

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 22 AUGUST 1922

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, AUGUST 22, 1922.

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ACT
AMENDMENT BILL.

ASSENT.

The SPEAKER announced the receipt from the Governor of a message conveying His Excellency's assent to this Bill.

APPLICATIONS TO VOTE BY PROXY.

The SPEAKER: I have to announce that I have this day received the following medical certificate from Drs. Morgan Lane and Ellis Murphy, and a notification under the provisions of the Legislative Assembly Act Amendment Act of 1922 from the Hon. W. McCormack, which I now ask the Clerk to read.

The CLERK then read the following medical certificate and notification:—

"To the Honourable the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland.

"We, Doctors Morgan Lane and Ellis Murphy, legally qualified medical practitioners, hereby certify that the Hon. William McCormack, member of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland for the electoral district of Cairns, is in such a state of ill-health, through no fault on his part, that he is unable, and in our opinion will, during a period of two weeks from the date hereof, be unable to attend any sitting of the House without gravely endangering his health.

"Given under our hands, at Brisbane, this twenty-second day of August, 1922.

"MORGAN LANE,

"A legally qualified medical practitioner.

"ELLIS MURPHY,

"A legally qualified medical practitioner."

"To the Honourable the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland.

"I William McCormack, member of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland for the electoral district of Cairns, hereby notify you that I have endeavoured to secure, and, through no fault on my part, have failed to secure a 'pair' during the period of two weeks from the date hereof; and I hereby further notify you that I desire to vote as a member at every sitting of the House and of every Committee of the Whole House by means of a proxy—namely, the Hon. Edward Granville Theodore, member of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland for the electoral district of Chillagoe, or, if the said the Hon. Edward Granville Theodore is not present, by another proxy—namely, the Hon. Alfred James Jones, member of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland for the electoral district of Paddington.

"Given under my hand, at Brisbane, this twenty-second day of August, 1922.

"W. McCORMACK,

"Member of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland for the electoral district of Cairns."

The SPEAKER: I have to announce that I have this day received the following medical certificate from Drs. Morgan Lane and Ellis Murphy, and a notification under the provisions of the Legislative Assembly Act Amendment Act of 1922 from the Hon. W. N. Gillies, which I now ask the Clerk to read.

The CLERK then read the following medical certificate and notification:—

"To the Honourable the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland.

"We, Doctors Morgan Lane and Ellis Murphy, legally qualified medical practitioners, hereby certify that the Hon. William Neal Gillies, member of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland for the electoral district of Eacham, is in such a state of ill-health, through no fault on his part, that he is unable, and in our opinion will, during a period of one week from the date hereof, be unable to attend any sittings of the House without gravely endangering his health.

"Given under our hands, at Brisbane, this twenty-second day of August, 1922.

"MORGAN LANE,

"A legally qualified medical practitioner.

"ELLIS MURPHY,

"A legally qualified medical practitioner."

"To the Honourable the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland.

"I, William Neal Gillies, member of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland for the electoral district of Eacham, hereby notify you that I have endeavoured to secure, and, through no fault on my part, have failed to secure a 'pair' during the period of one week from the date hereof; and I hereby further notify you that I desire to vote as a member at every sitting of the House and of every Committee of the Whole House by means of a proxy—namely, the Hon. Edward Granville Theodore, member of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland for the electoral district of Chillagoe, or, if the said the Hon. Edward Granville Theodore is not present, by another proxy—namely, the Hon. Alfred James Jones, member of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland for the electoral district of Paddington.

"Given under my hand, at Brisbane, this twenty-second day of August, 1922.

"W. N. GILLIES,

"Member of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland for the electoral district of Eacham."

The SPEAKER: I have to announce that I have this day received the following medical certificate from Drs. Morgan Lane and Ellis Murphy, and a notification under the provisions of the Legislative Assembly Act Amendment Act of 1922 from Mr. J. T. Gilday, which I now ask the Clerk to read.

The CLERK then read the following medical certificate and notification:—

"To the Honourable the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland.

"We, Doctors Morgan Lane and Ellis Murphy, legally qualified medical practitioners, hereby certify that the Hon.

Hon. W. Bertram.]

John Theophilus Gilday, member of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland for the electoral district of Ithaca, is in such a state of ill-health, through no fault on his part, that he is unable, and in our opinion will, during a period of two weeks from the date hereof, be unable to attend any sittings of the House without gravely endangering his health.

"Given under our hands, at Brisbane, this twenty-second day of August, 1922.

"MORGAN LANE,

"A legally qualified medical practitioner.

"ELLIS MURPHY,

"A legally qualified medical practitioner."

"To the Honourable the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland.

"I, John Theophilus Gilday, member of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland for the electoral district of Ithaca, hereby notify you that I have endeavoured to secure, and, through no fault on my part, have failed to secure a 'pair' during the period of two weeks from the date hereof; and I hereby further notify you that I desire to vote as a member at every sitting of the House and of every Committee of the Whole House by means of a proxy—namely, the Hon. Edward Granville Theodore, member of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland for the electoral district of Chillagoe, or, if the said the Hon. Edward Granville Theodore is not present, by another proxy—namely, the Hon. Alfred James Jones, member of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland for the electoral district of Paddington.

"Given under my hand, at Brisbane, this twenty-second day of August, 1922.

"J. T. GILDAY,

"Member of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland for the electoral district of Ithaca."

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): I would like to know whether you, Mr. Speaker, have satisfied yourself that the matters stated in the notifications of the three hon. members are true? I would like to inform you that no one or any of the said members has made any application to me for "pairs." This being so, I contend that the applications are irregular.

The PREMIER: You know very well.

Mr. VOWLES: These gentlemen have never approached me in any way at all.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You said yourself you would not grant "pairs."

Mr. GLEDSON: Members were told they would not be granted "pairs" if they were dying.

Mr. VOWLES: I repeat that I have never been approached by any of these hon. members.

The SPEAKER: I have no knowledge of any application.

Mr. VOWLES: That only confirms my statement. I assure you that no application was made to me.

[*Hon. W. Bertram.*

QUESTIONS.

PAINTING PARLIAMENT HOUSE.

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

"1. What was the number of superficial feet of painting in the job of painting exterior woodwork and fence of Parliament House?

"2. What was the estimated cost of this work?

"3. What was the time taken for completion of the work?

"4. What was the actual cost—

(a) Wages;

(b) Material;

(c) Total cost?"

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

"1. 88,614 superficial feet.

"2. £1,836 16s.

"3. Five months.

"4.—

(a) £1,226 19s. 8d.;

(b) £373;

(c) £1,599 19s. 8d.

This sum covers cost of a large amount of burning off, preparation, filling, etc."

OWNERSHIP OF SANDGATE RACECOURSE PROPERTY.

Mr. FRY (*Kurilpa*), in the absence of Mr. Sizer (*Nundah*), asked the Premier—

"1. Is he aware that a deed of grant, No. 76020, in favour of H. Wakefield, G. Agnew, and N. Corrigan, as trustees for the residents of Sandgate of a portion of land known as the Sandgate Racecourse, has, through a series of dealings, become vested in, as owners, persons by the names of J. Wren and Nathan?

"2. Do these persons hold the land, as trustees, upon the same trusts in respect with which the grant was made?

"3. Upon what authority do these persons become owners or trustees?

"4. If it is found that the present position is contrary to the spirit of the original grant, and that the rights of the people to the ownership of such land have been invaded, is the position legal?

"5. Will he take steps to have the land resumed and handed over to trustees or to the local authority in accordance with the spirit of the original grant?"

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

"1 to 5. This deed was granted on 9th October, 1890, under the 95th section of the Crown Lands Act of 1884, in favour of Hiram Wakefield, George Agnew, and Nathaniel Corrigan, as trustees for the property known as the Racecourse Reserve, Sandgate, upon trust for the purpose of a racecourse and for no other purpose whatsoever, and other reservations as to minerals, etc., with the proviso

that if the conditions, reservations, and provisos therein contained, or any part thereof, were not duly observed and performed by the said trustees and their successors, then the said land should be forfeited and revert to the Crown. By an Act called the Sandgate Racecourse Act of 1896, assented to 21st December, 1896, the duties and powers of the trustees were defined. On the 14th July, 1899, registration of the appointment of Herbert Hunter, as trustee in the room of Hiram Wakefield, was recorded. On the same date Andrew Lang Petrie was registered as trustee in the room of Herbert Hunter, the trustees then on the register book at that date being George Agnow, Nathaniel Corrigan, and Andrew Lang Petrie. On the 9th December, 1898, the Governor in Council approved of the trustees borrowing a certain sum of money from the Queensland National Bank. This mortgage was for a sum of £2,000, and was duly registered on 27th July, 1899. Default having been made by the trustees, the Queensland National Bank, exercising their powers under the said mortgage, conveyed the said land to Andrew Joseph Thynne (as trustee for Tattersall's Club, Brisbane) for the sum of £5,150. A bill of mortgage from the said A. J. Thynne, as trustee for the Tattersall's Club, was given to the Queensland National Bank to secure the sum of £2,980, being the unpaid balance of purchase money. This was duly registered on 8th February, 1900. This mortgage was transferred to George Wilkie Gray and Andrew Joseph Thynne, and registered on 3rd January, 1901. By nomination of trustees registered 29th May, 1902, the property was vested in Robert Fraser, as trustee for Tattersall's Club, Brisbane, and subject to above-mentioned mortgage. Default was again made under the lastmentioned bill of mortgage, and the land was sold by a transfer dated 31st December, 1911, registered 8th January, 1912, for the sum of £2,800 to John Wren and Benjamin Nathan, as tenants in common, and the land is still in their names."

RATES OF PAYMENT AT BARALABA AND STYX RIVER STATE COALMINES.

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

"What is the system of payment, and what are the rates of payment of underground workers at Baralaba State Coal Mine and Styx River State Coal Mine, respectively?"

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

"State Coal Mine, Baralaba.—Employees paid in cash fortnightly. Rates of payment of underground workers—In accordance with Australasian Coal and Shale Employees' Federation Industrial Award for Queensland. Miners on contract receive 5s. 9½d. per ton hewing rate. State Coal Mine, Styx River.—Employees paid in cash fortnightly. Rates of payment of underground workers—In accordance with Australasian Coal and Shale Employees' Federation Industrial Award for Queensland. There is no hewing rate paid. All miners receive daily rate as per award."

PAYMENTS BY STATE STATIONS IN LIEU OF LOCAL AUTHORITY RATES.

Mr. GREEN (*Townsville*) asked the Secretary for Public Works—

"What ex gratia payments in lieu of rates have been asked for by local authorities but not yet paid in full by his department, under the following headings:—

- (a) Name of local authority;
- (b) State station in respect of which payment claimed;
- (c) Amount claimed in respect of each station;
- (d) Amount of each such claim actually paid;
- (e) Balance of each such claim now outstanding?"

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH replied—

"Ex gratia payments have been made to the local authorities as under:—

Local Authority.	Stations.	1920-21.	1921-22.
		£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Boulia	Buckingham Downs	78 14 1	59 19 0
Balonne	Dillalah	17 5 5
Bulloo	Keeroongooloo	34 11 6
Barcoo	Keeroongooloo	175 16 3	175 16 3
Carpentaria	Vanrook	23 3 6	28 19 5
Croydon	Strathmore	7 13 8	7 13 8
Cook	Merluna, Brooklyn, Silver Plains, and Vanrook	152 5 8	152 5 6
Dalrymple	Dotswood and Wandovale	340 8 4	349 8 4
Etheridge	Strathmore, Lyndhurst, and Vanrook	215 0 0	205 1 8
Flinders	Wandovale	1 4 9
Mackinlay	Buckingham Downs	78 11 1	161 8 2
Murweh	Dillalah	52 12 10	85 2 3
Woothakata	Vanrook, Brooklyn, Strathmore, Dunbar, and Macaroni	292 11 11	292 11 11
		£1,416 17 4	1,652 7 10

Crown properties not being rateable, no claims can be admitted with respect thereto, but each application for a grant is considered on its merits. Applications for grants for the year 1922 have been made by the various local authorities concerned, and will be dealt with in due course."

PASTORAL HOLDINGS AMALGAMATED UNDER SECTION 167 OF LAND ACTS.

Mr. J. JONES (*Kennedy*) asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

"Will he kindly furnish the following particulars with respect to pastoral holdings amalgamated under section 167 of

the Land Acts during the three years ended 30th June, 1922:—

- (a) Names of the holdings;
 (b) Date of amalgamation;
 (c) Date of expiry of the current period of each lease prior to the amalgamation;
 (d) Rent per square mile of each holding prior to amalgamation;

(e) Date of expiry of first period of the respective amalgamated leases;

(f) Rent per square mile of each amalgamated lease?"

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

"I lay upon the table of the House a return containing the information asked for by the hon. member."

PASTORAL HOLDINGS AMALGAMATED UNDER SECTION 167 OF THE LAND ACT OF 1910 DURING THE THREE YEARS ENDED 30TH JUNE, 1922.

Name of amalgamated holding.	Date of amalgamation.	Date of expiry current period of constituent holdings.	Rent of constituent holdings prior to amalgamation.	Date of expiry of 1st period of amalgamated lease.	Rent of amalgamated holding, per sq. mile.
			Per sq. mile. s. d.		
Woodlands comprising subdivisions of previous— Woodlands Noogilla	1 July, 1920	... 31 Dec., 1917 31 Dec., 1917	... 20 1 31 0	31 Dec., 1927	£ s. d. 2 10 0
Noogilla comprising subdivisions of previous— Noogilla Woodlands	1 July, 1920	... 31 Dec., 1917 31 Dec., 1917	... 31 0 20 1	31 Dec., 1927	2 5 0
Wambiana comprising Wambiana Wambiana North	1 Jan. 1920	... 30 June, 1924 31 Dec., 1926	... 33 9 36 9	30 Sep., 1925	1 15 0
Forest Home... .. comprising Forest Home Yarman Langlo Vale Mount Clark	1 July, 1919	... 30 June, 1924 30 June, 1920 31 Dec., 1919 31 Dec., 1919	... 19 6 13 0 13 0 13 0	30 June, 1924	0 19 6"

SUGGESTED APPOINTMENT OF SPORTS ORGANISER FOR STATE PRIMARY SCHOOLS.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE (*Oxley*) asked the Secretary for Public Instruction—

"1. Has his attention been called to the honorary secretary's remarks in the second annual report of the Queensland State Primary Schools Amateur Athletic Association, reading as follows:—'The work of the association has grown and continues to grow to such an extent that it is now far beyond what can be overtaken in the leisure hours of any one man, no matter how enthusiastic. If more efficient and certainly necessary work is to be accomplished, an officer should be set aside for this work?'

"2. In view of the benefits which will accrue from the encouragement of healthy sport amongst the pupils of the State primary schools, and the great success which has attended the efforts of the willing band of State school teachers during the past two years, will he reconsider his refusal to appoint a sports organiser?"

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

"1. Yes.

"2. I am giving the matter further consideration."

SUPPLY.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

(*Mr. Kirwan, Brisbane, in the chair.*)
 Question stated—

"That there be granted to His Majesty, for the service of the year 1922-23, a sum not exceeding £300 to defray the salary of the aide-de-camp to His Excellency the Governor."

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): Before dealing with the Financial Statement, I would like to make a few comments in connection with the recent interviews referred to by the Premier in his speech on the no-confidence motion. At the outset I would like to say that I am of the opinion—and I am not alone in that opinion—that the whole of the proceedings are regrettable. The Premier, in my opinion, deliberately sought the interviews with Messrs. Garbutt and Boyce, with a view to ascertaining just how each stood in respect of the formation of a new party. (Government dissent.) There is no doubt that the Premier, for some considerable time—perhaps without the knowledge of some of his supporters—has contemplated the formation of a new party.

Mr. FORDE: You know that is absolutely untrue.

Mr. MORGAN: In order to ascertain what support was likely to be obtainable from this side of the House, he sought an interview with Messrs. Garbutt and Boyce, and I am very pleased to know that those gentlemen

made it clear, so far as the Opposition is concerned, that they could not guarantee the Premier any support from this side of the House.

The PREMIER: Except the two members of the Northern Country party.

Mr. MORGAN: I am very pleased to know these gentlemen made it definitely clear that, although the leader of the Opposition was sounded in respect to this particular matter, he absolutely refused to have anything to do with it at all. My contention is that the Premier was looking for a way out because of the fact that a great number of his supporters had turned against him in connection with certain legislation. Only a few weeks ago a prominent Labour supporter living in Miles, on returning from Brisbane, told some gentleman in Miles that, although the Government would not be defeated by a vote, it was the intention of the Premier to take from his side a certain number of followers, and, if sufficient support was forthcoming from the Opposition, he was prepared to establish a new party.

The PREMIER: More revelations.

Mr. GLEDSON: What was the man's name?

Mr. MORGAN: I will give the Premier the man's name if he so desires it. When I came into Miles, on my return from Brisbane, I was approached by a gentleman who asked me if there was any truth in that report.

Mr. DASH: Name the gentleman.

Mr. MORGAN: I will give the name of that gentleman and the name of the Labour supporter to the Premier. That gentleman asked me if there was any truth in the report and I asked him where he got the information from, and he told me that he had got it from this gentleman who had just recently returned from Brisbane. I told him that, so far as I was concerned, there was no truth in it whatever; that I had heard nothing whatever about it other than the rumours I had heard in the street; and rather than follow the Premier as leader and take over the responsibilities of the past seven or eight years' maladministration I would retire from politics and have nothing more to do with public life. As everybody knows, it has been common talk in the streets for some considerable time that the Premier was dissatisfied with a certain number of his followers, and that they were prepared to defeat him on the very first occasion, and that he was looking for a way out.

The PREMIER: The hon. gentleman should not take any notice of common talk.

Mr. MORGAN: Had Messrs. Garbutt and Boyce been able to guarantee a sufficient following from this side of the House, the Premier would have been prepared to form a new party, and he would have left the rank and file of the Labour party lamenting, but fortunately no definite support could be guaranteed, and the Premier, in order to rehabilitate himself in the eyes of the Labour party, had a report published in the "Daily Standard." That paper made special comment and displayed a heading extending over four columns of the paper. That was for the purpose of showing to the dissatisfied section of the Labour ranks how the Premier was determined to stand by the Labour party and his actions during the past seven or eight years of his administration. Very often politicians are approached with a view

to forming a new party. There is nothing objectionable in that, providing it is done openly and above board. The most objectionable part of the whole transaction is that Messrs. Garbutt and Boyce were enticed to go to the Premier's office for the purpose of an interview, and then a certain gentleman did not play the part of a true Britisher or a sport.

The Premier knows that he was in a favourable position at the interview, and that, being ready and having leading questions prepared, the other two gentlemen were not in the same position as he was. The Premier knew that he would naturally have to put leading questions to these gentlemen for the purpose of baiting them, and their making use of them for his own special purposes. It was not the action of a true Britisher, or of one who occupies the high and important position of Premier of this State, which is a position only conferred upon the ablest men in the community. I think that those who previously had a liking for the Premier in his political capacity will have quite a different opinion of the hon. gentleman after they read what occurred in connection with those interviews. I hold no brief for Mr. Boyce or Mr. Garbutt. I scarcely know one of them. I think that they took upon themselves something they had no right to do, although I do not know that there is anything against any free British subject interviewing the Premier on such a matter, providing that there was no question of bribery. There was nothing improper in what they did, and nothing that could be taken exception to, and nothing which had not previously occurred in the history of politics in Australia and in other parts of the world. I certainly think that the least the Premier should have done was to inform these gentlemen that it was his intention to have a verbatim report of the interview taken. (Government laughter.) I quite understand that hon. members opposite always want, as it were, to have something up their sleeve—to have the cards hidden away instead of disclosing them. I certainly think that, even if what I say does not meet with the general approval of hon. members opposite, it will fall in with the views of a majority of the people in the State, because I believe that the majority of the people in Queensland are Britishers, and believe above all things in fair play. I have mixed in rough company in my time. I have seen life on a goldfield, and have also been in shearing camps and railway construction camps, and whenever a row occurred—whenever two men met one another, they, generally speaking, met on even terms. They were true sports, and did not want to have something hidden up their sleeves. Nothing, in my opinion, goes more against a man than the fact that he always wants to have something up his sleeve. Those should not be the tactics of an ordinary Britisher, let alone of the Premier of this State; they were low-down tactics of the very worst kind. I feel sure that the Premier has sunk very low in the estimate of a very large majority of the people who before looked upon him with a certain amount of respect.

Mr. GLEDSON: You were disappointed. You wanted to get on the Treasury benches.

Mr. MORGAN: I was not disappointed in any way. If we cannot get on the Treasury benches by fair means, we do not want to get there by craft. (Government laughter.)

Mr. Morgan.]

