he thoroughly believed what he was saying. The men who have white-anted the movement and who now control it said at the conference that they would make the parliamentarians bring socialisation into operation without delay.

Mr. Fry.]

These men have so taken control that, not only does the Premier sign a pledge of obedient service, but every man sitting with him does the same thing—a pledge to carry out the will of the men who, he says, have white-anted the movement because they are in the majority. It is too late to deny that they are sitting in the saddle and driving the party to hell. Goodness knows, the working man to-day is suffering torments and anxiety enough because he cannot get the ordinary comforts of life and pay his way. The position of the unemployed is infinitely worse. As a building based upon white-anted foundations must ultimately crash to the ground, so the Government, which at bottom has for support all the unstable elements in the community, must in the end come to grief, bringing disaster to all. The present Government are so placed. They are controlled and dominated largely by the rabid extremists, ignorant and careless of economic laws and confused by foreign theories. The party is pledged to abolish private ownership, and yet they would have us believe that they are seeking to build it up. They are pledged to do away with co-operation, and yet they would have us believe that they are out to establish it. They are pledged to abolish profit-sharing, and yet they would have us think that they are here to set it up on equitable lines. They are pledged to the abolition of the wages system and the substitution of State ownership of everything. The farmers and tradesmen will be requested to produce for use and not for profit—all profits are to go to the State Treasury. The process by which this socialisation of the means of production, distribution, and exchange is to be accomplished means the entire upheaval of the Australian Commonwealth, the severance of Australia from the British Empire, and the substitution of a Russianised republic. Take plank No. 2, which reads—

“(a) Complete Australian self-government as a British community.

“(b) No Imperial federation.

“(c) Unlimited legislative powers for the Commonwealth Parliament and such delegated powers to the States or Provinces as the Commonwealth Parliament may determine from time to time.”

That is camouflaged by the use of the word “British.” If it is struck out of the subparagraph (c) it reads—

“Complete Australian self-government as a community.”

And that is the true intention. And there cannot be a British community if there is no Imperial federation. That is the key to the position, and you get the Australian community without any British federation. Why that should be is beyond the comprehension of all those who realise that in Australia we have the greatest freedom in controlling our own affairs of any place in the world. Why the Russian ideas should be introduced here and the Australian ideas abolished is indeed hard to understand. The British system of government by elected parliamentary representation, as we know it to-day, is to be abolished, and replaced by the Russian Soviet system. That is admitted, so that I am not stating anything which is in controversy with fact. The delegates at the conference stated that the supreme councils, which would replace Parliament, would take hold and control all factories, shops, ships, farms, mines, etc., for the benefit of the proletariat,

[Mr. Fry.

and that the farmers would be required to produce for use and not for profit. I want hon. members to bear in mind that this platform is suspiciously silent as to how these things are going to be acquired—whether they are going to be acquired by fair means or force—but, if we go further into the platform, we find that there is a clause which gives us a hint—

“Citizens, on completion of training, to retain arms delivered to them during training.”

That suggests that force is to be used against the moderates and the farmers who offer resistance to the will of the supreme economic council, as was done in Russia. Why do they want to hand over to every man his equipment when he is finished his universal training? A rifle is not much use as a toothpick, nor will it adorn the wall of a cottage. It certainly cannot be wanted on the ground that it is a memento. What is the reason? One Labour writer said—

“The socialisation of industry can never be a peaceful affair. A very necessary part of the socialisation of industry is the mobilisation of the Red Army.”

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

At half-past 10 o'clock the SPEAKER said: Under the provisions of Standing Order No. 17, the debate stands adjourned.

#### PRIMARY PRODUCERS' ORGANISATION BILL.

##### INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

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

Mr. MORGAN (Murrilla): It is not my intention to debate this motion at further length. The second reading of the proposed measure will give us an opportunity of dealing with it more fully, as we will then know exactly what is contained in the Bill.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed.

The CHAIRMAN reported the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

##### FIRST READING.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. W. N. Gillies, Bachelm) presented the Bill, and moved—

“That the Bill be now read a first time.”

Question put and passed.

The second reading of the Bill was made an Order of the Day for Wednesday, 12th July.

#### LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

##### INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

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

The PREMIER (Hon. E. G. Theodore, Chillagoe): I beg to move—

“That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the Land Tax Act in certain particulars.”