We want to occupy the Treasury benches with the consent of the people. I have always taken up the attitude that the people of Queensland who put the Premier and his party on the Treasury benches will have to take the responsibility of removing them, and when they do remove them, it will be for all time. We know what happened in respect to the Administration in New South Wales, when Mr. Holman's position was taken over by Sir George Fuller. Sir George Fuller had to bear the responsibility for Mr. Holman's bad administration for seven or eight years. The result was that Mr. Holman was eventually defeated, and the Fuller Government were out of power for a long period. That would apply to any party which followed the present Premier as its leader. If the Premier left his present party, and formed a new party from hon. members opposite with a certain number of members from this side, the result would be that members on this side who supported him would have to carry the burden of bad administration over the last eight years. They would have to carry the blame for the unfortunate position which Queensland is in to-day—for the widespread unemployment and high taxation, and increased expenditure generally.

I now desire to refer to the Financial Statement. I have read it fully, and, generally speaking, I am disappointed with it. There is disappointment right throughout the length and breadth of Queensland in regard to it. Notwithstanding the fact that we have gone through very strenuous times, and notwithstanding the fact that the country is not in a prosperous condition—although

the Premier would like us to [4 p.m.] believe that it is—still we see nothing in this Financial Statement that is likely to induce those who have the money to invest in industries or developmental work to have confidence enough to invest their money here. There is nothing whatever in the Statement to interest people in other parts of the world sufficiently to induce them to establish industries here or to open up the resources of this country. Everyone knows that we have the greatest possibilities of any State of Australia, but those possibilities cannot be realised unless we get the assistance of people with money to help us develop our resources. What the Government are doing is only a mere bagatelle so far as developmental work is concerned, and, so far as putting Queensland on a good, sound foundation is concerned. We require more population in order to send this country ahead and make it what it should be. We want greater settlement on the land. That is why we want to induce the proper people to come here. Unfortunately, they are not coming here. During the next twelve months we will go on as we have been going on in the past, and there will be no prospect of more people settling on the land. Unfortunately, to-day we are right on the eve of a very serious drought. It is no use us shutting our eyes to that fact; there are parts of Queensland at present which are suffering from a severe drought. The stock are dying in large numbers, and the conditions in some districts are very deplorable, indeed. Unless rain falls within a very short period, we are likely to have one of the smallest wheat crops we have ever had in Queensland. I have had word from some portions of my electorate towards Roma and other localities stating that the

crops are withering for want of rain. No doubt there are certain parts of the Darling Downs where the crops are still looking healthy and strong; but even on the Darling Downs there is not likely to be a bountiful harvest, and there will only be one-half, or at most three-fourths, of the usual crop. Unless rain comes within the next fortnight we will suffer deplorably, so far as the wheat harvest is concerned, and the wheat crop is a very important thing for Queensland. I notice in connection with the growth of cotton that a great deal has been said about this new industry right throughout Australia, but more so in Queensland. I am pleased to see that the prospects are good, so far as cotton-growing is concerned, because the people are putting more land under cotton. Still, I think it would be a good thing to discourage the people from putting all their eggs in one basket. It is not right to leave all the other established industries and go in wholly and solely for the growing of cotton. Cotton-growing may be a great success, providing the season is a suitable one; but, on the other hand, it may be a complete failure, and it would be a deplorable thing then if we found we had neglected all our other established industries. I am pleased to see that the farmer is to get the guarantee price of 5½d. per lb. for another year at least. It is pointed out in the Statement that the Government propose to give a guarantee of 5½d. per lb. for seed cotton of 1¼ inch staple. I think that that is a very long staple so far as cotton-growing is concerned.

On several hon. members conversing in loud tones,

The CHAIRMAN said: Order! I must again appeal to hon. members to try and conduct their conversation in lower tones. I can hear a good deal of what is being said from the chair, so it must be disconcerting to the hon. member addressing the Chair. I hope hon. members will kindly remember that when a member is addressing the chair, whether from the Ministerial benches or from the Opposition, he has a right to be heard without interruption; so I hope hon. members will converse in lower tones.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MORGAN: The paragraph which I referred to in the Financial Statement is as follows:—

“The details have not yet been worked out, but for the first year of the new guarantee period the maximum price will be 5½d. per lb. for seed cotton of 1¼ inch staple, of good quality and free from disease.”

I am told, on very good authority, that a 1¼ inch staple is an exceptional one, and is only likely to be grown by a few people, and in very small areas. It is right enough to encourage the farmers to grow the best cotton possible, but if you insist on a length of 1¼ inch, then only small quantities will be grown. I think, therefore, that the guarantee should be given for fair average cotton. I am told that in America, if the cotton averages 1 inch in staple, then it is exceptionally good cotton. It is a good thing to aim at a high standard of cotton, but we should give the guarantee for a fair average quality, as it is too much to expect all the growers to produce a staple of 1¼ inch length. We have heard a good deal

[Mr. Morgan.]

from members on both sides of the House as to the conditions operating in the manufacturing industries in Queensland as compared with the other States. Without wishing to decry this State, it is a fact that, unfortunately, our industries have not prospered during the last ten or twelve years as they have done in the other States. We know that there are less employees in manufacturing concerns in Queensland to-day than there were in 1914. Queensland is the only State that shows a decrease, while all the other States show an increase in the number of employees in factories as compared with 1914. We must look and discover the reason for that. It is the duty of the Government, as well as of the Opposition, to find out the reason for that. The Southern States have increased the manufacture of various articles. It is well known that we cannot compete with them in that respect. One of the reasons is that in Queensland we work our employees forty-four hours per week as compared with the forty-eight hours per week they have to work in the Southern States. One reason why we cannot compete with the other States is because the hours worked here are one-twelfth less than those in other parts of Australia. If the conditions were the same all over Australia, we would be able to compete successfully with the other States, but we cannot expect to do it when our employees work only forty-four hours per week as against the forty-eight hours worked in the other States. We are protected in Australia from the cheap labour in other parts of the world, and we are given that protection because the people in the other parts of the world work longer hours and get smaller pay than they do in Australia. Protection is afforded to the manufacturer on those grounds. Then, again, you must not forget that in some industries in Queensland we work forty-four hours as against forty-eight in the other States, and we must admit that that is a very important consideration, because, provided men work reasonably, a man working forty-eight hours will turn out more than a man working forty-four hours a week. I can give you an illustration. In Queensland a firm is established with a view to putting on the market certain articles. They called tenders for the manufacture of one part of each of those articles. The lowest tender obtainable in Queensland was £9 each. Tenders were called in the South, and a Victorian firm obtained the contract for several thousand of those articles, which they could land in Brisbane at £4 15s. each.

THE SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Do we not export articles to the Southern States?

MR. MORGAN: I know we do export to Sydney, but I just want to mention that as an illustration of the statement that if we cannot manufacture in Brisbane or Queensland as cheaply as the manufacturers can in the South, then we are going to lose trade, and eventually cease to be a manufacturing State, and we will get our manufactured articles from Victoria and other places. I am quite prepared to admit that certain classes of goods are exported, but for every pair of boots that goes from Queensland to Southern States, five pairs—if not more—manufactured in the Southern States come to Queensland. Then, again, there is the basic wage. If the basic wage is £3 17s. 6d.

in New South Wales and £4 2s. in Queensland, how can we possibly compete with them?

THE SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Is not the margin of profit higher in Queensland than in the Southern States?

MR. MORGAN: On certain articles. There are certain manufactured articles which, owing to conditions of transport—distance and freight—cannot be brought into Queensland and compete with the articles manufactured here, but that is really the only manufacturing trade that we obtain. There is other trade that we are losing.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: You want to get back to low wages.

MR. MORGAN: I am not one of those who want to get back to low wages, but we can only gauge the value of a wage by its purchasing value. If £4 5s. will not give the worker any more purchasing power with which to buy the necessities of life, than £3 10s. elsewhere, or at some other time, then the worker with £3 10s. is just as well off as the worker with £4 5s. And any industry that can be established and give employment, provided that the wages obtained in it are fair wages, should be encouraged. The argument that the high wage is a sign of prosperity or creditable to the Government in power is of no use unless it can also be shown that employment can be obtained under those conditions. In the recent Maranoa Federal election, the people were told by Mr. Dunstan, the Labour candidate, that the Government deserved credit for obtaining high wages for the men on the stations, and I believe that is true, but the men on the river bank, who were obtaining rations from the Government because they could not get work replied, "You may have been responsible for the high wages, but we are not getting them. We are out of work." By the mere fact that the Government have made wages so high and hours short, the Government are not doing a service to the working class, because if an industry is so overtaxed with high wages and short hours that it has to close down, an injury is being done to the worker in it.

MR. BRENNAN: What about the slump in the cattle industry?

MR. MORGAN: That had something to do with it.

MR. BRENNAN: Then why not say so? It had all to do with it.

MR. MORGAN: When an industry is prosperous then wages may go up. The Secretary for Mines, in his speech, gave us very fine information as to the price of copper prior to and during the war. He told us that the Government bought those mines at Chillagoe at a time when copper was high in value. I think everybody must know that at that time the prices of rare metals and metals generally were advancing in value owing to the war, and at the very moment that the war ceased, and they were not required to the same extent, there would be a reaction and the prices would be reduced. Then, why buy when prices were so high and when everything was being sold at an exorbitant value, as they did in the case of the State cattle stations? The cattle stations were bought when prices were exceedingly high, and the result is that, when they come down below normal, losses are being made, not only by the Government, but by private

Mr. Morgan.]

persons. The Secretary for Mines told us that copper was being produced with the price at £70 a ton, and the industries were not carrying on at a profit. He said it was necessary that the price of copper should be £90 a ton in order to make the mines pay. We know that some mines are closed up altogether, unfortunately, and many thousands of men are out of employment. The Minister admitted also that in 1914 copper was £60 a ton and the industries were all working. Industries then were able to make the copper mines pay owing to the fact that conditions were different—wages were lower and the men worked longer hours—and it gave work to thousands of men throughout Australia.

Mr. COLLINS: The men did not work longer hours.

Mr. MORGAN: When the war broke out and the price went up, I admit that it was only reasonable and fair that the wages of the men should go up, too. I do not think that the men should not share in such prosperity in the industry.

Mr. BULCOCK: When cattle were at their highest prices, did certain employers refuse to recognise the Federal award in its application to stations?

Mr. MORGAN: There are some employers who are not reasonable, and there are some employees who are not reasonable. There are some employees who would like to rob their masters and take an unfair advantage of them, but that is not general. The point I want to make in respect of the copper mines, for instance, is that, in 1914, the conditions were such that we had thousands of men working in them. It is not possible to pay the present wage. It may be necessary that the workers should accept £3 10s. per week. I claim it would be better for them to be working for £3 10s. per week and to have the mines producing, than to have the mines closed and the men receiving Government doles in order to keep their wives and families from starvation. Instead of endeavouring to increase wages and shorten hours, in order to regain our prosperity, we should endeavour to make the purchasing value of the sovereign greater; we should endeavour to shape conditions so that money would have its full purchasing value. I think the Federal Government are acting wisely in their proposal regarding the movement to increase, from 15s. to £1 per week, the old-age pension payment.

Mr. COLLINS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MORGAN: It may be a very laudable object to increase the payment. The Federal Treasurer, however, did not adopt the stand, "We will increase the old-age pension payment." He says, "We will try and make the 15s. buy what can be bought to-day for £1." That, in my opinion, is what should be done. We know that there are many industries in Queensland which can afford to pay any wage, because of the fact that they are able to pass it on. Any industry depending upon local consumption only, and enjoying high protective duties, can pay increased wages and stand a shortening of hours. But we have in Queensland, and in Australia, a great number of industries which are compelled to compete with similar industries in the outside world; we produce more than we require locally, and are compelled to sell our surplus in other parts of the world.

[Mr. Morgan.

Generally speaking, all those industries which are compelled to compete with the outside world are closed down to-day because the conditions are such as to render impossible the carrying on of those industries at a profit. That is deplorable. We have been told by hon. members opposite that we are the "low wage" party.

Mr. COLLINS: So you are.

Mr. MORGAN: Hon. members opposite can be termed the "no work" party; they give a dole, but they do not give work. The Government are making conditions such that industries, which otherwise would give employment to thousands of men, are, unfortunately, not able to give that employment, because they cannot compete with industries in other parts of the world.

Mr. COLLINS: If your reasoning were correct, Britain would be prosperous instead of having 2,000,000 unemployed.

Mr. MORGAN: The Federal Government have brought in a Budget which provides for a reduction of taxation. If there is any country which should endeavour to bring about a reduction of taxation, it is Australia—and Queensland, in particular. We in Queensland are labouring under great difficulties, not only in respect of the basic wage and the forty-four-hour week, but also in respect of the high taxation which is ruining Queensland. That little State of Victoria went right through the war—sent her men abroad in proportion to the population, suffered from drought and other things the same as Queensland did, bore the burden of those and other conditions caused by the war and its aftermath—and did not increase its taxation upon its people; the taxation per capita is no higher to-day than it was in 1914. That State never yet has had a Labour Government to administer its affairs. The conditions of the worker in Victoria, notwithstanding that he has not had a Labour Government to spoon-feed him, are to-day, and at all times have been, equal to, if they are not an improvement upon, the conditions of the worker in Queensland. It cannot be said that Victoria is in its present prosperous condition at the expense of the worker: it is owing to the good government and good administration which have prevailed in that State. Look at the increase that has taken place in taxation in Queensland. The figures show that in 1914 the tax per capita was only £1 8s. 2d.; it was brought to that level during fifty years of Liberal administration. Yet during the short period of seven years a Labour Administration has increased the tax to £4 19s. per capita. That is not encouraging people to come here and establish industries. When an individual or a company has money to invest, he or it makes full inquiries before deciding in which State the industry shall be established. Representatives would come to Queensland and make inquiries as to what are our labour conditions, our basic wage, our hours of work, our taxation. The same thing would be done in the Southern States, and comparisons would be made. What would be found?—everything to the detriment of this State. The evidence that would be collected would be sufficient to induce the establishment of that industry in other parts of Australia. That is what is being done. The figures show that we are losing opportunities which we should not lose—opportunities which would make for the progress and prosperity of this State—owing to the

fact that our Government have not realised their responsibility to this State. Instead of encouraging people to come into this State, the Government are driving people out of this State. The Premier endeavoured to show that the prosperity of Queensland was evident owing to the fact that a record crowd attended the Brisbane Exhibition. The secretary of the Association (Mr. Bain), and every hotelkeeper in Brisbane, knows that that crowd did not come from the outlying parts of Queensland; it was due to the increase of population in and around the city. Being a very cheap show, where the people got full value for their money, the city people attended and made the attendance a record. There were less country people in Brisbane on this occasion than there have been for many years.

I would like to deal also with land settlement and land revenue generally. As everyone knows, Queensland has enormous areas of undeveloped land which should be developed, and we should be producing more than we are producing. Private capital should be encouraged to come here in order to make the land more productive. It has been said that the man is a public benefactor who makes two blades of grass grow where only one grew before. That is so. A man who takes up virgin soil and who shows that it is capable of producing a particular product that we did not know it would produce is a public benefactor. Unfortunately, people are not encouraged to come here and perform such important work; the conditions are such that people will not go upon the land. Generally speaking, there has been a gradual influx of people from the country into the larger cities and towns. In the year 1914-15, which was the last [4.30 p.m.] year of the Liberal Administration, the amount received as revenue from the land was £561,608, and for the year 1921-22 the amount received was £1,515,535. The figures disclose that about £500,000 more was taken by this Government from the producers in the way of land revenue, as compared with the amount obtained under the last year of Liberal administration. In 1914-15 the amount received from holdings and runs amounted to £299,959, and for the year 1921-22 the amount received was £542,497, showing the enormous increase of nearly £300,000.

Mr. COLLINS: The hon. member should compare the price of wool in 1914 with the price of wool to-day.

Mr. MORGAN: In 1914-15 the amount received from occupation licenses was £52,309, whereas the amount received in the year 1921-22 was £62,162. Those figures go to show that people, instead of taking up the land under conditions that certain improvements should be effected and that certain pests, such as pear, lantana, and Noogoora burr, should be destroyed, are now taking up land under occupation license, which means that the land is held without any condition as to improvements. It therefore offers no employment, and is really allowed to go back to its old state, and is, in fact, being overrun with pests that did not exist on it fifteen to twenty years ago. Our country lands are not being improved, unless it is a new holding where a man has gone with a certain amount of capital and has effected some improvements. We find that on old properties the fences are falling down, suckers are growing all over the land, and

pear is spreading where previously it did not exist.

Mr. COLLINS: Jeremiah the second.

Mr. MORGAN: That state of affairs exists because the men who own the land cannot afford to keep it in an improved condition, and in an endeavour to get what they can out of it, it has unfortunately been allowed to get into its present state. Hon. members opposite who represent country electorates cannot deny that or suggest that my remarks are exaggerated. It is a sad state of affairs that our lands to-day do not possess the carrying capacity that they had ten, fifteen, or twenty years ago. That has been brought about because the industry has been squeezed and ruined by the present Government.

Mr. COLLINS: Does the hon. member say the wool industry is ruined?

Mr. MORGAN: One hon. gentleman, who is now dead, said that he would make the squatters squeal. The Government have not only been successful in making the squatters squeal, but they are making the little graziers squeal also. The only way in which it can affect the squatter is, perhaps, in connection with his banking account. If the Government injure the squatter, it has an effect on the cattle market and on wool values; if the Government does anything to injure the producer, who is a "big" man, then it also will affect the bread and butter of the small man. This Government have succeeded in affecting the livelihood of the small man. They have also succeeded in damaging the large graziers, and have exterminated the men who have been in a small way. A great number of the men are holding their lands because the mortgagees do not want to take them over. One estimable young gentleman, who was rather inexperienced, bought a grazing property in St. George district. Shortly afterwards there was a reassessment of his rent and he had to pay £300 as back rental, which was more than he could afford. He told the mortgagee that he could not keep on with the property, and although the mortgagee did not want to take the land they were compelled to do so, because the young man walked out, leaving behind what capital he had invested. That state of affairs was brought about because of the Repudiation Act passed by this Government, and it is not the state of affairs appertaining in one case only, but in many cases. The Government realise they have done wrong, and they should set about to rectify these injustices or go to the country and ask the people to return a Government who will bring about a better state of affairs. It is the duty of the Government at the present time to go to the country. We know the deplorable state that the country is in.

Mr. COLLINS: Everything is deplorable in the eyes of the hon. member.

Mr. MORGAN: I hope the hon. member for Bowen will not abuse the Governor again.

Mr. COLLINS: I did not abuse the Governor.

Mr. MORGAN: In referring to the remarks made by the Governor in connection with Golden Caskets, the hon. member said that the Governor ought to be put in his place.

Mr. COLLINS: And so he ought to be.

Mr. MORGAN: The hon. member should not say that after what has happened to-day.

Mr. Morgan.]

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: The hon. member for Bowen ought to be put in his place.

Mr. COLLINS: I will be here most likely when the hon. member for Pittsworth is outside.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: I am not a bit flattered at being in here with the hon. member for Bowen.

Mr. COLLINS: I return the compliment.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MORGAN: Perhaps the state of affairs that exists to-day has not existed in the history of any other Government. We know that, with the Government representing a minority of the electors and the Opposition representing a majority of the electors, the Premier will be able to vote for three absentee members. I hope that if hon. members on this side become ill that they will stay away and not have their votes recorded by proxy. I would sooner do that than have my vote recorded.

Mr. DUNSTAN: One hon. member opposite asked for a "pair," and he got it.

Mr. MORGAN: A "pair" is quite different. A majority has to sit on one side or the other in this Chamber. If "pairs" are granted, that has no effect on the voting. Since the opening of the session, until to-day, members had to be present in order to record their votes; but Bills can become law and placed on the statute-book by a Government having fewer members present than are in opposition.

Our railways are a most important factor in connection with land settlement; but if they are to become a burden on the people, instead of helping the country people, they are no assistance to land settlement. Unfortunately, we are getting to that stage when the railways, owing to the high cost of freights and fares, are becoming a burden to the people and are not assisting in land settlement as they should do. In 1914-15 the railway receipts amounted to £3,792,000, and in 1921-22 they totalled £5,125,000. Notwithstanding the fact that the receipts in 1914 amounted to £1,333,000 less than in 1920-21, in 1914 the railways paid.

Mr. COLLINS: Be honest. Quote the wages paid.

Mr. MORGAN: That is one of the things I have previously referred to: that industry is being asked to carry a greater burden by way of wages than it should do. If the wages of the men on the railways were reduced by half a million pounds to-morrow, and we set about to arrange matters so that the employees would have the same purchasing power with that amount less in wages, the workers would be just in the same position they are in to-day, but it would mean an enormous difference to the railways. It would mean that the loss on the railways would be half a million less than it is at the present time. The men would be no worse off, and the railways would show much better financial results than they are showing now. Hon. members opposite do not see that, but use the parrot cry, "Look at the wages being paid on the railways." The railway men will tell you that their wages to-day are not equal in purchasing power to those paid in 1914. I have met men who told me that they reared families when they were getting from 8s. 6d.

[Mr. Morgan.

to 9s. per day. Young men to-day, who have families, say that it is difficult to rear them on 15s. or 16s. per day. That is because the purchasing value of money is lower to-day. In those days, they could buy a pair of blucher boots for 7s. 6d., but to-day they cannot buy a pair of boots of the same quality for less than 17s. 6d. or £1 a pair. Yet we have the parrot cry from the hon. member for Bowen, and he will tell the people in the country, "Look how we have increased the wages." I think the people will say, "Yes, you have increased the wages, but the price of commodities is so high that our wages are not so good to-day as they were in 1913." It is generally admitted that an individual who spends more money per week or year than he is earning is likely to become insolvent. It is just the same with a company, and it is the same with the Government. For the purpose of regard to comparison, I will give the figures with regard to expenditure. In 1914-1915, the Liberal Government earned £10 12s. 10d., and spent £10 12s. 9d. per head, or 1d. per head less than they earned. It was only a penny, but they were not going into debt. In 1921-1922 the present Government earned £15 9s. 9d., and spent £16 4s. 8d. per head, or 14s. 11d. per head more than they earned. This state of things has been going on for some years, but it cannot go on for long. The Government must live within their income, otherwise the State will not be prosperous. When an individual spends more than he receives, it is only a matter of time when bankruptcy will occur. If I live beyond my income I must soon totter to the ground. The Government, in presenting their finances to the House, should show that they are going to live within their Estimates. They have had deficits year after year, and they make no provision for the deficit which is estimated during the current year. That shows bad finance. The Government should have made provision to meet that deficit and balance the ledger, which they could have done without any great difficulty; but, unfortunately, they have not done so, and it is injuring the reputation of our State.

Mr. COLLINS: You have proposed no remedy yet beyond a reduction of wages.

Mr. MORGAN: I want to refer to the industry known as the "opossum industry," which has been mismanaged by the present Government. It is a valuable industry, and at times gives employment to a great many men who cannot find other work; but, unfortunately, the Government have seen fit to turn it into a political matter in order to obtain votes. From 1st November, 1911, to 24th June, 1915, the industry was closed down. That was before the war. It was closed down altogether, in order to allow the opossums to multiply. In those years, things were fairly prosperous, and there was work for the people. Men had work on the stations, and the then Government thought it was not advisable to open up the industry because there were other avenues of work available. In June, 1915, the industry was opened, and why was it opened? It was at a time when the war was on, and thousands of men were away at the front. The Government opened the industry at a time when there was other employment for everyone. What has been the result? There is a scarcity of work to-day, and the industry might have been availed of for four or five months, but the present Government allowed the opossums to be slaughtered in millions, because their furs

were valuable, when there was plenty of other work available at the time.

The bell indicated that the time allotted to the hon. member under the Standing Orders had expired.

Mr. PAYNE (*Mitchell*): The hon. member for Murilla has told the Committee that the Premier has been feeling his way, and that if he could have got sufficient support from the Opposition he would have gone to the country and formed a new party. As far as I and other hon. members on this side are concerned, there is not a particle of truth in that statement. The Premier has proved his genuineness beyond doubt to any honest-thinking man, and has stood the acid test more than once. Hon. members opposite sent their delegation to England, in an endeavour to stop the Premier from getting loan money. Although the Premier knew the distress that would be caused to the workers in the State on account of his failure to get a loan, rather than sell the birthright of the people of Queensland, he came home empty-handed. I am satisfied—and I know I am speaking for hon. members on this side—that the statement of the hon. member for Murilla is all "moonshine." I listened with considerable attention to the speeches delivered by different members of the Opposition. They have been jumbling a lot of figures together and telling this Government that they are a wasteful Government.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Quite true.

Mr. PAYNE: Everybody that has studied the position at all knows that Queensland, and every other State in Australia, and even the Commonwealth itself, are suffering a financial depression at the present time. The hon. member for Oxley went to some trouble to criticise the Government and their financial position, but if the Nationalist party, which the hon. member for Oxley recently deserted, had had their way, and had succeeded in carrying conscription, then the financial position of every State would be much worse than it is to-day. If conscription had been carried it would have meant that 16,000 men would be sent away from Australia every month. Look what that would have cost the country; and, in addition to sending all the best men out of the country in that way, there were all the other things that had to be paid for in connection with conscription. If the Nationalist party throughout Australia had had their way, and succeeded in carrying conscription, then Australia to-day would be financially insolvent. A man does not need to be an exceptional financial expert to understand the situation in Australia to-day. If we take all the debts of the Commonwealth and all the States of Australia, and add up the interest bill of each, we will find that Australia had to find an annual interest payment of £40,000,000 per year, and we have only got a population of 5,000,000 people to find that immense amount of interest. The great financial experts understand the difficult position that any Australian Government are faced with to-day. Some of the best men I have spoken to in my electorate, and in other parts of Queensland, have come to the conclusion that it would be better to wipe out the whole of the war debts, and then they would know where they were. Some of these men are not only in favour of wiping out the interest on the Australian war debts, but even believe in wiping out the principal, too.

Mr. CLAYTON: What do you mean by the best men?

Mr. PAYNE: I mean the men who talk without bias, and the men who have a soul. We have members opposite who talk about these things, but they have no soul. There is no Government in Australia to-day, including the Commonwealth Government, that does not find the financial position very difficult owing to the fact that we have to find £40,000,000 annually in interest and a population of only 5,000,000 to raise that amount.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: You are adding to it as fast as you can every year.

Mr. FLETCHER: The Queensland Government is the chief offender.

Mr. PAYNE: We have to admit that during the war it was a very exciting time, and many men lost their heads to some extent; but when the Labour party took up the stand throughout the Commonwealth to fight against conscription, we did a good thing for Australia. Had it not been for the stand taken by the Labour party on that occasion, then Australia would be absolutely insolvent to-day. It was the Labour party who started the Commonwealth Bank, and it was the Labour party in Queensland more than anyone else who saved this country from conscription. By doing that we prevented the Commonwealth from sending 16,000 men away to the front every month. I cannot help repeating it, because you cannot repeat a good thing too often. We know that Queensland, in common with every other part of the British Empire, has felt the financial position very much owing to the effects of the war. In fact, it is felt by every country in the world except America.

Mr. FLETCHER: Queensland benefited from the war.

Mr. PAYNE: Queensland suffered as much as the other States from the war, but we had an honest Administration in power. (Opposition laughter.) Hear them laugh! Any fool can laugh. Go around and look for yourselves and see the improvements going on in your own city.

Mr. CLAYTON: And see the unemployed.

Mr. PAYNE: Anyone who travels throughout Queensland can see the enormous amount of money that is being spent.

Mr. CLAYTON: You can also see the unemployed.

Mr. PAYNE: There are less unemployed in Queensland than in any other State in Australia. (Opposition dissent.)

Mr. FLETCHER: Let us hear how Queensland was adversely affected by the war.

Mr. PAYNE: Members opposite talk about the unemployed. It has been proved that men come from the other States to Queensland, and, no doubt, they have increased the number of unemployed here. Why did they come here?

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: To get your doles.

Mr. PAYNE: They came here because Queensland is under a better form of Government. (Hear, hear!) They came here because we have a more humane Government. (Hear, hear!) It is only human nature that these men who have no ties to keep them in any particular place—it is only the law of human nature, just like the animals, if you like—they will go to the spot where they can get the best food and best accommodation.

Mr. WARREN: Yes, your doles.

Mr. Payne.]

Mr. PAYNE: That caused a rush of men from the other States to Queensland and caused more unemployment here. I said just now that Mr. Theodore stood the test in England. So far as this side of the House is concerned, we never had any doubt of the loyalty of Ted Theodore, the Premier of this State.

Mr. FLETCHER: You don't know him.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope the hon. member for Mitchell will address the Chief Secretary by his proper title.

Mr. PAYNE: What would the Premier gain by joining the Opposition?

Mr. KERR: It would save his job.

Mr. PAYNE: The Premier sprang from the workers, lived with the workers all his life, and he knows that the workers placed him in the position which he now occupies. He knows the whole Labour movement from A to Z, and that he would do nothing to kill the Labour movement. I ask any common sense person what the Premier would gain by joining, as he puts it himself, a rabble like the Opposition? The thing is unthinkable to a common-sense man.

Mr. KERR: He did not seem to think so.

Mr. WEIR: All they think about in the Opposition are bonds and wheat pools.

Mr. PAYNE: The other night we had the member for Port Curtis, Mr. Fletcher, and the member for Oxley, Mr. Elphinstone, giving this House a lecture on political morality. Those hon. members and other hon. members were discussing something that appeared in the paper about two men being arrested for offering a bribe of £3,500.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member not refer to that incident.

Mr. PAYNE: You allowed other members to refer to it.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to point out that no other member of this Committee has referred to that incident.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. PAYNE: I was referring to it in the way that they referred to it, when they were giving this House a lecture on political morality. Political morality for—
[5 p.m.] sooth! Such a lecture comes ill from two men who went to the electors as Nationalists and joined another party without going to the country again. I agree with the member for Bulimba—

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: You agree with him!

Mr. PAYNE: I agree with any man in what I think is an honest thing. I agree that any man who goes before the electors and then sees his way clear to change his opinions, should at least go to the electors again before he takes his place in Parliament.

Mr. KERR: What about your retrenchment policy? What did you say on the hustings?

Mr. PAYNE: There is not one member on this side of the House who has broken or splintered one plank in the platform so far as the wages of the workers are concerned. I say that it ill becomes those members—they have a cast-iron front—to rise in their places and give a lecture on political morality. I say that the Nationalist party—or rather, I shall not confine my comments to the Nationalist party, but include the whole of the Opposition—are responsible for the very bad financial conditions in Australia

[Mr. Payne.

to-day. Had the producers of Australia got the same prices for their products as did the producers of Canada, the producers of Australia could have paid the whole of the war debt, and they would have been better off than they are to-day.

Mr. MOORE: What about the extra distance?

Mr. PAYNE: I give you that in. The people of Canada and other portions of the British Empire got three and four times as much for their products as the Australian producers.

Mr. WARREN: They had ships to take them away.

Mr. PAYNE: There were ships here before the effects of the war became serious, but the Commonwealth Government were too mean. If the Commonwealth Government had been a truly Australian Government, they would have taken advantage of the opportunity of their lives and started secondary industries here during the war. There was a natural protection. The politician or the individual who thinks that we are going to make this country a free country and increase population without increasing secondary industries in a big way, is living in a fool's paradise.

We have heard our opponents talking about land settlement. I am very pleased to see that the Government have seen their way to introduce some legislation that will assist the man on the land to get a decent price for what he produces. To me it has always seemed foolish to talk about settling people on the land before you have arrived at some organisation scheme that will guarantee them fair prices for their products. I think nothing can be more lamentable than to see hard working men on the land—as I have seen them during the last two or three years—producing first-class crops and when they are marketed getting scarcely what it cost to produce them.

Mr. J. JONES: That applies to the settler to-day.

Mr. PAYNE: What worse attraction for settling people on the land in Queensland could we have than the Queensland-born man working practically all the daylight hours only to turn around and tell you that he can hardly get a decent living, after he has produced first-class crops? I think it is monstrous to talk about settling people on the land when they can never be sure that if they work they will get what it costs them to produce their crops. The Government are trying to remedy that state of affairs with the Primary Producers' Organisation Act, and if the farmers will fall into line I have no hesitation in saying that land settlement in Queensland will get a bigger boom than it has ever had, by the establishment of markets, the provision of pools or some organisation scheme whereby the men on the land will get a reasonable, decent price for what they produce. It will have a greater effect than half a dozen Burnett schemes.

Mr. WARREN interjected.

Mr. PAYNE: I would be very much surprised if I had not done more practical farming than the hon. member. I was born on a farm. The hon. member for Murrumbidgee is farming on the share system. He has families working for him, and he farms them; he sits quietly by while they do the work.

One of the principal items in the charges against the Government has been that the Government have spent too much money in relief doles. The unfortunate men who are out of work the members of the Opposition are pleased to call loafers, and I can remember some years ago when the unemployed went to the Government in power, the present Opposition, and were told to go and eat grass. I am glad, anyhow, that the present Government have not descended so low that they would treat men, women, and children—women and children in particular—so callously as to tell them to go and eat grass. It is true that the Government have spent a considerable amount of money in giving people relief. I admit it would be very much better if they could be kept in employment, because mere relief has a tendency to degrade honest men who will work. The matter was discussed by the whole of the party—I am giving no secrets away—and every one of us preferred to help men by giving them honest work. The Government had a certain amount of money and it was proved that if they had to buy material and provide plant and erect certain buildings to start works, the money would last only for a very short time, whereas if they gave the men enough to keep body and soul together, it would at any rate tide them over the period till, perhaps, they could give them constant work. Had the Opposition been over here—had this humane party on the Opposition benches been on the Government side of the House, they might have started works with a great flourish, but in four or six months they would have found that they had no money—the job would not have been completed, it would have been no use to anybody, and the unfortunate people would have had to starve. I stand by the Government in every action they have taken for the feeding of men who could not get work owing to the conditions caused by the war.

Mr. KERR: The Government have stopped the City Electric Light Company spending £100,000 and providing work.

Mr. PAYNE: I happened to be on the committee which gave that matter honest consideration. It dawned on each member of that committee that it was a most peculiar coincidence that just now, when money is a little bit tight, these companies come along making out that they are trying to give the people the comforts of life. The man who would give public utilities away for a life time is a criminal. Those people have done without for some years, and it would be much better for them to go without for another year or two and allow the matter to remain in their own hands rather than give it to some Shylock company which could charge what is liked and give whatever service it liked. The Government did right in not giving away any of those public utilities. I would advise the hon. member for Enoggera to "read up" the municipalities of Glasgow: it would open his eyes. He has never read them, or he would not talk as he is talking. Any man—whether Australian-born or Australian by adoption—who is anxious to give away public utilities—water, light, tramways—and tie up future generations for all time, in favour of some Shylock company which would be able to treat the people as it liked, is a criminal in the community. Any hon. member who would speak and vote in favour of such a proposal would not be acting in the

best interests of the community. I have heard a good deal about this Government having gone to America for money. What else had the Government to do? They showed their backbone in that—rather than be subdued by the capitalistic power of this State, by a delegation to England, by the attacks of the Tory newspapers—they took the action they did.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Do you think the newspapers said anything which was not true?

Mr. PAYNE: I am quite sure they never said anything which was true. This is the only Labour Government in the world to-day. It is only natural that members who are here in the interests of the great big capitalistic class, the boodle class, and not in the interests of the great mass of the people, will stop at nothing to get rid of this Government. We have heard a good deal about the Bill that became law to-day. Probably it would have been better had it not been necessary to place such an Act on the statute-book. Had the Opposition been a decent Opposition, had they followed the custom of giving "pairs" to sick members of this House, it would not have been necessary. I congratulate the Government on the passage of that Bill. As one of the earliest pioneers in the Labour movement in this State, on behalf of the workers in my electorate, I congratulate the Premier on the stand that he has taken during this trying time. I congratulate him for—as hon. members opposite call it—hanging on to office.

Mr. FLETCHER interjected.

Mr. PAYNE: It requires someone to act the part of a dog to catch a dog. (Laughter.) Hon. members can laugh, but a dog is a dog no matter what camp he is in. I congratulate the hon. member for Toowoomba. The methods adopted were the only ones possible, to expose the extent to which the capitalistic class of this country would go in trying to oust the only Labour Government in the world to-day. I do not want to touch on this case, although a good deal has been said both in the House and in the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out to the hon. member that nothing has been said in Committee in regard to that case.

Mr. PAYNE: I do not want to break your ruling on the matter, Mr. Kirwan. As far as I am concerned, men of the character of those who are at the back of the Opposition require to be exposed. I have heard a lot about clean politics, about public morality. I have come to the conclusion that many of those people who talk about political morality have not an ounce of common justice in the whole of their composition. I am sick and tired of hearing men talking about honesty of purpose. They say that this Government are hanging on to office for what they can get out of it. This Government are hanging on to office, because they know that if members at present sitting in opposition were to occupy the Treasury benches for one year the great mass of the workers of this State would be in a very much worse position than they are to-day. The workers in New South Wales are tasting that medicine from the Fuller Tory Government. I claim that this Government, by hanging on to office with a majority of one, are doing justice to the great mass of the people of this country. I hope that they will continue to hang on.

Mr. Payne.]

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowoong*): During his introduction of the Financial Statement, the Treasurer seemed to stress the point that Queensland was in a flourishing condition. As an illustration, he used the national festival that we have had during the course of this month; he pointed out the number of people who attended, and gave that as one of the reasons justifying the Government in retaining the Treasury benches and having the confidence of the people. If Queensland is in such a flourishing condition, how is it that we have our unfortunate people down at the various relief depôts accepting the doles that this Government choose to pass out to them? How does it come that the Government have introduced a retrenchment or deflation policy and a reduction of wages throughout the public service? I would like to draw the attention of hon. members to the condition of one of the industries of this community which is contradictory to the Premier's statement. I refer to the building trade. In the last annual report of the Master Builders' Association the following appears:—

"The marked depression that closed the months of the year 1920 continued; and, in fact, became, if anything, more intense during the year under review, which closed with a rather discouraging prospect. The year had found nearly 75 per cent. of the association's members practically idle, which, of course, meant that a large number of employees were also idle."

Mr. DASH: That industry is flourishing.

Mr. MAXWELL: I am associated with the building industry, but the hon. member is not.

Mr. DASH: The hon. member cries "stinking fish" all the time.

Mr. MAXWELL: I do not cry "stinking fish," nor do I cry "longer hours." I must dissociate myself from the system of a forty-eight-hour week. I contend that a forty-four-hour week is a fair proposition, and I am not going to allow an hon. member who walks up and down Queen street to try and gull this Committee somewhat along the lines adopted by the Premier by stating that the State is in a prosperous condition because one or two buildings are being erected. I endorse what is contained in this report by the master builders. It states further—

"The year had found nearly 75 per cent. of the association's members practically idle, which, of course, meant that a large number of employees were also idle. 'What is the cause of this depression in the building trade,' continues the report, 'is a question that has been answered in various ways; but of all the causes put forward probably the absolute lack of confidence in our legislators is far and away the chief cause of depression. Money is apparently plentiful, but this is being invested in gilt-edge securities, such as war loans, Government bonds, and preferential shares, as is proved by the firming of all these securities as against the falling tendency of industrial stocks. There is no gainsaying the fact that money is being taken out of Queensland industries and invested elsewhere, for the extremely heavy taxation, coupled with the insane legislation against the laws of supply

[*Mr. Maxwell.*

and demand, and State interference with industrial matters leaves no alternative. Optimism is a virtue that can well be indulged in in this great colony, provided the people are allowed to work out their own salvation, free from the paralysing effect of a tyranny that could be hardly equalled under the worst possible capitalistic system; but it is useless to say all is well when the reverse obtains. Restore the long-lost confidence by eliminating the extremist on either side, by encouraging a friendly relationship between employer and employee, as against the teaching of that ungodly and ruinous doctrine of 'class consciousness,' and by restoration of practical working conditions; then there will be cause for optimism, as undoubtedly under those favourable conditions this State is ripe for a huge development in the building trade, bringing in its train prosperity to employers, constant work to employees, with happiness and contentment for both."

The Master Builders' Association speaks with a great amount of authority. The reports by union secretaries as to the condition of trade contained in the "Queensland Industrial Gazette" for July, I take it, are a fair index of how things are. The "Industrial Gazette" states—

"Boot trade—no work."

Mr. WEIR interjected.

Mr. MAXWELL: I want to dissociate myself from anybody who would attempt to say that hon. members on this side believe that children should go without boots. We believe that everyone should enjoy a decent living. We do not believe that people should be bootless or unemployed.

Mr. WEIR: Of course, the hon. gentleman does.

At 5.25 p.m.,

Mr. DUNSTAN, one of the panel of Temporary Chairmen, relieved the Chairman in the chair.

Mr. MAXWELL: I know what it is to be an employee just the same as to be an employer. If hon. members on this side had an opportunity of occupying the Treasury benches, the people of this State would be in a better position than they are in to-day. They would enjoy legitimate and honest legislation intended for the benefit of the whole community. The "Industrial Gazette" further states—

"Builders' labourers—lack of employment."

That emphasises the statement contained in the annual report of the Master Builders' Association. The "Industrial Gazette" further states—

"Amalgamated engineers—slackness of trade.

"Federated furnishing trade—slackness of trade.

"Federated liquor trade—depression."

Mr. WEIR interjected.

Mr. MAXWELL: I do not stand for German goods. I stand for British material all the time. The "Industrial Gazette" continues—

"Federated moulders—slackness of trade.

"Painters and decorators—advice on causes exhausted."

That emphasises the statement I made in connection with the condition of that branch of the industry. The "Industrial Gazette" further states—

"Queensland plasterers—slackness of trade.

"Plumbing—illness 1, lack of work 14.

"Federated ship painters and dockers—lack of work.

"Storemen and packers—will be in work next week.

"Waterside workers—insufficient shipping work.

"Australian Workers' Union, Central district—scarcity of employment.

"Queensland colliery employees—slackness of trade, sickness, and accident.

"Waterside workers—lack of shipping, no cargo.

"Waterside workers (sub-branch)—casual employment.

"Boilermakers—sickness 1, accident 1.