There can be no ground for opposition to this Bill, for its chief provision has for its object the lightening of the land tax on the primary producers. It also re-enacts the super tax and deals with certain small amendments in the general provisions of the Land Tax Act.

Mr. BRAND: You already have said that it does not affect the farmers.

The PREMIER: It does. It practically lifts the tax off the farmers who are working their own farms.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: In what way?

The PREMIER: It increases the exemption.

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): The motions I agreed with the Premier to deal formally with to-night did not include this one.

The PREMIER: It is on the business-paper.

Mr. VOWLES: I want to widen the scope of this by deleting the words "in certain particulars," and I suggest that this be deferred.

The PREMIER: All you are doing is giving yourself shorter time to consider the Bill, because you will have it in your hands at a later date.

Mr. VOWLES: I want to widen the scope of the Bill.

The PREMIER: You cannot widen it to-morrow any more than to-night.

Mr. VOWLES: We can try to widen it.

The House resumed.

The CHAIRMAN reported progress.

The Committee obtained leave to sit again to-morrow.

#### TRADE UNIONS (PROPERTY) BILL.

##### INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

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

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

"That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend in a certain particular the Real Property Act of 1877 and the Trade Union Act of 1915."

said: The measure which will be founded on this resolution is a small Bill of two clauses. The Bill is intended to place trade unions in the same reasonable position as building societies and friendly societies. At present, when a trade union holds land under the Real Property Act, it has to register the resignations and transfers and all further appointments of trustees. This, of course, involves the payment of registration and transfer fees, and also involves the trade unions in considerable delay. If that is not done, the trade unions cannot sell, lease, or otherwise deal with their land. Section 22 of the Real Property Act of 1877 provides that building societies and friendly societies can hold land under their official style, without being in the name of trustees for the time being. Unfortunately, when we passed the Trade Unions Act of 1915, we provided that trade unions should vest their land in trustees for the time being.

Mr. MORGAN: Was that not because you did not believe in freehold?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: No. This measure is merely to place trade unions in exactly the same position as building societies and friendly societies.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Why?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: There is no reason why trade unions should not hold land in the same way as friendly societies and building societies, instead of the land being vested in trustees for the time being. No reasonable-minded man can take any exception to the Bill.

Mr. FRY: Is it not to enable the Australian Workers' Union to take over the One Big Union? (Government laughter.)

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: That is the kind of stupid interjection that we should expect from the hon. member.

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): So far as I can see, there is no objection to the Bill. Provided that there is nothing sinister in the Bill, I see no reason why this should not be done. It struck me that, when dealing with the Real Property Act, trade unions might be asked to surrender the freehold of the land, and convert it into perpetual leasehold.

The PREMIER: It also applies to leasehold.

Mr. VOWLES: I am offering no opposition to the Bill.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed.

The CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee had come to a resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

##### FIRST READING.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL presented the Bill, and moved—

"That the Bill be now read a first time."

Question put and passed.

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

#### CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL.

##### INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

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

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

"That it is desirable to introduce a Bill to abolish capital punishment and to amend the Criminal Code and other enactments accordingly."

said: The Bill provides that the sentence of death shall no longer be pronounced or recorded, and the punishment of death shall no longer be inflicted. Capital punishment will be abolished, and the sentence will be imprisonment for life without any mitigation by any court. On the second reading I will give reasons for the introduction of the Bill. It is unnecessary to say anything further at this stage.

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): This matter was brought up on a previous occasion, and was passed by this Committee and rejected by the Upper House. This is the first Bill rejected by the Upper House to be reintroduced in the unicameral Parliament. This is not a principle that should be adopted. I do not propose to take up any more time now. The views of hon. members on this side of the House are well known on this subject. It is not a party matter. When we are dealing with this amendment of our Criminal Code, I hope that every opportunity will be given to hon. members to discuss the matter, more particularly because in recent years we have had drastic movements, such as a movement to bring about revolution, and crime is on the increase.

Mr. COLLINS: They assassinate people in Germany.

Mr. MORGAN: So they do in Russia.

*Mr. Vowles.]*

Mr. VOWLES: It is proposed that prisoners should be incarcerated for life, which in some cases is worse than a quick death. We should not make conditions for criminals better in Queensland than in other States, for, if we do, we are only encouraging them to come here. I do not propose to say anything further now.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed.

The CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee had come to a resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### FIRST READING.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Flinders*) presented the Bill, and moved—

“That the Bill be now read a first time.”

Question put and passed.

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

The House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.