"Moulders, Ipswich—sickness and accidents."

These are reports by union secretaries, and I am quoting them in order to emphasise the statements made in the Master Builders' Association's annual report. It shows that a most deplorable state of affairs exists, and I hold that union secretaries can, undoubtedly, speak with greater authority upon these matters than can the Premier or the member for Mundingburra. The Premier and others are invited to a number of social functions, where they see everybody enjoying themselves, where the festive board is laden, and where liquor is flowing freely.

Mr. W. COOPER: Does the hon. member mean civic functions?

Mr. MAXWELL: I mean all functions, including civic functions. At these functions hon. members opposite do not see the other side of the shield, and do not know the exact state of conditions existing. What was the result of an appeal made a short time ago in connection with the returned "digger"?

Mr. COLLINS: Who is to blame for that?

Mr. MAXWELL: Who?

Mr. COLLINS: The Commonwealth Government.

Mr. WEIR: The hon. member knows it, too.

Mr. MAXWELL: The committee of which I have the honour to be chairman waited on the Prime Minister in connection with this matter, and he has placed £250,000 at the disposal of the committee to assist unemployed "diggers."

Mr. WEIR: Look what the Prime Minister has done for the "brass hats."

Mr. MAXWELL: He has discharged a lot of them. It is all very well for the Premier to say that 70,000 people attended an annual festival, and then use that argument as an indication of the prosperity of the country. That is no indication at all. We have got our relief depôt, and we have in the basement of the Queensland Turf Club building women working all day making and distributing clothing for women and children of "diggers" out of employment. Nobody regrets the present deplorable state of affairs more than myself. It is most unfair for any hon. member to say that Queensland is in a flourishing condition. And to say that such a condition is due to the Labour party! If that is so, the present state of unem-

ployment is also due to the Labour party. No matter who is to blame, the fact that we have a relief depôt, and we have people making clothing for the women and children of the "diggers," is a disgrace to this community. We have been told that this is all the aftermath of the war. It was up to the people who, before the war, knew that there would be this aftermath of the war to have done something to prevent the present state of affairs. These gentlemen who are always talking about the capitalist system are doing their hardest to try and become capitalists them-

[5.30 p.m.] selves, and I do not blame them. I say that capitalists are a class of men who are good for the community. I do not think it is right for a man to be always satisfied to stand on the lower rung of the ladder. We want men like the late Hon. T. J. Byrne and like Mr. Andrew Fisher. Take the present Premier, for example, who worked in a mine, and he raised himself by his industry and ability to the position which he occupies to-day. It is disgraceful to talk in the way some hon. members opposite talk about capitalists. Then we find that during the Paddington election the Secretary for Mines spoke in favour of the abolition of the wage system. I do not know whether he desires to associate himself with the I.W.W., the preamble to whose platform states—

"Instead of the conservative motto, 'A fair day's wages for a fair day's work,' we must inscribe on our banner the revolutionary watchword, 'Abolition of the wage system.'"

The Secretary for Mines said at the Paddington election that there was to be no unemployment; but what do we find to-day? There are numbers of men travelling from the Southern States to Queensland. I would not like to say that these men are coming here because there are relief depôts in existence.

Mr. BRAND: It is a fact, all the same.

Mr. MAXWELL: I would like to say that, irrespective of the present Government, this State bears a splendid reputation all over Australia. It stands to reason that Queensland could not have stood the misgovernment she has been subjected to if she had not been a great State. Then, we had the Premier stating, in reply to an interjection, that he believed in a co-operative commonwealth. I must say that during my experience I have been greatly disappointed in regard to some of the statements made by the hon. gentleman. (Government laughter.) I always judge a man by his statements until I prove him to be unreliable. I remember that, on the first occasion I had the privilege of being here, the Premier made a statement in which he asked for the co-operation of all hon. members in order to make this fair State of ours what it should be. Then, a couple of days after, he got the hatchet out and started to use it, and allowed us to believe that he did not want any assistance from hon. members on this side at all. The Premier's scheme of co-operation is entirely different to what I anticipated it would be. To prove it, I have only to go to the One Big Union. I believe that is what the hon. gentleman believes in; in fact, I believe the whole of hon. members opposite are advocates of the One Big Union.

Mr. COLLINS: Hear, hear!

Mr. Maxwell.]

Mr. MAXWELL: I am glad to hear that interjection. I want to read an extract, in connection with the co-operative community which the Premier wants, from "The One Big Union and Reconstruction," by Ernest H. Lane, with introduction by Hon. W. R. Crampton, M.L.C. Chapter XI. is headed "The Wings of Desire," and states—

"Who can doubt the necessity of the idealists and dreamers who, in their visioning of the future, conjure up a picture of society which serves as the basis or model of the days that are yet to be, and thus point the way that leads to the co-operative commonwealth?"

"But before it will be possible to attain this ideal of a nation of free men and women in place of the present one of privileged bondholders on the one side and dependent bond-slaves on the other, the workers will have to have greater and higher ideals in their curriculum of reform than they have at present. Their childlike faith in old, time-worn nostrums of political fetishes and beliefs will have to be abandoned; the delusive principle of 'a fair day's pay for a fair day's work' must be scrapped along with the many other shibboleths of a past epoch of evolution.

"As soon as the workers realise that arbitration courts, wages boards, and the various other methods of 'mutual' bargaining will never bring them any nearer to their emancipation from the toils of capitalist exploitation, that on those lines nothing that really matters can possibly be attained—as soon as that position is realised, then will another big advance be made on the onward march."

We continually hear hon. members on the front Treasury benches denouncing what they call the capitalist gang. Does it not seem ridiculous for a body of men who pose as intelligent people to stand up on all occasions and denounce the capitalists as being a capitalistic gang, when we read that their aim and objective is to try to get to the top of the ladder? We do not blame any man who tries to raise himself from the ranks to the position of an officer. We know that this One Big Union is associated with the communistic plot that was hatched in Melbourne, transferred to Sydney, reborn in Brisbane, and then sent to Melbourne to be ratified. I do not want to weary the Committee by stating what the hon. gentleman said at that conference. The plank was agreed to by the conference in Brisbane. I have the report of the conference here, which confirms my statement. I do not know whether, in view of the statement which the Premier has made about the co-operative commonwealth, that the hon. gentleman coincides in the views expressed by Mr. Garden, in his latest manifesto in the South, when he said that he had referred his "go-slow" and "irritation strike" policy to the Council of Action for endorsement. Imagine hon. members opposite advocating the continuation of arbitration courts, when we find, in connection with the One Big Union, that the abandonment of the arbitration courts altogether is advocated! When the hon. member for Barcoo spoke the other night, in connection with the basic wage, I asked him to read the statement of Mr. Piddington. Mr. Piddington pointed out how ridiculous it was that in fixing the

basic wage a married man with a wife and three children should be placed on exactly the same footing as a single man. That is not a fair proposition.

Mr. BULLOCK: If you hold that the present basic wage is too low, do you pay a higher rate than the basic wage yourself?

Mr. MAXWELL: I might reply to the hon. gentleman in this way: Of the present time, owing to the restrictions and conditions that are placed upon some of us in our own business, we pay the minimum wage to the majority of men and we obey the conditions laid down by the Arbitration Court.

Mr. BULLOCK: Then you perpetuate what you admit to be an unfair position?

Mr. MAXWELL: We abide by the decision of the Arbitration Court. I venture to say that, although the hon. member does not believe in the contract system, he would not perpetuate that system himself, but he would rather do the work himself and not give the work to an unfortunate man who requires that work. This is the statement made by Mr. Piddington, as published in the "Sydney Morning Herald" on 29th February, 1922:—

"The aim of the league is to secure remedy of defects in the existing basic wage system by establishment of a flat rate minimum wage sufficient for a man and wife, and, in lieu of payment for three children, as at present, an allowance be made for each dependent child.

"Referring to the present basic wage system, Mr. Piddington said that nothing could be more flagrantly unfair to the employer than to force him to pay a wage, based on family maintenance, to those who had no such responsibility, and nothing more unjust to the people in whose interests the scheme was brought into operation. It was simply impossible to expect a coherent living wage declaration by a court if everyone was to have the same wage. The time would soon come when the country would look back with amazement at the present living wage law, and wonder how it was employers and employees had tolerated the arrangement so long."

I think that hon. members will admit that when a gentleman like Mr. Piddington was invited to address the unions—or, at any rate, some of the citizens of Brisbane—in the Albert Hall, that he was thought to be good enough for those gentlemen. And that is the gentleman who made the statement I have just referred to. The hon. member for Barcoo referred to the employers' conference in Brisbane. I have also some reference to make to that conference, and I take my information from a similar source to the hon. gentleman, namely, the Press of Brisbane. There was a resolution passed which I think I should read. I might say that last year the Government proposed to introduce an amendment of the Arbitration Act, but no mention of that amendment appears in the Governor's Speech this year. I do not know why it was omitted. It might be because there was not sufficient paper, or perhaps their friends from the Trades Hall gave instructions that it had to be eliminated. This is the resolution that was passed at the employers' conference—

"That, while the employers of Australia, as represented at this conference, are of opinion that a properly constituted arbitration system for the settlement of industrial disputes is in the best interests

[Mr. Maxwell.]

of Australian industry, they cannot overlook the fact that, unless the awards of the Arbitration Court are to be loyally obeyed by both employers and employees, then such legislation is an encumbrance on the statute-book of Australia and should be repealed, as it is contrary to equity and fair dealing that one party to these awards should be bound thereby and the other party allowed to flout them with impunity."

I consider that is as fair a resolution as any body of men could pass. I have been associated with those men on the Council of Employers for Australia, and I know Senator Fairbairn, who is at their head, and I can say that it has never been my lot to associate with a more honourable body of men. All these men stand for fair dealing. They favoured co-operation, they offered profit-sharing, and they even offered the Whitley scheme to the employees for the purpose of bringing about industrial peace. But the militant section of the unionists would not agree to any of them, and they stated that there was nothing in common between the employing class and the employees. I notice several hon. members on the Government benches are laughing. I know from experience where men who have risen from the ranks and have become bosses are absolutely tyrannical to the employees. I remember in Brisbane some years ago, just before the Early Closing Act came into force, one of the biggest advocates for early closing was a shopwalker in one of our Queen street establishments. When he afterwards started in business for himself that man kept his business open till 9 o'clock at night and 11 o'clock on Saturday nights. Yet he was a man who professed to believe in early closing. In my opinion, hon. members opposite who are interjecting and laughing would do just the same as that man. We are often asked what socialism is. This is Kirkup's definition of what socialism is—

"Whereas industry is at the present carried on by private capitalists served by wage labour, it must be in the future conducted by associated or co-operating workmen jointly owning the means of production. On grounds both of theory and history this must be accepted as the cardinal principle of socialism."

Instead of the Government saying that we are in a flourishing condition at the present time, it would be better if they gave encouragement for the distribution of capital throughout the length and breadth of the State so that work can be given to the unemployed. I cannot understand the Premier saying that we are in a flourishing condition when we have a Bill before the House to reduce the salaries of the public servants. The Government went to the Arbitration Court and asked for a reduction in salaries, notwithstanding the fact that when they went to the country they promised the electors that there would be no retrenchment. I have rather a good "Psalm of an Unemployed Man," which I will read to the House. It is as follows:—

"PSALM OF AN UNEMPLOYED MAN.

"1. Theodore is my shepherd, yet I am in want.

"2. He maketh me to lie down on the park benches: He leadeth me beside the free dole houses.

"3. He restoreth my doubt in the communistic party: He guideth me in the path of destruction, for his party's sake.

"4. Yea, though I walk through the valley of starvation, I will fear no evil, for thou art against me: Thy politicians they frighten me.

"5. Thou preparedst a reduction in salaries or deflation for me. Thou anointed my income tax; my expense runneth over my income.

"6. Surely unemployment shall follow me all the days of the communistic party: And I shall dwell in the parks for ever."

(Opposition laughter.)

So far as the unfortunate unemployed are concerned, the Secretary for Mines stated that the opening of the Burnett land scheme would absorb them in two months.

Mr. FOLEY: That is correct. Did he not prove it the other night?

Mr. MAXWELL: It is all very well for the hon. member to say it is correct. He has a good salary, and what is more, he has a blanket to cover him, but there are other people who are not in the same fortunate position. I am not going to quote the "Courier" and the "Telegraph" to show what the Burnett land scheme was going to do, but I am going to take the "Daily Standard" of 29th December, 1921—

"Queensland is the only State with a big, practicable plan which would have properly settled thousands of workers on the land. The Government is still strongly in favour of the Burnett proposals, and it is understood is considering means of borrowing or raising the £2,600,000 required to carry them out successfully. But the Federal Government, acting under orders doubtless, turned those proposals down and reneged on the offer to provide the £2,000,000 for the Burnett land settlement. In any case, the Burnett lands proposals, in the present state of Australian unemployment, would be only sufficient to absorb a considerable number of Australian workless and would not go far as a solid excuse for encouraging immigration."

It was necessary for me to read only the last part, but I want to be fair, so I have read it all. So you see how ridiculous was the statement that the scheme is going to absorb the unemployed. I wish it would. Nobody would be better pleased than the members on this side of the House. We have a State second to none in the whole of the Commonwealth, and because some of us criticise the management of the State, we are told by members on the other side that we are defaming the State. I say that the men who are defaming the State are those who hold the Treasury benches and the others sitting behind them. We know full well the condition of affairs to which we have been brought owing to the reckless expenditure and extravagance of the Government, a Government who resort to the tactics we have seen during the last couple of days—proxy voting of members who are unfortunately unable to take their places. They have created a very bad precedent. I think it was the Secretary for Public Lands who, by interjection the other night, said that it was for a Government who had high ideals to create precedents, not to follow precedents. If so, I want to ask hon. members on the other side of the House, "Why did you follow the precedent

Mr. Maxwell.]

that another Government introduced—at least, you say they did—that is, the bludgeoning of free speech? These are the advocates of democracy, but they are most hypocritical in their advocacy—these class-conscious people. Did not the Premier say on the Address in Reply, “We are here to represent not one class, we are here to represent the employers and the employees and to do our best for Queensland”? What have they done? The communistic plank that was born in this House—and had illegitimate birth again in the Trades Hall. Then, again, a precedent has been established by the Government in the manner in which members of the Opposition have been treated, which would be a disgrace to a suburban debating society let alone our legislative hall. I cannot understand any Ministry who desire to secure the assistance and support of the people resorting to tactics such as this Government have adopted during the course of the various debates in this House, in which they bludgeoned through a certain measure. I venture to say that before very long they will be up before the tribunal.

At 5.55 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER interjected.

Mr. MAXWELL: I do not know to what the hon. member refers, but I am game to go to my crowd and they are not game to go to theirs. I will go to-morrow. We heard an interjection from the Premier the other night, when the Legislative Assembly Act Amendment Bill went through, “I thought you said there was going to be an election?” The Premier practically held up the Bill and in colonial parlance said, “What do you know about that? We have this and we are in a position to carry on.”

Mr. W. COOPER: Absolutely!

Mr. MAXWELL: I venture to say that when the Bill goes to the people they will answer the Government in no uncertain fashion.

Mr. COLLINS: Send them back with an increased majority.

Mr. MAXWELL: The hon. member is very optimistic. If he is really so optimistic as that, why not take the opportunity now? Why not go to the people and receive their instructions? (Government interruption.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MAXWELL: I would just like to refer hon. members to what a late respected member of this House, Mr. David Bowman, said of the Kidston Administration for carrying on in 1909 with a majority of one or two. We have heard from the hon. member for Kurilpa the statement by the Attorney-General with reference to the same Government carrying on with a majority of one or two, but circumstances alter cases. It makes all the difference when the “ins” are in and want to stay there.

Mr. BULCOCK: What did Earle Page say about the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth?

Mr. MAXWELL: I do not know what Dr. Earle Page said about the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth, but I do know that if there is one body of men who regret what they did to the Right Hon. William Hughes it is the body of men who sit over there. (Government laughter.) Hon. members may laugh—he was one too clever for them. Mr.

[Mr. Maxwell.

Hughes stood for the Empire. (Government laughter.) Did “Billy” Hughes stand for the Perth Conference, where they sang the “Red Flag”? No. He stood for the flag of the Empire. He did not stand for Sovietism; the condition of affairs that will obtain here—the condition of affairs in Russia—if some fate does not intervene and prevent some men from carrying out their desires. The only thing to which I am looking for intervention is the will of the people. Those gentlemen opposite believe in the voice of the people, they say. The fact is that they believe in it when it suits themselves. The hon. member for Bowen asked members on this side if we understood the meaning of “Communism.” Naturally, being prepared

always to learn something, I [7 p.m.] wanted to know if hon. gentlemen wanted to know if hon. gentlemen on the other side could tell me what it was. We were told it was practically the “Sermon on the Mount.” It was the teachings of the Great Master. I would remind hon. gentlemen opposite who say that, that if that were so, a better spirit of co-operation would exist amongst members on that side towards members on this side—a better spirit of co-operation, of brotherly love and affection towards the general community than obtains at the present day. The system of class consciousness would not prevail. We have been told by the Master, “If a man strikes you on the left cheek, turn the right”; again, “Love one another,” “Live peaceably with all men”; and, “If a man ask you to go one mile, go two miles.” If that is the communism that the hon. member understands, why do they not practise it? The communism we are told of to-day is the communism that is practised in Russia.

Mr. FOLEY: Communism is not being practised in Russia.

Mr. MAXWELL: I am glad to have that from the hon. member.

Mr. FOLEY: You ought to know that.

Mr. MAXWELL: It may not be practised; but that is the class of libelled communism which hon. members desire to put upon us; and they give us to understand that that is what communism means. This is what the “Communist,” of 4th November, 1921, says—

“The workers in Europe are again gathering strength for another and, they hope, final struggle for victory over their exploiters. The bloody hand of British Imperialism is at work, not only in Ireland, where death stands between the Irish and a bourgeois republic, but in India and Egypt. These masses, ere they gain their freedom, will free the same symbol of capitalism and Imperialism as the external enemy—a British bullet. Such is the class struggle to-day, bringing the workers ever near and nearer to victory—to the time when the revolutionary party of the proletariat—the communist party—will smash the State and set the workers free.”

Is that the class of communism that the hon. member means? Is that the class of communism that hon. members desire to set up? This Soviet appeal to Australia was published in the “Telegraph,” of 18th August, 1922—

“A communication was received yesterday at the Sydney Trades Hall from the executive of the Red Labour Union

International, whose headquarters are at Moscow. The letter states—

“ We are sending to the Melbourne All Australian Trades Union June Conference our heartfelt greetings from far Moscow. We urge you to come out in joint action in an attack against the stronghold of capitalism. We ask you to send your delegates to the coming second congress of the revolutionary union to take place in Moscow on 20th November next, in order to deal jointly with the present tasks of the Labour movement in the whole world.”

“ The letter adds: ‘ The decision of your national congress at Melbourne in June, 1921, shows that you have taken the right path. It is necessary for you to collaborate with revolutionary labour organisations in the other parts of the world.’ ”

That is in support of the ideals they have in Russia. Those in Russia naturally think that there are here in Australia some people who are permeated with the self-same views.

Mr. PAYNE: You are going a long way to bring a charge against the Government—to Russia. (Laughter.)

Mr. MAXWELL: Hon. members have been swallowed by the red rag element which believes in the socialisation of industries, and whose chief objective is the wiping out of the employer. They say, “ There is nothing in common between the employer and the employee.” Hon. members opposite realise how ridiculous it is, in a community such as ours, for such pernicious doctrines to be enunciated amongst the people. I proceed again with the “ Communist”—

“ Soviet Russia is the headquarters of the world revolution. And against Soviet Russia, world capitalism is directing its main offensive. When we read that nations are trading with Russia this does not mean peace; it only means war in another form, or a breathing space in order to prepare new attacks. There can be no peace between a proletarian State and a capitalist State any more than there can be peace between the working class and the capitalist class. And in this conflict victory is the historic mission of the workers; they alone can create the new economic order; they alone have the will to victory; they alone are the creative force of the future.”

Hon. members opposite sit on the seats of the mighty and do not go to help their comrades in the red Soviet department. So long as they can gull the unfortunate men and women, so long will they talk this cheap clap-trap. It is a wonder to me that, in any British community, rubbish like this is allowed to be circulated. It is said that British success to-day is due to the liberty given to its people. That liberty can be abused, and is being abused to-day by a certain section of the community.

Mr. PEASE interjected.

Mr. MAXWELL: The hon. member's voice is like a cracked gramophone record, and I object to listen to a voice like that. It jars on a man's nerves. Mr. Garden, leader of the militant section of workers in the South, states—

“ We believe there is a paradise ahead

for the workers, but there is a long and bloody road to travel before we get there.”

That is the revolutionary clap-trap with which these men try to gull the unfortunate working class; but, thank God, the working class are seeing the light to the extent that the Government are not game to go to their masters. The late Mr. Bowman, when he was in Opposition, twitted the Government with holding on to office. In “ Hansard,” 1909, he states—

“ I think that if the hon. gentleman leading the Government has any feeling at all of self-respect he will not continue as leader of the Government and attempt to carry on business. Either he will tender his resignation and allow an opportunity to be given for another Government to be formed, or he will bring about a dissolution and let the country determine what is best to be done.”

Hon. members opposite made statements of that kind when they were in Opposition, but it is quite a different thing when they are on the Government side of the House. I would like to reply to the remarks made by the hon. Minister, the Hon. W. Forgan Smith, in connection with a deputation which waited upon him in connection with arbitration. He said I misquoted his remarks entirely in connection with that deputation. If anyone was wrong it was the “ Daily Standard,” which I quoted at the time. The “ Daily Standard ” of 28th April, 1922, states—

“ MAY DAY.

“ FINAL ARRANGEMENTS.

“ Trades and Labour Council.

“ Position of Returned Soldiers.

“ Important Committees Appointed.

“ Preference to Returned Soldiers.

“ Mr. G. Lawson reported on the result of the deputation from the council which had interviewed the Minister in charge of Arbitration Court matters (Mr. Forgan Smith), to request the Government to intervene with the action of the court in granting preference to returned soldiers. Mr. Lawson stated that Messrs. Brice and Roche had fully and forcibly placed the position before the Minister, who was very sympathetic to the object of the deputation, but it was a Cabinet matter, and at the earliest opportunity he (the Minister) would bring the question before Cabinet, and would do all in his power to impress it with the desires of the council.

“ Mr. Brice supplemented and endorsed the report of the previous speaker, also Mr. Roche, who said that if the matter was in the hands of the Minister he would probably accede to the council's request. The deputation pointed out how seriously this matter affected the unions. The reports were adopted, future action remaining in abeyance pending the Cabinet's decision.”

If there is any misleading being done, it is being done by “ The Daily Standard,” because that is the statement which appears in that paper. I leave that report of the Trades and Labour Council with reference to returned diggers, which I have just read, for the consideration of hon. members. I want to refer to the treatment which is

Mr. Maxwell.]

meted out by this fatherly Government to our railway people. I have here the "Railway Advocate," which contains a photograph of shacks which are not fit for black-fellows to live in. If the Country party or the Nationalist party allowed people to live in shacks like these, and then posed as friends of the working people, they would be driven out of office. (Government interruption.) Previous Governments did not waste money like this Government do. The paper states—

"For years past one of the principal matters of dissatisfaction in the railway service has been the abominable and disgusting conditions of habitation imposed upon, and tolerated by, the hardest worked railway employees and their families—the fettleers and gangers."

(Government interruption.) I care nothing about hon. members opposite telling me that I am a Tory. I am not a hypocrite. I am not like hon. members opposite, who pose as friends of the working class in order that they may be kept in power. I say that the workers have got more friends on this side. (Government laughter.) The report proceeds—

"Our pages have repeatedly tried to expose the almost inhuman conditions under which these comrades and their families exist. . . ."

"The squatters and other employers of labour are rightly compelled, by the provisions of the Workers' Accommodation Act to provide suitable barracks and quarters for their employees, but repeated requests for the Government's own employees to be extended the benefit of that Act have been received with that—'which availeth nothing.'"

Hon. members opposite talk about what Liberal Governments have done in the past, and they printed and published a deplorable financial story, which was circulated throughout Queensland.

Mr. BRENNAN: That is threadbare.

Mr. MAXWELL: No, it is not threadbare. This Government, during their term of office, have spent more than £70,000,000, and have had an accumulated deficit of about £1,500,000. In seven years they have spent and squandered nearly one-third of the total amount which has been spent since 1859.

Mr. PAYNE: In what direction?

Mr. MAXWELL: In a good many instances for electioneering purposes. (Government laughter.) They have sunk money in State stations; but it should be remembered that it is the duty of a Government to govern and not to trade. The Government have increased the public debt from £52,000,000 to nearly £86,000,000, thus adding to the burden of taxation. We are told by the heaven-born financiers on the other side of the House that this is the only country in Australia that has reduced taxation. The Government are ruining this country. It is all very well for hon. members opposite to lie back in their seats and say that the finest sight in the community was to see the 70,000 people who attended the National Show. What hypocrisy, when women and children are going down to the relief dépôt to receive doles! When did the Government try to reduce the unemployment? No effort has been made to save expenditure. It cost £4,000 to send the Premier to London, £1,800

for Mr. Fihelly's trip to America and England, £1,000 for a Lieutenant-Governor, and £250 for a visiting justice. Some time ago, when the Trades Hall people found that the building in which they were situated was not big enough or good enough for them, they told the Government they wanted another building, and the Government, in face of the opinion of the Brisbane City Council, allowed the Trades Hall to infringe on the streets of the city. The Government could have saved money in every direction, but they have not tried to do so. But what did they do? They would not come within their ambit. Their sole desire was to attempt to gull the people. They said, "Let us spend as much money as we can." We were told by the Premier when he came back to Queensland after visiting Mr. Hughes, the Prime Minister, in Melbourne, that Mr. Hughes would not give him the money to settle the Burnett lands because a Labour Government was in power in Queensland. It was a well-known fact that Mr. Hughes was prepared to give the money to Queensland provided that the Queensland Government agreed to settle people from overseas. It was the domestic policy of the Government to settle people on the land in a proper manner, and they could have got the money from Mr. Hughes under those conditions.

The bell indicated that the time allotted to the hon. member under the Standing Orders had expired.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS (*Pittsworth*): I would like, first of all, to touch upon a little episode which took place in the House last Tuesday when a man largely responsible to the people of Queensland in regard to setting up an example to the community, did not act as he should have done.

Mr. COLLINS: For God's sake don't talk about setting an example to the community.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: Last Tuesday, the Premier intimated that during the previous week he had got down to the position of what we might term an eavesdropper. So far as members on this side of the House are concerned—and I believe as far as members on the other side are concerned—the people think that a man holding the highest position in the land, that is the position of Premier of the State, should, at any rate, act in such a way as to set the best possible example so far as moral conduct is concerned. (Hear, hear!) But in deliberately taking up the attitude of an eavesdropper in order to make public a certain conversation which took place between himself and one man from North Queensland, and later on between himself and another man who was living in Brisbane, the Premier forgot his duty to the people of Queensland. It was the Premier's duty on that day to set up a moral code for the people to follow. That was his duty as a public man. No one can say that the Premier is not a public man. He deliberately took up the attitude of putting the people of Queensland au fait with what may be termed confidential chats between himself and other men. Not only did he do that, but he acted the part of what I might call a "keyhole listener." There is not one man in this Chamber who would do other than despise a man who would listen at the keyhole. (Hear, hear!) I say that the Premier put himself absolutely in that position. He went a step further. I should not have minded if the Premier himself had been the only person concerned,

[Mr. Maxwell.

but the Premier himself admits that the notes which he read out to us here last Tuesday were taken down by a stenographer. We have the Premier in his position as leader of the State, both morally and otherwise, putting upon a certain young man in the public service the hateful duty of listening to a conversation which he knew he was not intended to listen to.

Mr. COSTELLO: He was a pimp.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: That young man was put in a position that he had to listen to a conversation that he knew he was not intended to listen to. When the Premier had those notes taken down and transcribed, he was exercising the rights and powers which were invested in him as Premier of the State. God help the people of Queensland if the moral code set up on Tuesday last by the Premier is to be the moral code of the rising generation in this State! Where are we going to get to? We are going to get down to the lowest depths it is possible to get to. Later on I will show that the Premier has not only to set the moral codes of the community, but also, as he said, the commercial integrity of the State. Supposing an hon. member went into the office of a leading business man, or a banker, and he found out afterwards that that banker or business man had a note taken of the conversation which took place between the business man and the hon. member. Suppose that banker or business man took the precaution of having a stenographer behind the screen, what would the hon. member think of him? Suppose an hon. member spoke to a banker over a telephone and he found out that a shorthand note was taken of that conversation although it was done in no way in consultation with him, what would he say? And I am going to say that when the Premier, of his own free will and of his own accord, exposed last Tuesday night in this House what he believed to be a plot, he then told us that he was prepared to get right down into the lowest depths it is possible for a man to reach, in order to make political capital or any other capital he could out of the conversation of two men. At any rate, I protest myself, and I believe I am right in protesting on behalf of the members on this side of the House, against the political life of the State getting to so low an ebb that the Premier should deliberately set a man to overhear a conversation or take shorthand notes of a conversation which is supposed to have taken place between himself and Mr. Garbutt and of a conversation between himself and Mr. Boyce, and then come into this Chamber and openly flaunt—shall I say?—the low-down tactics he employed in order to get the information. I sincerely trust that the people of Queensland will remember in time to come that the Hon. the Premier of Queensland is an openly confessed eavesdropper or keyhole listener.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: During the discussion on the Financial Statement we have heard many statements made by members on the other side in regard to the taxation of Queensland, the prosperity existing in it, and how gloriously we are succeeding under the rule of the Labour Government. I would like to point out, first of all, that this Government were entirely responsible for the imposition of the land tax.

Mr. COLLINS: Hear, hear!

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: The hon. member knows perfectly well—

Mr. COLLINS: I represent more farmers than you do in the South, more intelligent ones, at any rate.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: The hon. member may. That does not say that they are any more successful than the farmers in my district—not one bit. I would not like the hon. member for Bowen to believe that he is a better man than I am. I am able to represent the farmers in my constituency quite as well as he represents those in his electorate, and I believe I represent mine in an honest way.

Mr. COLLINS: Do you say I represent mine in a dishonest way?

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: I say that this Labour Government are entirely responsible for the imposition of the land tax in Queensland, and responsible for taxing the small man as well as the big one. I have here a table showing the collections of land tax in Queensland as compared with those in the other States—

Year.	New South Wales.	Victoria.	Queensland.	South Australia.
	£	£	£	£
1915-16	3,199	352,352	247,044	154,483
1916-17	3,215	369,488	362,535	139,372
1917-18	2,921	353,156	344,547	135,469
1918-19	2,806	324,332	378,253	154,621
1919-20	2,839	314,217	459,188	146,336

£578,253 in 1918-19, after three years of Labour rule—a record in the taxation of the man on the land! I know that the hon. member for Bowen does not believe it is quite right to work out taxation on a per capita basis, but I have done so, and I find that every man, woman, and child in the respective States was called upon in the years specified to pay the following amounts in land tax:—

Year.	New South Wales.	Victoria.	Queensland.	South Australia.
	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.
1915-16	1 11	5 0	7 3	7 0
1916-17	to	5 2	10 4	6 3
1917-18	2d.	4 11	10 0	7 1
1918-19		4 6	15 7	6 5
1919-20		4 1	12 0	6 0

We repeatedly have it stated that it was largely because of the effects of the war that it was necessary to impose this enormous extra taxation upon the people of Queensland. If that was so, why was it possible for Victoria to carry on with a lesser land tax in 1918 than at the beginning of the war, and South Australia with the same amount? Would I be wrong in saying that it was because, in Victoria, they had sane government as against insane government in Queensland? These figures go to prove that I would be correct in saying that in Victoria and South Australia, during the war period, they had sane government; and, unfortunately for Queensland, we had a Government whose one idea was to spend, spend, spend; to tax, tax, tax; and on those lines alone they were insane and were not responsible, very largely, for their actions. Our friends on the other side say that increased taxation was due entirely to the fact that the Government had to finance certain war obligations and do certain work

Mr. J. H. C. Roberts.]

during the war period. So had Victoria, South Australia, and New South Wales. Yet none of those States conceived the idea that it was necessary to increase the land tax by over 100 per cent., as was the case in Queensland. In 1920 the land taxation in Victoria was the lowest on record; it had fallen to 4s. 1d. In Queensland it was 12s. 4d., and in South Australia 6s. The land tax in Queensland was due entirely to the "foresight" of the present Administration, whose one object was to impose, as soon as possible, a land tax upon the freeholders of the State. The result has been that to-day there are many men who find they can neither pay their land tax nor sell their land. That is what the Government boast of having done. The present Premier, in 1912, on the question of immigration, said—

"The Premier has at last found the correct policy regarding immigration—the necessity of making conditions attractive and satisfactory enough for workers in this State, so as to attract immigrants without the necessity of paying for their passage. He admits that large numbers of people from the old country are being attracted to Queensland, no doubt because of the prosperity that Queensland is enjoying in many of her industries. And that is the policy which this party entirely concurs in. If we can make the conditions in Queensland good for the worker, there will be no necessity to pay scalp money to get immigrants to come to Queensland."

At that particular period the industries were in such a prosperous condition that we were attracting a large number of immigrants from other parts of the world. Can the Premier to-day say that the conditions of Queensland, after seven years of Labour rule, are so attractive that immigrants come here in large numbers?

The TREASURER: I say, if you read more of those speeches you would make a much more sensible speech.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: I will probably act upon that advice; it is interesting to note what hon. members said in 1912. The hon. gentleman cannot say that the condition of the industries of Queensland in 1922, after seven years of Labour rule, is as prosperous as it was in 1912. Let me quote the amounts that have been collected from the different States over a period of years, under the heading of income tax and dividend tax; it will be a revelation to the people of the State—

—	New South Wales.	Victoria.	Queensland.	South Australia.
	£	£	£	£
1915-16	1,707,403	702,745	766,560	212,418
1916-17	1,997,477	766,746	756,292	264,946
1917-18	2,182,117	773,468	967,420	452,303
1918-19	2,355,243	928,210	1,677,335	542,000
1919-20	2,308,267	915,551	2,023,316	662,384

In 1917-18, evidently, the Government of Queensland were beginning to feel that, owing to their mismanagement in the previous three years, it was essential that they should increase very considerably the income tax and the land tax.

I will come back now to the per capita taxation. I know that some hon. members will maintain that that is an incorrect method of arriving at the taxation of a State. This

[Mr. J. H. C. Roberts.

is what every man, woman, and child paid during the last few years in the different States—

—	New South Wales.	Victoria.	Queensland.	South Australia.
	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.
1915-16	18 0	10 0	22 4	9 7
1916-17	21 2	10 10	22 2	11 9
1917-18	22 9	10 11	27 8	18 7
1918-19	23 8	12 0	46 3	21 10
1919-20	22 0	12 0	54 2	26 10

Queensland is out on its own and a sure winner all the time. Yet hon. members opposite say, "Why is it that people will not come to Queensland?" They say that the people will not come to Queensland because they do not know the country. They know it only too well, and they are not coming here to place themselves under the domination, or thumb, of the Premier and hon. gentlemen sitting behind him, to be taxed as they are being taxed at the present time. The fact that the increase in taxation during the last three years has been phenomenal is an incident against this Government. The figures in connection with the receipts and expenditure for New South Wales show—

—	Receipts.	Expenditure.	Surplus.	Deficit.
	£	£	£	£
1915	18,946,227	18,516,179	430,048	..
1916	19,703,518	19,553,927	149,591	..
1917	20,522,097	20,790,895	..	263,798
1918	21,543,742	21,519,918	23,824	..
1919	23,448,168	23,235,398	214,768	..

For four of those years there was a surplus and for one year a deficit, and there then comes on the scene an Administration similar to the Administration that has been for the last seven years and is now ruling in Queensland. That Administration in New South Wales was the Storey or Dooley Administration. In 1920 the receipts in New South Wales, under the Storey or Dooley Government, amounted to £28,650,496, which is an increase in receipts of over £5,000,000 when compared with 1919. The expenditure for that year amounted to £30,210,013, showing a deficit of £1,559,517. That was the first deficit that had been shown for three years. I suppose that Government behaved themselves in the same way as this Government do. When they first got into power they imagined there was no bottom to the pockets of the public and they thought they could get any amount of money and feed the fowls on it or something of that sort, and they never thought that the time would come when they would be hard-pressed or squeezed for money, and that they would have to tax the people out of the State by means of income and land taxation. They did not realise that the time would come when the people would not be able to pay the taxation that was imposed upon them. The Dooley Government perpetrated the same thing in New South Wales and copied the example set by the Theodore Government in Queensland. In 1921 in New South Wales the receipts amounted to £34,031,396 and the expenditure amounted to £34,476,892, showing a deficit of £445,496. The aims, ideas, objects, and ambitions of

the Dooley Government in New South Wales were exactly similar to the aims, ideas, and ambitions of the Queensland Government. They are actuated by the same desire. The idea was to spend public money as quickly as they got hold of it, and if they could not get it quick enough to spend it and then ask the people to find it afterwards. In 1919 the accumulated deficit in New South Wales had amounted to the paltry sum of £244,540. Then we had this notorious Dooley Government, a twin brother to the present Queensland Government, and during the following two years the accumulated deficit had increased to £2,249,558. That is a record that perhaps the Dooley Government might be proud of, and I venture to say their twin brother in Queensland would be still more proud of it, and if they could only have a £2,000,000 deficit here the hon. member for Bowen and other hon. members would be as happy as larks.

How many people in Queensland to-day appreciate the fact that we have a very large sum of money falling due in the way of loans between now and 1950? No provision is being made to meet those loans. The Government are quite prepared to carry on and tax the people, and borrow, boom, and burst. It does not matter to them one iota about the future. They realise that they have only a short period to live, and they say, "Let us have a short life and let us have a merry life." If they took the right course to-night and appealed to the country their life would be cut short. They would go out. We have the following loan money falling due—

	£
1922	2,839,750
1924	13,140,634
1925	12,097,200
1926	813,300
1927	4,352,050
1928	453,600
1929	95,100
1930	3,954,800

During the next eight years, we shall have £37,654,434 of loan money falling due. The average rate of interest on the whole of that loan money is a fraction over 4 per cent. We find that no effort is being made to meet these loans. The people of Queensland are not told the exact position with regard to our loan expenditure. We hear from time to time about the surpluses of the Government. We find hon. members opposite somewhat proud of the fact that the late Treasurer, Mr. Fihelly, managed to show some small surpluses. That hon. gentleman was so surprised with himself that he left this country and went to the mother country.

Mr. BRENNAN: He is still in the British Empire.

Mr. ROBERTS: He is in the proper place now that he is in England. We hear a great deal of talk from hon. members opposite about the deficits which have accrued in previous years in Queensland. We find that in 1910-11, there was a surplus of £5,274, in 1911-12 a surplus of £23,654, in 1912-13 a surplus of £6,115, and in 1913-14 a surplus of £10,742. In 1914-15, the year that this famous Government came into power, and of which the hon. member for Toowoomba has always been a supporter, there was a surplus of £3,259.

Mr. BRENNAN: The war broke out then

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: Were not Victoria and New South Wales in the same position with regard to the war? Have I not quoted figures which show that New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia had not to materially increase taxation during the whole of the war period? Yet the hon. member for Toowoomba is foolish enough now to talk about the war. The extraordinary part about it is that it so happens that the only time that the Government made a decent surplus in Queensland was the year after the war broke out—that is the surplus of £34,791 in 1915-16.

Mr. MORGAN: That was "faked."

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: I think it must have been "faked." In 1916-17, after the present Government had been in office for a couple of years, they had a deficit of £253,493. In 1917-18, they had a deficit of £409,451. Although the Government party was growing smaller at that time, the deficit was increasing considerably. In 1918-19, the present Government had a deficit of £171,938. Then they had the fictitious surplus—I believe it was a fictitious surplus—brought in by Mr. Fihelly, of £26,833. Then they had a surplus of £9,830 in 1920-21.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Quote from the Auditor-General's report with regard to that surplus.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: I am quoting figures given in the Commonwealth year-book. I do not believe that the Minister will say that the figures supplied in that book are wrong. He has to admit that they are correct. In 1921-22 the deficit was £188,592, and I dare say that the then Treasurer saw what was coming. He said that in case there was to be a reduction in wages during his tenure as Treasurer—it was a good thing for him to say, as they were going to have such an enormous deficit—that they would have to take it out of the wealthy taxpayer. The Treasurer estimates a deficit this year of £576,840. Is that a record of which any Government can be proud?

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: During the debate, statements have been made with respect to the question of unemployment. I think the hon. member for Mitchell said there was a lot of unemployment, and used the parrot cry that a lot of men were coming over from New South Wales because conditions were so excellent here, but that is not correct. We know that the unemployed are coming here from New South Wales because this Government are deliberately encouraging them by first giving them doles and then assisting them to do anything but work.

Mr. BRENNAN: Do you say the men of Queensland are loafers?

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: I cannot understand why it is that when the hon. member for Toowoomba is "doped," he comes into the Chamber. The unemployment which exists is entirely due to the bungling of the present Government, because they have taken out of industries by way of taxation the money which should have been employed in the development of those industries. In 1912, according to reports of trade unions, the unemployed in New South Wales was 5 per cent., in Victoria 6.7 per cent., in Queensland 4.6 per cent., in South Australia 5.1 per cent., in Western Australia 5.8 per cent., and in Tasmania 3.4 per cent. That was before the Dooley Government got into power in New

Mr. J. H. C. Roberts.]

South Wales, and before the present Government came into power in Queensland. In 1920, when the Dooley Government was in power in New South Wales, in the first quarter of the year, there was 5.5 per cent. of unemployment, in the second quarter 5.5 per cent., in the third quarter 5.2 per cent., and in the fourth quarter 6.9 per cent. The Dooley Government had been in power for a short time in 1920. In 1921, we find that the unemployment in New South Wales in the first quarter of the year had increased, as compared with the first quarter of 1920, from 5.5 per cent. to 13.7 per cent. In the second quarter of 1920 it was 5.5 per cent., and this increased in the second quarter of 1921, to 13.5 per cent. In the third quarter of 1920 it was 5.2 per cent., and this increased in the third quarter of 1921 to 12.3

[8 p.m.] per cent. In the fourth quarter of 1920 it was 6.9 per cent., and this increased in the fourth quarter of 1921 to 11.9 per cent. In Queensland in the four quarters of 1920 the figures were 10.5 per cent., 13 per cent., 13.4 per cent., 16.8 per cent., and in the four quarters of 1921 they were increased to 15.5 per cent., 21.8 per cent., 13.5 per cent., and 11.3 per cent.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: What are you quoting from?

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: I am quoting from Knibbs's statistics.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: That is all rot.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: The Minister should not say it is all rot. He is such a good-tempered Minister that I do not like to say anything against him; but the facts are there. The Secretary for Mines is so accustomed to looking at departmental papers, and faking them this way and that, that when he sees facts he says that they are all rot.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is not in order in saying that the Minister fakes the departmental papers, and I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: I withdraw the statement; but I have said it just the same. That is the reason why the Secretary for Mines says these things are rot. When facts are put before him he does not recognise them. In view of the return that has been placed before us dealing with the question of soldiers' settlements by the Secretary for Public Lands, I would like to quote from a speech made by the Premier at Nambour on 12th July, 1916. This is what he said—

“Parliament will be asked to endorse a scheme for permanent homes and comfortable homes for the men that fought for their country. We mean to see that the conditions for marketing the produce of these soldiers' farms are the best possible. The Government will establish either State or co-operative agricultural agencies for the handling of the produce and making provision for transport.”

I have yet failed to find where the assurance given by the Premier at that particular time has eventuated. We were told that he was going to find a market for the products from the soldiers' settlements.

Mr. BRENNAN: So he did.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: What have the Government done to find a market?

Mr. BRENNAN: They established a State cannery. That takes all their pineapples.

[Mr. J. H. C. Roberts.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: The Premier talked about making provision for transport. What provision did he make for transport on the lines laid down in his speech of 1916?

Mr. BRENNAN: It is laid down in the Bill passed by the House this session.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: The hon. member for Toowoomba knows as well as I do that most of the soldier settlers in Queensland are at their wits' end to know how they are going to carry on.

Mr. BRENNAN: Why?

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: Because the laws of the land have been largely modulated by men of the stamp of the hon. member for Toowoomba. Every member of this House knows that the returned soldiers on the different settlements have had to struggle for their existence mainly because the assurance given by the Premier in 1916 in regard to marketing their products and making provision for transport has not taken place. The Premier meant that he would get cheap railway freights; but did he give them cheap railway freights? As a matter of fact, he increased the railway freights from 35 per cent. to 40 per cent. during the last three years. The Premier gave a distinct assurance to the returned soldiers that the Government he was then leading would see that every facility was given to the returned soldier to find a market for his goods and to arrange for transport on cheap lines.

Mr. BRENNAN: The Repatriation Committee are responsible for that. It is a Federal matter.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: It is no use saying the Repatriation Committee are responsible. The Government are absolutely responsible.

Mr. BRENNAN: What did the leader of the Nationalist party say? He said that this Government did more than any Government in Australia.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: The sooner this Government realise their responsibility for it the better for all concerned. Why should the returned soldier be given an assurance of this kind if it is not intended to carry it out? The agriculturists of this State were recently given an assurance by the Premier as to what he intended to do for them; but if he is not going to do more for the agriculturists than he did for the returned soldiers after his promise of 1916, then he is going to do thundering little in regard to the carrying out of this great scheme.

Mr. BRENNAN: What did you do for the farmers before you came here?

Mr. BRAND: He has been working for the farmers all his life.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: During his speech, the hon. member for Mitchell talked about encouraging secondary industries. Every man in this House realises the necessity for building up our secondary industries. We should not only have our own manufacturing centres in Queensland, but we should have them in Australia. But when a member talks about assisting secondary industries, he must also take into consideration the ability of those secondary industries to compete with the markets of the world. I refer the hon. member for Mitchell to a statement recently made in regard to the iron and steel works at Newcastle, where

the Broken Hill Company used to employ 5,000 or 6,000 hands. An endeavour has been made to keep those works open. Everything possible was done to foster the industry; but it was discovered that it was impossible to do so, because the workmen were not giving their best work in regard thereto.

Mr. BRENNAN: That is not true. The Federal Government would not give the protection.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: The hon. member for Toowoomba was never a worker in his life.

Mr. BRENNAN: You are always defaming the worker.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: It is entirely due to the fact of Labour Governments in the past and Labour unions of to-day not insisting upon their members being efficient in regard to their workmanship.

Mr. BRENNAN: No.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: Yes. It is due to the lack of efficiency, and it should be the first plank of every Government and the first tenet of every union that the working man should be efficient. Why is it that one solicitor can earn £7,000 a year and another one can earn, probably, only £500? Because one man has efficiency and brains, and the other man has neither efficiency nor brains.

Mr. BRENNAN: One man employs Chinamen and the other man white men.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: I am not going to say in which category I place the hon. member for Toowoomba. I leave the hon. member to decide that. That is the reason why we advocate efficiency, efficiency, efficiency, and the reason why 5,000 or 6,000 men are out of employment in Newcastle to-day is because we have not the same efficiency here as in America or elsewhere.

Mr. COLLINS: You ought to get six months.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES interjected.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: The Secretary for Mines has just dropped into the place where I wanted him to drop. The report went on to point out that in America 2,250 men were doing the same work in the same day as 5,200 men in Newcastle. Does not that show the impossibility of carrying on industries successfully here unless the hon. member for Mitchell and his friends are prepared to advocate, at all times, that there shall be efficiency among the people of Australia? Without it we are never going to get anywhere.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: You do not know anything about it.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: What is there that we do know anything about? All that the Secretary for Mines knows about agriculture and the other things of which he speaks could be put in the corner of your eye. Let me read what the present Secretary for Agriculture said in 1912, at page 1231 of "Hansard"—

"While I am pleased to note that in the education branch of the service a minimum of £110 has been fixed for adults, I regret very much the Government has not recognised the principle of equal pay for equal work, and have not given to the female public servants a minimum of £110."

And then he goes on to say that he hopes the men and women of Queensland will rise in a

body and put the Government out. If those were the views of the Secretary for Agriculture when just an ordinary member in 1912, why has the position not been rectified during the seven years he has been Minister? The basic wage to-day is £200 for males and £150 for females. He does not insist on equal pay for males and females in that respect; and, in addition, in the automatic increases, there is a difference between the sexes—they still differentiate there.

Mr. PAYNE: What did the previous Government do?

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: I am very glad that the hon. member for Mitchell has asked that question, and I shall have very great pleasure in answering it. If he takes money value to-day and money value in 1911, he will find that after seven years of Labour rule the working man, the school teacher, the public servant, is not one iota better off than before. The hon. member knows as well as I do that on the basis of money value their salaries are no better than in 1911, and though Ministers may cry, "Look at what we have done in increasing salaries," as a matter of fact they have done nothing of the sort. They have simply given to the workers the means to make up for the increased cost of living brought about by the imposition of taxation and super-taxation by our friends on the other side of the House. In 1912, page 1507 of "Hansard," the hon. member for Brisbane said—

"I say that the Secretary for Railways is to be congratulated for what he has done in the direction of raising the wages of the lower paid men in the railway service. I say, as one who has spent a few years in that service, that Queensland can boast of the most efficient body of railway men in Australia."

—He did not say anything about the scheme he evolved—

"and I think the general running of the railways in this State proves that, whether from a revenue point of view or from the point of view of the safety of the travelling public, (Hear, hear!) There have been very few railway accidents in Queensland; and when I read of the accident in Melbourne the other day, I had no hesitation in saying that in Queensland, with the regulations of the department and the strict way in which they are carried out by locomotive men, no such accident could have happened here."

I wonder what the hon. member is going to say to the railway men after seven years of Labour rule, when he realises that they have had a certain amount of their money deducted.

Mr. BRENNAN: There have been no accidents.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: Was not the accident at Murphy's Creek in the time of this Administration?

Mr. BRENNAN: No.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: Of course, it was; and there have been one or two runaways as well. I am not going to argue whether the Queensland railways to-day are as safe as in 1912, but I am going to say that the hon. member for Brisbane, after having in 1912 backed up an Administration to which he was opposed, for having done something for the lower paid men, is going to have some difficulty in explaining the actions of the present Government, of which I understand he

Mr. J. H. C. Roberts.]

is a supporter, in reducing their wages. On that occasion he went on to say—

“ I am glad to know, as an ex-railway man, that the Secretary for Railways has been influential enough to open the close fist of the Treasurer and get a few extra thousand pounds for the Railway Department.”

Evidently, one may imagine, the Treasurer at that time was inclined to be niggardly. Nothing of the sort. It was merely his duty to see that Queensland was so financed as to be able to carry on and show a slight surplus instead of a huge deficit from year to year. I congratulate the hon. member for Brisbane upon the stand he took in congratulating the Government upon increasing the pay of the lower paid servants, and I venture to say that the hon. member will find it a most objectionable task to explain the reductions of the Labour Government, of which he has been a supporter for so many years and in whose behalf he has gone to the people year after year and told them, “ If you put us back we will give you better wages and better conditions of living.”

Mr. RYAN (*Cook*): The hon. member for Pittsworth, who has just resumed his seat, revealed the fact that he is not too particular as to the truth of any assertion that he makes.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: To be called a liar by you is a compliment.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. RYAN: The hon. member has the reputation of having employed Chinamen while, at the same time, he was advocating conscription throughout the Darling Downs. The facts with regard to the Newcastle workers are that when the employers used as an argument in favour of lowering wages the importation of large quantities of iron and steel from overseas, the workers offered to meet the employers at a round table conference, but the employers would not agree unless the workers were prepared to accept £3 10s. in place of £3 18s.—the ruling rate in New South Wales. I will leave other speakers, who paid more attention to them, to reply to any other statements which were made by the hon. member. From the time he started his oration I do not think the hon. member entertained anyone in the House.

It is a remarkable, as well as a very entertaining fact, that every member who has spoken from the other side during this and last week endeavoured to disassociate himself from certain happenings which were disclosed in this House during the early part of last week. I ask any intelligent person who are going to benefit by the actions of certain gentlemen who approached the Premier?

Mr. PETRIE: Not us.

Mr. RYAN: I do not charge the Nationalists. But I am sure that those sitting on the front Opposition benches would be the first to be benefited if, through any cause, the Opposition were to assume control of the Treasury benches.

Mr. MORGAN: We would not associate with the Premier.

Mr. RYAN: It is a certainty that, had it not been for a certain happening being brought to a culmination, the Premier—who was laying a bait to catch certain fish—might have had them in his bag by this time. Those particular gentlemen are fairly lucky; because the Premier has been playing them

with a good line for a long time. I am sure that those who, on the other side, utter disclaimers will be met by the people outside in a different way to that in which their assertions are met in this House. One thing is certain—that the Premier will earn the gratitude of the people outside. It does not matter where you go, this is the topic of conversation right throughout the State.

Mr. FLETCHER: And the Premier does not come too well out of it.

Mr. RYAN: He comes out really well, because the two gentlemen have admitted that they were in his chamber. Hon. members opposite find fault with the Premier because he had a stenographer taking a note of what happened.

Mr. FLETCHER: A secret stenographer.

Mr. RYAN: In the interests of the State, he did the right thing; it was right that he should scotch anything in the nature of that which happened. Any member in this House knows that if he were to go and see the Premier on any business connected with his department a stenographer—and sometimes the reporters of the newspapers—would be present.

Mr. FLETCHER: Not secretly.

Mr. RYAN: It is only a right and proper thing that, on an occasion such as that which the Premier disclosed here, he should have a stenographer to record whatever happens.

Mr. MORGAN: Why did the Premier hide the stenographer away?

Mr. RYAN: I do not know whether he hid him away. These gentlemen went there for certain purposes, and they should protect themselves.

Mr. BRAND: Don't you know that they were asked to go there?

Mr. RYAN: That does not matter. The fact remains that a stenographer was there and reported the proceedings. When the whole thing comes out there will be disclosed much which will not be too palatable to hon. members representing both parties on the other side of the House.

I notice that in the Treasurer's Financial Statement reference is made to the fact that the consumption of sugar is fast overtaking the production; and special reference is made to the fact that a Royal Commission is to be appointed to inquire into and report upon certain facts connected with the sugar industry and the location of any new mills that are to be erected. Representing a far Northern district, I am aware of the fact that that particular portion must be populated; and, knowing that the soil and climate, from a geographical position, are suitable for the growing of sugar-cane, I welcome the fact that this Royal Commission is to be appointed. Some time in 1916 the Government appointed a Commission somewhat on similar lines. The instruction to that Commission was to inquire into and report upon—

- (i.) The position of the industry in Australia with regard to the possibility of over-production;
- (ii.) The wisdom of establishing additional mills; and
- (iii.) In the event of additional mills being recommended, the most suitable localities for same.

I take it that this Royal Commission will be directed on similar lines. It is a remarkable fact that about that time the Com-

[Mr. J. H. C. Roberts.]

menwealth Government—through its Prime Minister—decided that no new mills should be erected in Queensland—which at once stopped any action that the Government intended to take in connection with the establishment of new mills.

Mr. CATERMULL: That was in 1913.

Mr. RYAN: Exactly; before the Government had got a start on the recommendations of this Commission.

Mr. BRAND: Do you say it stopped the building of mills?

The TREASURER: They stipulated that there should be no new mills.

Mr. BRAND: It did not stop the building of them. (Laughter.) You know you could not build a sugar-mill in those years.

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: It was done to limit production.

Mr. RYAN: The particular portion of the State to which I intend to refer is that known as Bailey Creek and the Daintree River, in far North Queensland, 25 miles north of Port Douglas. In the report of this Commission we read—

“The lands comprised within the suggested mill area are fairly level alluvial soils hemmed in by the Alexandra and Thornton ranges, which rise rather abruptly from the flat lands on the coast and on either side of Hutchinson and Cooper Creeks, thereby reducing the land available for sugar-cane cultivation to 5,320 acres—equal to about two-thirds of the proposed mill area. The greater portion of this cane land is scrub. The steeper and mountainous lands are suitable for fruit-growing and grazing purposes. The scrub generally is of small growth, chiefly lawyer vine. The whole area is well watered with freshwater streams, principally by Hutchinson and McLean creeks, which would afford ample supplies for mill and township purposes. The accessible timber suitable for tramway construction is limited, but there is a plentiful supply for fuel and building purposes. Some of the land on the alluvial flats was cleared and cultivated some years ago, but, through neglect, has since become overgrown.

“SCHEDULE.
“Cane Lands.

	Acres.	Acres.
First-class freeholds and lands in course of alienation	...	3,890
First-class vacant Crown lands	...	1,050
		4,860
Second-class freeholds and lands in course of alienation	...	220
Crown lands	...	240
		460
Total cane lands	...	5,320

“Further areas, as under, suitable for canegrowing are to be found on the north bank of the Daintree River, separated by Thornton Range from the Bailey Creek lands—

	Acres.
Freeholds or lands in course of alienation	1,200
Vacant Crown lands	700
	1,900”

The finding of that Commission with regard to this particular land is mentioned in this way—

“Question III.—When the time arrives for still further mill construction, the applications submitted to us should receive consideration in the following order, subject to the provisos to be found in the summary at the end of Part III. of our report:—

- (1) Banyan, Hull, and Tully rivers;
- (2) Bailey Creek;
- (3) Daraji, South Russell, and Babinda;
- (4) Freshwater;
- (5) Long Pocket.”

A mill has been established at Babinda. I believe provision has been made for the establishment of a mill at Tully River and South Johnstone. Bailey's Creek,

[3.30 p.m.] the second on the list, has been left out in the cold. I hope that the new Commission to be appointed will direct its attention to Bailey's Creek and the Daintree lands. Until we populate that particular portion of the State it is certain that we will never be in the position to be able to resist aggression. If this is done it will make for the benefit of Queensland. Much has been said regarding what the Government have done in connection with the production of cotton. It is generally known that in the final analysis, cotton is a tropical production, and the far Northern portion of Queensland is more tropical than any of the other portions. In that far Northern area the soil is of the best; there is good scrub land right throughout, perhaps for a distance of 600 to 700 miles north of the boundary of the sugar districts. The country is well watered by thirty or forty rivers or creeks, running across the peninsula to the eastern and western coasts. I think there is a great opportunity now for the Government to endeavour to populate that portion of the State by encouraging people to go on the land and produce cotton. At the present time the cotton expert is visiting the Coektown district, and he has reported that he knows of no district in the State that will lend itself to the cultivation of cotton as well as that particular district. Anyone who has made a study of cotton production knows that it is essential that the winters should be dry, and that the rain should come at a certain period when the plant has reached a certain stage. There is no doubt that round that particular portion of the State the winter is really a dry one and very seldom does a shower of rain fall in some of those places. That is why that district is so eminently suited for cotton-growing. I hope that the Government will do something to encourage settlement in that far Northern portion of the State, and thereby do something to benefit North Queensland. There are areas also west of Port Douglas right through to the back of Mount Molloy, along the Mitchell as far as the southern portion of the Gulf. I hope that the Department of Agriculture will not overlook the fact that there is an opportunity to populate this area under the cotton-production scheme. Representing as I do an area of 98,000 square miles, in an electorate which embraces nearly every industry in Queensland, as well as one or two that are not operating in any other portion of the State, there are one or two matters in the Financial Statement that I

Mr. Ryan.]

would like to refer to. I will content myself with referring to one or two different industries in an endeavour to show the Government that something should be done in the far North in assisting to populate that area. During the war period many young men who had left for the front and returned—some maimed and wounded—made their homes in Brisbane and other portions of the State. The young men who did settle temporarily in Southern Queensland are now drifting to the North again. I think I can claim that the true type of prospector, both old and young men, are to be found in far North Queensland. They are, as a rule, the true type, because they are men who will do legitimate prospecting work. I notice that in the Financial Statement the sum set aside is equal to the sum set aside last year for prospecting, and now that the meat and cattle industry is under a cloud, because of low values in stock, many young men have drifted from the cattle industry into other industries. They have been travelling about the State from one place to another, and are now making their way back into the mining industry. I would like to see the vote for prospecting increased, and I hope that the Minister, from any source whatever, will endeavour to assist the bonâ fide prospector who will go out into the wilds and endeavour to find something for the betterment of the State. I have nothing to complain concerning the assistance given to prospectors up to the present time, and I am sure that if the Government would assist the men, say, to the extent of half wages, any number of men, instead of going into other industries, especially seasonal industries for wages only, would accept the temporary assistance from the Government and do something for the State which would be, perhaps, more beneficial than if they worked in other industries. In 1918 this Government were chosen by the people to carry on the functions of government in this State. The Government then had a majority of eighteen, and they carried on the functions of government so well that in 1918 they were returned with a two-to-one majority. That is to say forty-eight members representing the Government and twenty-four members representing the Opposition, or a majority of twenty-four. In 1920 the Tory newspapers and hon. members opposite had stamped the people into the belief that the credit of this State was in jeopardy. A delegation was sent to England at the time the Premier was visiting that country with the result that this Government were placed in the position of having to stand with their backs to the wall and show the people of Queensland that Queensland's credit was not in jeopardy. However, the capitalistic class, having a large amount of money at their disposal, prevailed upon the people to the extent that the majority of twenty-four was reduced by ten members.

Mr. MORGAN: Representing a 20,000 minority of the electors.

Mr. RYAN: We have shown the people that the credit of the State has not been lost. This is the only State in Australia which has shown that within the last two or three years exports have exceeded imports. Other States have shown a decrease. The hon. member for Pittsworth, and other hon. members opposite, when referring to unemployment, overlook the fact that Queensland industries are mainly seasonal, and that men migrate from other States in Australia into

Queensland in search of employment. The fact that the Government give a bonâ fide report as to the number of unemployed in the State through the State Labour Bureaux and the Labour Exchanges, which is not done in any of the other States, puts Queensland into an apparently bad light as far as unemployment is concerned. This Government have always said that no man, woman, or child within the State should starve, and I think that will meet with the approval of every person in Queensland. While hon. members opposite are condemning the Government with regard to unemployment, they keep their tongues in their cheek about the fact that no one need starve. If a man is unemployed, and unable to obtain work, he can get relief. I trust that the Premier will bring in an Unemployment Bill, and that, instead of giving men relief rations, they will endeavour to find employment. I trust that the Government will not do what our opponents did when they occupied these benches at one time. They gave the unemployed a couple of days' work in the week at 3s. 6d. a day. Men were very lucky if they could get four days' work a week and earn 14s. a week. They were doing work which was of no benefit to the community. I am satisfied that when the Government again appeal to the country they will come back with a bigger majority than they did in 1920. I am confident that they have the electors behind them. The events which have occurred here within the last week or two have so dismayed our opponents that they are now trying to put a false construction on things, in order to gull the people into the belief that they are the party which should be over here. One could not help but notice the crestfallen appearance of hon. members opposite since last Tuesday. They had the strings pulled and all arrangements made for an election within a few weeks. (Opposition laughter.) But the 6d. had a string on it, and now our friends opposite have to sit back and leave it to this Government to conduct the election. I am satisfied that when the Government go to the country they will come back with a majority, not merely as big as they had in 1920, but a much larger one.

HON. J. G. APPEL (*Albert*): My political training was founded on very different ideals to those which have come into vogue since the Labour party came into office. I have always endeavoured to keep politics pure and unsullied.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. J. G. APPEL: I may say that I loathe and abhor the system which has grown into existence, and which was initiated and suggested by the Premier. Does it not, however, indicate the degradation to which this Parliament and hon. members have fallen, when it can even be suggested that members are susceptible to bribery and corruption, and, according to what fell from the Premier, are apparently prepared to coquette with men who are striving to bribe and corrupt them? Personally, I have always taken up the attitude that I would absolutely refuse to associate with any member, no matter which side of the House he may be on, who, corrupted by money or for the sake of office, is prepared to act as a traitor to and betray his party.

Mr. COLLINS: Come over here.

[*Mr. Ryan.*]

HON. J. G. APPEL: Furthermore, in view of what has been said by the leader of the Government, it is his duty, not alone to himself as the leader of a party, but as the leader of this House, and in view of his position in regard to the electors, to cause a thorough inquiry to be made into the suggestions which he asserts have been made in connection with the bribery and corruption of members.

HON. W. FORGAN SMITH: You do not want that.

HON. J. G. APPEL: It is his duty to appoint an independent commission or tribunal to inquire thoroughly into this matter, and, if any member has been guilty of dishonourable practices, to have such conduct exposed. I challenge the Premier to take that action.

HON. W. FORGAN SMITH: Your friends will be very crestfallen when it is all over.

HON. J. G. APPEL: While I have no desire to say anything personally discourteous to the Premier, I absolutely decline, as a member of the Country party, to follow that hon. gentleman should he be requested to act as leader of any section of our party. (Government interruption.) I regard the Premier as the arch-enemy of the democracy of this State. He has assisted in reducing this State to a condition of disrepute, and he has likewise brought it into financial disaster.

MR. COLLINS: Like you did in 1912, when you gave us the batons.

HON. J. G. APPEL: The hon. member took very good care to be in the rear at that time.

MR. COLLINS: I did not run away. Why did you run away to Southport?

HON. J. G. APPEL: The hon. member at one moment says that I ordered batons, and then in the next breath says that I retreated to Southport. It is the invariable practice of hon. members opposite to talk about corruption, and draw it like a red herring across the path. Is it not singular that, on a former occasion, a private letter was purloined or abstracted from the private office of the late hon. member for Toowong?

MR. COLLINS: "Dear Mr. Macartney!"

HON. J. G. APPEL: Is it not a fact that the receiver of a stolen article is equally guilty with the thief?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. J. G. APPEL: Yet that private letter was made use of by the party opposite. They strove to make capital out of it, just as they are striving to make capital out of this particular incident.

At 3.40 p.m.,

MR. F. A. COOPER, a member of the panel of Temporary Chairmen, relieved the Chairman in the chair.

HON. J. G. APPEL: It is the duty of the Premier, if he bonâ fide believes that such efforts have been made, to appoint an independent commission to inquire into the matter, so that those who are or have been guilty of attempting to corrupt hon. members of this House should be exposed and receive the punishment which they deserve.

MR. FLETCHER: The eavesdropping will be exposed, too.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: The court will deal with it.

MR. FLETCHER: The court will not deal with the eavesdropping.

HON. J. G. APPEL: The leader of the Government of late has assumed that method known as the Bombaster-Farjoso style. (Opposition laughter.)

MR. COLLINS: The hon. member is a good exponent of that.

HON. J. G. APPEL: The Premier objects to the slightest criticism of any of his actions. He endeavours by roaring out personalities frequently to his opponents to becloud the whole issue. The Premier accuses a member of this House of discourtesy to him because that hon. member did not write directly to him, but communicated with an officer of his department instead. What is the position of a member of this House who desires to obtain certain information, and who, after writing a courteous letter to the Premier, does not receive even an acknowledgment of the letter? I, on my part, accuse the Premier of gross discourtesy to a member of this House, and that is myself. On the 28th July, 1922, I wrote the following letter to the Premier:—

"28th July, 1922.

"My Dear Premier.—

"For the last revision of justices of the peace I submitted the names of three electors of the Albert for appointment. I understand that this is the number conceded to each member.

"Two of the electors were nominated by the Mayor of Coolangatta, viz., Thomas Callan Saunders, Robert Johnston, and the third, Abraham Turner, of Southport, by a brother member of the Assembly.

"Being personally satisfied as to their qualifications, I recommend them for appointment.

"One of the electors was rejected, viz., Alderman Robert Johnston, of Coolangatta. This elector had occupied the position of mayor of his town, and at the recent municipal election was returned as alderman. He is a well-known and reputable man, and bears a high character amongst his fellows.

"I can only conceive that his name was overlooked and that I only need to mention the matter to you to have this matter rectified.

"I regret to have to trouble you, but I will, of course, have to advise the elector if the omission to appoint was owing to some reason of unfitness or otherwise.

"Believe me,

"Yours faithfully,

"(Sgd.) J. GEO. APPEL."

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES: Don't you know the practice of the department?

HON. J. G. APPEL: The practice of the department is that every member of this House can nominate three persons to be appointed as magistrates. I nominated three electors for the positions. I wrote a courteous letter to the Premier, who accused the hon. member for Bulimba of discourtesy in so far as that hon. member did not write to him directly. I wrote to the Premier directly, and he has not even had the courtesy to acknowledge my letter, much less reply to it. The late Hon. T. J. Ryan always treated me with the same courtesy which I considered it my duty to extend to him. The same thing took place in connection with our present Agent-General when he acted as Premier. It remained for the present Premier to be guilty of what I

Hon. J. G. Appel.]

consider a gross act of discourtesy to a member of this House, who approached him, I venture to say, in as courteous a manner as it was possible to do. The Premier and members sitting on the other side of the House appear to resent criticism. When the finances of the State are criticised by members sitting in Opposition, or when the actions of the Government are criticised, they immediately raise the cry, "You are decrying your own State." They also say, "You are doing all you can to bring your State into disrepute." I have carefully gone into this matter, and I propose to quote my conclusions upon that matter verbatim. They are as follows:—

"The Premier and his party have charged the Opposition with decrying their State. Such accusations are unfounded and unjust, and carry no weight amongst the people, who realise that no community ever suffered half so much damage from knowing its real condition as from living in a fool's paradise of imaginary wealth. The resources of Queensland are magnificent—its means of prosperity almost boundless. It is the biggest State, if account is taken only of the land with an average rainfall of 15 inches per year or more. Of this sort of soil it has 491,999 square miles, while the next largest State, Western Australia, has only 229,452 square miles, which is less than half. In fact, Queensland has as much well-watered country as all the other States put together. It is compact and easily reached by railroads, whereas Western Australia has a large proportion of desert in between its good country. It is the supreme sugar and cattle State, and possesses all the possibilities of Australia in the direction of cotton and other tropical produce. It has more Crown land bringing in rental than any other State—more than the combined States of New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, and Tasmania; and although it only represents about 16 per cent. of the area of the Commonwealth, it owns 40 per cent. of the forests. It is the queen State of Australia—the land of blessings—therefore there is so much the greater necessity for inquiring why the employment of so great possessions has produced depression, debt, and difficulty.

"The financial condition of a country is an index to the character of its Government."

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. J. G. APPEL: These are the conclusions which I drew of the present conditions and the absolute necessity for criticism, considering the trust which has been handed to us, in respect of the advancement and prosperity of a State so richly endowed by nature. Hon. members sitting on the Government benches object to our criticism in connection with the obtaining of loans from the United States. It seems only but yesterday that those self-same members cried out about the villainies of the men whom they called the capitalists and plutocrats of the United States; the men who drew their wealth from the stress and toil and the blood of the men from whom they extracted it.

MR. COLLIER: The capitalists are the same the world over.

HON. J. G. APPEL: To-day they bless the same capitalists, who have advanced them that money which, owing to their policy of repudiation and their other actions, they

[Hon. J. G. Appl.]

were unable to obtain in Great Britain. As has been pointed out, they are consistent only in their inconsistency. We have always to

realise that the domination of the [9 p.m.] party at present occupying the Treasury benches comes from the Trades Hall, for the executive has passed a resolution, which has been carried out, that every alteration in any Act of administration and any proposed legislation shall be submitted to and approved by that organisation before it is carried out or submitted to this House; and it is just as well that the electors of the State should know the exact position, and that the principal evidence of that condition of affairs appeared in the columns of that paper whose policy was suggestively described by the leader of the Nationalist party, and which represents the opinions and the doings of the Labour Socialist party.

MR. W. COOPER: The "Producers' Review"?

HON. J. G. APPEL: I am afraid I am not acquainted with the paper to which the hon. member refers, but, apparently, it is the paper to which members on that side of the House devote a very considerable amount of attention. I have listened with very considerable attention to members on the Government benches, and not one have I heard really commend the Financial Statement which we are now discussing and criticising. Practically every member who has spoken has simply given voice to some parochial wants. Not once has an hon. member dealt with the anticipated deficit of nearly £600,000. None of them has given any time to the apparent want of businesslike aptitude of the Administration who, from year to year, have increased their deficits until now they are apparently absolutely proud of them and view them as a matter for congratulation and something which should commend them to the electors of the State.

Unemployment has been referred to during the debate, and I notice a cartoon which appeared in the Sydney "Bulletin" of 3rd August which is really very suggestive. I think it practically covers the whole position. It represents the interior of a café, "Queensland Café, Golden Brisket Always on." Waiter Theodore asks, "What can I get you, sir?" and the diner replies, "Employment," and waiter Theodore replies, "Sorry; employment is off." There is the whole position—employment is off. Here we find again the position as it is seen by others—I am quoting again from the Sydney "Bulletin," this time of 10th August—

"It was revealed at the close of Banaraland's last financial year that the Theodore Government spent £174,000 in relief and charitable doles in 1921-22. This means nearly £500 a day for a country with a population of 750,000 souls, and would suffice to give 1,115 unemployed a steady job at the rate of £5 a week the year through. Under the Morgan-Kidston régime about £5,000 per annum used to suffice for this purpose. Under Denham £2,000 or £3,000 was ample. But the edger's millennium has arrived since then, and is, apparently, here to stay as long as Theodore."

The whole position speaks for itself. It is not a question altogether of the number of unemployed who have been reduced to that condition by what the Premier cheerfully

and playfully calls deflation, but unemployment which exists throughout the length and breadth of the State, and has been caused by the present Administration placing an excessive burden of taxation on the taxpayers, the taking of money from those legitimate trade avenues in which it should have been invested, whereby trade has been restricted and men have been cast upon the labour market, and are, therefore, unable to obtain that work which they have a right to receive. Does it not strike you as a very extraordinary thing that the present Administration apparently encourage that policy under which a man has not the right to work unless he is prepared to be taxed? Is it not an extraordinary thing that in the State of Queensland, this democratic State of Queensland, a man is not free to obtain work till he has paid his dues to a body of men who never disclose by a balance-sheet or otherwise how the money extracted from the unfortunate unemployed is expended? Is not that an extraordinary thing?

Mr. COLLINS: You know all about the balance-sheets.

HON. J. G. APPEL: Where are the balance-sheets? The hon. member knows that no balance-sheets are ever published.

Mr. COLLINS: That is not correct.

HON. J. G. APPEL: The balance-sheet showing how that £2 is spent, which is extracted from every man who desires to get work on a Government job, is never published. We know the position of the hon. member. He is a very weak joint in the dog's tail; he has to do exactly as he is told; he has no mind of his own, but is there simply for the purpose of using certain clap-trap expressions. To my mind, too much attention has been paid to the hon. member. It is an extraordinary fact, with which the public should be made acquainted, that a man is refused the right to work in a Government job until he has paid the sum of £2 to the Australian Workers' Union.

Mr. COLLINS: That is not true.

HON. J. G. APPEL: The hon. member who states that that is not true is guilty of a terminological inexactitude. Not alone do the Government insist upon it; but these unfortunate men, who are in debt, have to give an order upon the first wages which they earn, and that money is collected by the present Administration and handed over to this body. It is just as well that the electors should be made acquainted with the fact that the unfortunate toilers are quadruply poll-taxed, not by the Government—because that money would have to be expended, legitimately or illegitimately—but by a body of men who never disclose where those funds go. These funds are used for the purpose of feeding a number of agitators and others and enabling them to live in luxury.

Mr. BRIDGEMAN: Every year a balance-sheet is published.

HON. J. G. APPEL: We hear hon. members opposite repeating the parrot-ery that it is only the wealthy who are taxed. What is wealth? It seems to me that a number of hon. members sitting on the opposite side think that wealth is comprised in bags of sovereigns or bundles of bank notes which are carefully locked away in the individual's safe or cupboard. They fail to realize that the wealth of Queensland is the money which is invested in its different enterprises, whether primary or secondary; and that, if

that wealth is once disturbed, if it is encroached upon, the effect will be to limit employment. How many individuals are there who may be said to possess wealth without employing the funds from which that wealth is produced?

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Quite a number.

HON. J. G. APPEL: I have never come across one.

Mr. WEIR interjected.

HON. J. G. APPEL: I work more than the hon. member. He is one of those go-slowers. You have only to look at him to judge what kind of work he does—work which is not for the benefit of the State or its people.

In connection with our State enterprises, I have pointed out on different occasions that a State should not conduct business enterprises, its function being to administer and govern, and I have been fortified by the opinion of the foremost political economists. However, we are blessed—or cursed—with what we know as State enterprises. We have State meat shops—

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. J. G. APPEL: We have State fish shops.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. J. G. APPEL: We have State cattle stations.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. J. G. APPEL: We have State grog shops.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear! (Laughter.)

HON. J. G. APPEL: We have State gambling saloons, we have State lawyers, we have State sawmills. In fact, we have everything except that which we most require—good, sound, prudent, honest government. It has been suggested that a new branch of industry has been initiated—State medical men. (Laughter.) What do we find in connection with these State enterprises? One of the first effects is that the competition of the State, with all the resources of the State at its back, is driving out of trade the small trader. The inevitable result is, the aggregation of larger establishments, the creation of trusts, monopolies, and combines. We find that previously in those businesses in which the State now engages, there were a number of small retailers and traders. To-day these men have been put out of business, and the men whom they employed are walking about in the ranks of the unemployed. The larger and wealthier establishments are increasing their businesses at the cost of the smaller trader, who, above all others, should receive the protection and encouragement of the State. Another evil in connection with this matter is that we are closing up the avenues whereby men are enabled, by thrift, to improve themselves until they reach the position of becoming employees and adding to the material prosperity and advancement of our State. Is this the policy which should be encouraged? Yet that is the policy which has been encouraged, which has been fostered by the present Administration and their followers, who claim to be the champions of the smaller and weaker members of the community. They talk of members on this side representing the wealthier industrial concerns; yet, by their actions and their policy, they are increasing the prosperity and scope of the wealthier and more prosperous concerns.

Hon. J. G. Appel.]

As I have already indicated, by closing these small concerns, a large number of men are deprived of the means of obtaining a livelihood. The whole policy of the present Administration appears to be the creation of additional departments and the appointment of additional highly paid officers and the appointment of an army of inspectors and officials, who are sent out to worry and harass the unfortunate selectors; and verily, the methods which are now adopted for the purpose of gaining money to be placed in the Treasury are marvellous. The Government are now searching the hedges and ditches for every sixpence to add to the funds which they are endeavouring to collect for the Treasury. It was brought under my notice to-day that, in the district which I represent, it has been the established custom for years for a police officer to come round and collect stock returns from the different dairy farmers in that district. This year that officer failed to come. The dairymen awaited his coming, but instead of an officer coming they received a summons and were haled to the court and were fined for their failure to furnish the return. I quite admit that it was a breach of the law, but for years this police officer had come round to collect the returns. No doubt the officer received his instructions not to call for the returns, and now the departments are receiving additional funds for the Treasury in the way of fines imposed on those unfortunate dairymen.

HON. W. FORGAN SMITH: There was an official notification sent out which apparently the electors represented by the hon. member disregarded.

HON. J. G. APPEL: If the hon. gentleman knew a little more about country life he would realise that dairymen live at different distances and in different localities, with an indifferent postal service, and very seldom have they the time or the leisure to read papers and they fail to see the notice. It seems an unfortunate thing that a Government, professing to do so much for the dairymen and the primary producers, are not doing so, but in their anxiety to get a few shillings for the Treasury to reduce their huge deficit, are haling small dairy men to the court and fining them for the purpose of replenishing the Treasury which the Government have done so much by their inefficiency to deplete. It is just as well to see how matters are regarded by people outside. I have an excerpt from the "Sydney Morning Herald," of 8th August, dealing with State enterprises. If it is not of interest to hon. members opposite, I have not the slightest doubt that it will interest the electors of Queensland, who are very much concerned and perturbed at the present state of affairs. The excerpt states—

"These State enterprises have had a three-fold baneful effect. They have lost an appalling amount of money. The Queensland Government railways, although they do not come within the usual acceptation of State enterprises as Australia understands them, showed a deficit of £1,739,475 on 30th June of last year. Again, Queensland's State enterprises have left the door open to place-hunting, until the country appears to be overrun with inspectors and officials of all sorts. There has been also a tendency to placate one class in the community at the expense of others. The result is inevitable—a feeling that to clean up

the mess is an almost hopeless task. Dame Partington, finding the tide coming up to her doorstep, tried furiously, but in vain, to sweep it back. That appears to be the feeling, even if Labour is cast into oblivion, among those who may be saddled with its legacy of disorganised finance and doctrinaire theories, without regard for actual conditions, which find expression on all hands."

MR. BRENNAN: A Tory journal wrote that.

HON. J. G. APPEL: If Toryism is a symbolism of honour and honourable dealing, I am quite willing to be called a Tory.

MR. PEASE: But it is not.

HON. J. G. APPEL: In dealing with our railways we urge that they should be removed from political control. This matter has been discussed and particularised already, and it is unnecessary for me to go into full details. Hon. members in opposition have always urged, and it is one of the planks of our platform, that the railways should be removed from political control.

MR. BRENNAN: Platform?

HON. J. G. APPEL: Yes. Not the hon. member's 5-cwt. silos. If the railways were removed from political control I have no hesitation in saying that matters would considerably alter for the better and would eventually right themselves. If the Commissioner for Railways were in control of the whole business of that great utility, no member of the community would complain if it was necessary that there should be an increase in railway fares and freights so long as that increase affected every member of the community and not, as in the past, when the primary producers were the sole members who were singled out and affected by an increase in fares and freights, whereas those who dwell in the cities and were supposed to be supporters of the Labour Government escaped any increase in that regard. It is all very well for the present Government to try and placate the farmers when they are at their last gasp, and are in the position of a gambler having his last throw. It is all very well for the Government to say, "We are prepared to do this; let bygones be bygones." In common with other hon. members on this side, we desire to know what are the facts in connection with the grave burdens that have been imposed on the primary producers of the State. Why is it necessary to urge upon the part of a Labour Government, "Let bygones be bygones"? Any sane or intelligent person knows that that simply means admitting the injustice which has been done to the primary producers, and now the Government are attempting to gain their votes by means of certain suggested concessions. If the primary producers of the State are prepared to accept the assurances of the present Government, and they have no knowledge of the administration or of hon. members sitting behind the Government, then it is our duty to make them acquainted with those matters. But if they accept [9.30 p.m.] that assurance they will receive that which they do not expect and deserve all that they will get. We find that it is possible to realise more accurately from outside what is going on inside the House. The "Sydney Morning Herald" on 8th August instant, in a leading article, says—

"Holding on to office figuratively by the

[Hon. J. G. Appel.

'skin of its teeth,' judging from appearances, the Government is now out to buy the producer's vote. That it is largely a sham, and a vote-catching business can easily be seen. For the man on the land, working from daylight until dark, and getting for his labour less in a year than some of the more-favoured workers obtain in a month or two, there is not apparently much hope while the spoil industrialists, who the Government represents, have a strangle-hold upon the community and upon the producer, weighed down with harassing restrictions and obligations. While, under present conditions, the producers cannot afford to employ labour, or can employ only sufficient labour to keep their businesses going, thousands of men are wandering about the country in search of employment, and being passed on from town to town with ration orders. And yet the Government is pretending to have a deep and abiding interest in the man on the land. It is a hollow sham, a subterfuge to catch votes, and to keep Labour in office, and makes one highly suspicious of the wonderful things the Premier is going to do for the producer, with an eye to the general election."

That is how it appears to those who are outside the House, and we who are inside the House know how absolutely correct that view is. We hear the protestations in the House by hon. members opposite, and then find that only lately a no-confidence motion was levelled against the Nationalist party in the Federal House of Representatives by the leader of the Labour party in these terms—

Mr. BRENNAN: Supported by the Country party.

HON. J. G. APPEL: The leader of the Labour party said—

"I wish to give notice to move that the Government be severely censured for referring its sugar transactions to the Public Accounts Committee before disposing of the amendments moved by the members for Swan and Bourke, thereby delaying a decision on the question of immediately reducing the price of sugar."

What a parody! On the one hand, the Labour party in the Legislative Assembly of Queensland are endeavouring to placate the primary producer by promises which, I venture to say, they never intend to observe. Do not the Labour party here and the Labour party in the Commonwealth Parliament work together? There is absolute co-ordination between them. Yet, in a Southern capital, where cheap sugar is the cry, the leader of the Labour party there is quite prepared to penalise the sugar-growers of Queensland by reducing the price of sugar. The sugar industry will enable us to preserve a white Australia. But when it suits the Labour party, and their supporters in the South who desire cheap sugar, notwithstanding the white Australia policy, the interests of the primary producers in Queensland are to be placed on one side. Is further comment or criticism necessary? There has been a significant silence on the Treasury benches while I have given that information, which will go forth to the electors of the State.

HON. W. FORGAN SMITH: You misrepresent the whole position.

HON. J. G. APPEL: I have simply quoted the notice of motion given by the leader of the Labour party in the House of Representa-

tatives. When there is anything which hon. members opposite cannot refute, they immediately say, "You are misquoting the matter." I am not misquoting. I have simply given the actual notice of motion given in the House of Representatives by the leader of the Labour party. The motion is aimed at the sugar industry of Queensland, and will not give any assistance to it. That industry is the only means by which we can maintain the policy of a white Australia in Northern Queensland. I leave that matter for the electors of the State.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. J. G. APPEL: We all know about that wonderful pamphlet upon finance and household economy which was published by the Labour party, and the authors of which were the present Premier, our present Agent-General, and the Home Secretary. They termed the borrowing which had taken place "The Great Loan Tragedy."

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. J. G. APPEL: I want the electors to realise that, allowing that the tragedy was a great one, and that we had in fifty-five years built up a debt of £52,000,000, there was included in that amount the cost of construction of the greatest mileage of railways which any State possessed. The great harbour works in Queensland were built out of that debt, and all the public buildings in the State as well. If we call that a tragedy, what do we call what has happened since 1914-15? The debt since that time has been increased by £33,000,000, or by more than half. What is there to show for it? "Wildcat" State enterprises; State stations which have been purchased, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Port Curtis, who has a knowledge of these matters, at a greater price than they were worth, and which are admitted to-day to be less than one-half the amount in value that they were at the time of purchase. The Government have indulged in "wildcat" schemes, but they have no great public works to show; they have no great river works to show; they have not got hundreds of miles of railways to show.

Mr. COLLINS: Yes, they have.

HON. J. G. APPEL: You completed a few miles of railway here and there which were arranged for by the previous Administration. If it was a tragedy to expend that much money in fifty-five years by creating great public works, what would you call it when the Government increased the indebtedness of the State by £33,000,000 in six and a-half years?

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN indicated that the time allowed the hon. member under the Standing Orders had expired.

Mr. FOLEY (*Leichhardt*): I rise to take up a different attitude to hon. members opposite, who, right throughout the debate, have seen fit, not only to decry the State, but also to attempt to belittle the Treasurer in his Financial Statement, and also to belittle the Government. I am going to take up the attitude of congratulating the Treasurer upon the satisfactory Financial Statement that he has presented to this House.

Mr. VOWLES: With an estimated deficit of over £500,000.

Mr. FOLEY: I consider the Financial Statement is a satisfactory one, despite the fact that the revenue per head of population for the last financial year showed a

Mr. Foley.]

decrease of £1 1s. 6d. per head. Right throughout the debate members opposite, including the leader of the Opposition and the leader of the Nationalist party, sought to avoid the Financial Statement altogether. They indulged in a kind of propaganda to fill "Hansard" and send out masses of misrepresentation to the people in different parts of the State. They also have their views published in the daily Press of the following morning. But no attempt has been made to analyse the Financial Statement. The deficit for last financial year was £188,592, and that was mentioned by the leader of the Opposition and the leader of the Nationalist party. Condemnation has been the order of the day although, when the Treasurer presented his Financial Statement last year he estimated a deficit of £465,038. No attempt has been made in this debate to give credit to the Government for the economies that have been effected, which resulted in reducing the deficit from nearly £500,000 down to £188,000. I am going to show where the Government effected economies amounting to £235,707. Interest on the public debt amounting to £13,904 was saved in one transaction. The Chief Secretary's Department showed a saving of £2,403, and had it not been for the subscription of £10,000 to the Suffering Children Fund, that saving would have read £12,403. The Department of Public Works saved £15,000, and in the Justice Department there was a saving of £10,000. There was also a saving of £19,655 in the Department of Public Lands, and a saving of £45,440 in the Treasury. The Department of Agriculture showed a saving of £7,183, while the Department of Public Instruction effected economies to the extent of £8,250.

Mr. EDWARDS: The schools in the country are neglected.

Mr. FOLEY: It will be shown that the schools in the country have not been neglected when we get the report of the Secretary for Public Instruction. It is well known that all Governments have to allow for unforeseen expenditure, and, as the Treasurer has announced, there has been unforeseen expenditure to the extent of £78,817. That has left a total saving of £235,757, of which no notice has been taken by members of the Opposition side. The Treasurer puts the whole position very concisely when he says, on page 5—

"The results of the Government's endeavours are reflected in the reduced expenditure of the various departments, and had it not been for the cessation of mining activities at Mount Morgan and in the Cloncurry district, and the depression in the cattle industry, it is highly probable that the increased revenue which would have been earned by the railways would have enabled us to balance our accounts for the year."

There is the matter put very plainly, though every hon. member opposite has avoided that particular point. They talk about reckless expenditure, but they say nothing about the economies which have been effected. We have no apologies to offer as to why the Government had a deficit last year. We have no apologies to offer for the deficits of this Government since they have come into office. I may mention that this is the first financial year that the Government have shown a deficit since they ousted the Tory control from the Legislative Council, which used to be practically controlled and dominated all

our financial Bills for the first four years of the existence of this Government. In the first four years we showed deficits, but in the two following years, when we had control of the Legislative Council and our finances, we showed surpluses. That was the first time we were really in power as a Labour Government, and we showed surpluses on each occasion. As the Treasurer pointed out, if it were not for the falling off in revenue from the cattle and mining industries, we would have balanced our accounts and shown a surplus for the last financial year. I would like to touch on the Federal Treasurer's Statement made on the 20th October, 1921, where he quoted an official return showing the comparative increase in expenditure from revenue in the different States for the year 1921 as compared with the year 1917-18.

He showed that Queensland's finances are in a most favourable position in comparison with those of other States. The increases in expenditure for that term work out as follow:—

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

So that the point of reckless expenditure is groundless. Queensland stands in a more favourable position than several of the other States in so far as she is third last on the list, and for sound finance beats New South Wales, Tasmania, and Victoria.

I have been reading lately a work dealing with the finances of the world, and I find that the budgets of practically every country of the world, which were presented at the Brussels financial conference about two years ago, show deficits, except those of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Peru, India, and the United States of America. The proportion of expenditure not met by revenue ranged from 1 per cent, in the case of the Argentine to 79 per cent, in the case of Poland.

Figures have been cited on the other side, comparing the expenditure of the State when this Government came into power with the expenditure at the present time. I think it worked out at about £6,500,000 in 1912, and at about £12,500,000 to-day, but when you take into consideration the fact that money values have been inflated considerably during the last few years, so that £1 12s. is worth only what £1 was worth in 1912, you find that an expenditure of £12,500,000 represents an expenditure of only £7,800,000 reckoned in 1912 money values, so that from that aspect this Government have nothing for which to apologise. One of the reasons for the increased expenditure is this inflation of money value, and the next is the expansion of the State generally, which takes place from time to time, and the consequent gradual increase in the cost of administration. Mention was made by the leader of the Opposition of the surpluses of previous Governments, but no mention was made of the financial years in which this Government have shown surpluses nor of the deficits of previous Governments. The deficits of anti-Labour States in the Commonwealth since 1915 amount to well over £9,000,000, and since the inception of her contribution in Queensland there have been thirty-one deficits and thirty-two surpluses, and twenty-seven of those deficits occurred under Tory Administrations. Whilst we have been in power we have shown a comparatively

[Mr. Foley.

small deficit when one puts it side by side with those incurred by previous Governments, particularly when one takes into consideration the comparatively better times which prevailed when those Governments were in power.

If there is one thing more than another of which this Government can boast, it is that they have the most equitable system of taxation in Australia; and I am going to prove that statement as I go along. Our exemption is fair and our graduated system of tax hits those in receipt of large incomes, who therefore are best in a position to pay. Less is extracted from the small income earners than in any of the other States, except New South Wales. To give an idea as to how our tax affects the small income earners, I have made an extract from the last report of the Commissioner, and I find that 10,000 persons classed under the head of employees contribute 5.64 per cent. of the total tax, bulking the tax of individuals and companies; cane farmers, whom hon. members opposite claim to represent, contribute .94 per cent.; dairy farmers, .23 per cent.; mixed farmers, .33 per cent.; fruit farmers, .07 per cent.; public servants, numbering 5,098, .93 per cent.; and Commonwealth servants, .13 per cent.; making a total of 8.32 per cent.—which is relatively small. Yet we find hon. members opposite condemning this Government for excessive taxation of the agricultural industries, although the 20,000 to 25,000 farmers in the State do not contribute 3 per cent. of the tax collected.

Mr. MOORE: Very few have any income.

Mr. FOLEY: Whose battles are they fighting when they charge us with imposing excessive taxation and say that when they get on this side of the House they are going to reduce it considerably?

At 10 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

Mr. FOLEY: On whom are they going to reduce it? The 2,457 pastoralists and pastoral companies of the State contribute 36.15 per cent. of the total taxation. Manufacturers, wholesale, and manufacturing companies contribute 7.66 per cent. of the taxation collected. That shows conclusively that our taxation does not hit those individuals who can ill-afford to pay, but hits individuals such as the pastoralists, whose taxable incomes during the period we have been in office have increased from £3,000,000 to approximately £7,000,000. Those are the people from whom we derive this enormous amount of tax of which hon. members opposite are always complaining. Despite the fact that hon. members opposite are continually claiming that this State is going to ruin under a Labour Administration, the Commissioner's report discloses that in the year 1920-21 the number of taxpayers increased by 1,610. What can be inferred from that? It means that the State has developed under Labour rule to such an extent that 1,610 persons paid income tax who previously did not pay it.

Reverting to the taxation of other States: Whereas Queensland extracts only 8.32 per cent. of the total tax from her employees, cane, dairy, fruit, and mixed farmers. What must be the position in the other States under the administration of anti-Labour forces, such as those sitting on the opposite side, when you consider that a man in receipt of an income of £3 10s. per week has to pay 16s. 8d. in South Australia, £1 17s. 9d.

in Western Australia, and £1 19s. in Tasmania, while he pays nothing in Queensland and New South Wales? Take an income of £200 per annum. A man in receipt of that income in Queensland does not pay any tax. It is the same in New South Wales; but in South Australia he pays £1 6s. in West Australia £2 3s. 4d., and in Tasmania £2 16s. 8d. A man in receipt of £208 a year pays only 5s. a year under the taxation laws of Queensland. He does not pay anything in New South Wales. He pays £1 10s. in South Australia, £2 5s. in Western Australia, £3 10s. in Tasmania, and 14s. 6d. in Victoria—which is always held up as an example to this Chamber. The point I am trying to make is that, whereas we extract our income tax from those who are best able to pay it, on the figures I have quoted, the anti-Labour States extract the bulk of their taxation from the lower-paid individuals in their States so that they can lighten the burden upon the manufacturing companies and the landlords who are drawing unearned increments. A married man in receipt of £225 per annum in Victoria pays 18s. 9d., Queensland nothing, South Australia £1 19s. 9d., Western Australia £2 11s. 7d., and Tasmania £3 7s. 10d. If he has three children he pays no taxation in New South Wales, Queensland, Western Australia; but in Victoria, the most prosperous State, according to hon. members opposite, he would pay 18s. 9d., in South Australia 15s. 7d., and Tasmania £2 9s. 7d. A person in receipt of £1,000 in Queensland pays £60, and in Victoria he gets off with the paltry sum of £18 5s., in Tasmania £31, South Australia £39, Western Australia £35 per annum. The figures I have quoted show that those in receipt of £1,000 per annum and upwards in the States governed by anti-Labour forces get off practically "scot free" and the burdens are imposed on the smaller income-earners of those States. Hon. members opposite have stated that if taxation upon the higher incomes was reduced industry would revive and unemployment would be relieved. I would point out that the capitalist in Victoria, Western Australia, and other anti-Labour States, pay considerably less in income tax than is paid in Queensland, yet we find the unemployment problem is just as severe in those States. Suppose income taxation was reduced 10 per cent. and 20 per cent. for those receiving the high incomes. How far would that go towards revival of industry and the employment of workers? How much raw material could be purchased and dealt with, so that the finished article could be produced? The argument, to my mind, is ridiculous. The only thing which is going to revive industry in Queensland and other States is not reduced taxation, not reduced wages, and not increased hours, but organisation to procure markets and to bring fair and stable prices for our products. A cattle man, talking to me recently on the wages question, said, in answer to my question as to how the reduction was going to benefit him, "It is no benefit to me. What I want, Foley, is high values, not low wages." The fact that his employees' wages had been reduced 10s. or 12s. a week did not assist him to any considerable extent. The same thing applies to other industries throughout Australia.

Mr. FLEWHER: The gem industry.

Mr. FOLEY: The gem industry will right itself when there is a demand for gems, the same as any other industry. With a little organisation, I think we can do more for the

Mr. Foley.]

gem industry than we are doing at the present time. The Premier is far-sighted enough to recognise that organisation is the most important factor in connection with the revival of our industries. He placed a scheme before hon. members on this side which was unanimously adopted, with the result that the Primary Producers' Organisation Bill was introduced into this Chamber to enable primary producers to organise to obtain a stable price for the articles they produce. The hon. member for Murilla stated that if employees were worked forty-eight hours a week in preference to the hours worked at the present time, it would go a good deal towards enabling this State to compete with other States in the Commonwealth. I would like to quote what Mr. Stirling Taylor, Director of the Bureau of Commerce and Industry, has to say. This man has to be conversant with conditions existing in practically every country in the world so that he can give advice to oversea inquiries as to the conditions of Australia when compared with other countries of the world. He states—

"The people of no other country are as lightly taxed or permitted to enjoy so large a proportion of the fruits of their industry."

That particularly applies to Queensland, as I have pointed out in the figures quoted with regard to other States—

"It is true that labour costs in the Commonwealth have increased somewhat during the war; but labour costs in other countries increased at a far greater rate comparatively. The Australian worker is more profitable to the employer than the workers of any other part of the world."

He winds up by saying that the wealth of raw material is produced in remarkable abundance almost at the factory door in Australia, and this enables the manufacturer in Australia to avoid the expensive rates which external competitors, who are obliged to transport their requirements in some cases half round the globe, have to bear. Mr. Stirling Taylor's remarks with regard to raw material being at the factory door particularly applies to Queensland, if it applies to any part of Australia. As I have pointed out, taxation and rates of wages in Queensland are not crippling industries, which can be seen if one refers to the returns, which show that Queensland last year was the only State which increased her exports—namely, by £769,752—compared with a decrease of £4,022,000 in Western Australia, a decrease of £8,200,000 in Victoria, a decrease of £2,730,000 in South Australia, and a decrease of £2,400,000 in New South Wales. That gives the lie to the Opposition when they claim that taxation is crippling industry in Queensland. I have also taken this clipping, which Mr. Stirling Taylor uses in his reply to oversea inquiries. An evidence of increased prosperity in Australia is shown by the bills, cheques, etc., passed through the Australian clearing house from 1914 to 1920. In Brisbane £84,925,000 passed through the clearing house in 1914; and in 1920, despite the fact that hon. members opposite claim that we are sending the State to ruin, we find that the amount has increased to £150,539,000. It is only natural that the capitalists should squeal and howl and try to get their taxation removed.

Mr. J. JONES: What about the small man?

[Mr. Foley.]

Mr. FOLEY: The small man is not affected. Were our capitalists in England, or any other European country, they would be much worse off than they are in Queensland to-day. This quotation is taken from last Sunday's "Sun"—

"Owing to the pressure of increased rates and taxes, the Duke of Richmond and Gordon has announced that he intends to sell the entire famous Huntley estate, comprising 60,000 acres in Aberdeenshire. The Duke says that from his property, in many cases, all that comes to him out of a pound rental is two shillings, with which he must meet the cost of upkeep and build new houses."

We have not arrived at this position in Australia to-day, and hon. members opposite, who are continually fighting on behalf of this class in Australia, should thank their lucky stars that they are not trying to fight their battle in the House of Commons.

Another thing which has been stressed to-night is our excessive borrowing. I would refer hon. members to the Premier's remarks on page 9 of the Financial Statement—

"The Loan Expenditure during the year totalled £2,599,573 as against £4,251,248 for the year 1920-1921—a decrease of £1,651,675."

Hon. members opposite are continually referring to the fact that we are becoming more extravagant in the expenditure of loan moneys, showing that they have either not read the Financial Statement, or desire to misrepresent the matter to the people by making the inferences which they have made. Surely hon. members opposite do not wish to convey the inference that the Labour Government should not borrow money! I have not heard either of the leaders of the opposite parties mention any specific case where loan moneys have been used extravagantly or improperly. I will cite a few instances and see if members opposite object to them. Have members opposite objected to loan moneys being expended on the North Coast Railway? They have no objection to that. Do they object to loan money being spent on the Bowen Coalfields Railway and the Bowen Coalmine? We have good assets there, and there is a prospect of a big trade in the near future, and a consequential relief of the Northern Railway. There are the Styx River and Burnett schemes. I have not heard any member show the courage to stand up and condemn the Government or the Premier for launching out in that big Burnett scheme, which means the settlement of 5,000 or 6,000 settlers.

Mr. MOORE: Do you think the Government ought to be condemned for doing that?

Mr. FOLEY: The hon. gentleman has often taken deputations from the local authorities to the Treasurer for loan moneys from time to time. They have asked the Treasurer for sums ranging from £4,000 to £20,000. Do hon. members opposite say that money has been extravagantly used?

Mr. MOORE: It has to be returned to the Government. It is all returned to the Government.

Mr. FOLEY: But you always include it in the amount the Government is spending. Those sums all help to increase the amount of loan money spent since we have been in office. You do not deduct those amounts. Practically every item included in the loan

account can be accounted for. Therefore, we have got splendid assets which in time will become reproductive, and pay their way. Notwithstanding the fact that the Premier the other night, when he read out verbatim reports of two interviews he had with the dictators of the Country party—(Opposition laughter)—the Premier never went out of his way to make a specific charge against members on the Opposition benches. But we find that every member opposite who has dealt with this subject has set out to excuse himself. What is the reason for that? Is it because they have a guilty conscience and because they knew what was taking place? I want to read a quotation from the "Producers' Review," as it shows that the editor of that paper knew what was coming. At any rate, he knew what was taking place behind the scenes, because we find the following in an article headed "Principles or Opportunism," on page 9 of the issue of that journal for May, 1920—

"Big interests, backed by selfishness and thoughtlessness within the organisation, have captured the Country party movement. We are sorry, but it would be mere cowardice to deny it or to deceive ourselves deliberately. And now comes the moment when the man on the land must make his decision. Are you going to stand for honest politics or are you going to herd like sheep going to the slaughter in an organisation which is useless to you, no matter how much it may pretend."

That shows that there was something moving behind the scenes in connection with the Country party organisation which would be given effect to at no distant date. The Opposition have made many attempts to oust this Government from power. We know that the Attorney-General some years ago outlined the scheme which had been put forward by the employers for the specific purpose of ousting the Government from office. Then we had the famous delegation to England. The editor of the "Producers' Review" pointed out that the big interests behind the Country party tried to prevent the Government from getting loan money, and were guilty of hamstringing the Premier, to prevent him from carrying on. A little later there was the delegation to London, of which I think the hon. member for Toowong knows a good deal. I think Mr. Fihely accused him once of painting the minutes. A little later we find things developing somewhat further. On 24th January, 1921, the Employers' Federation met in Brisbane for the purpose of establishing a fund for the following objects—

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

The second object was—

"Supporting, assisting, or rendering aid to candidates, or intending candidates, in parliamentary, municipal, and other elections."

And the fifth was very broad—

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

When you take the evidence that has come

before the people of Queensland in the conversations with the Premier of the two dictators of the Country party and the bribery charge—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. FOLEY: I was just referring to that in passing. I do not wish to deal with the matter in any way or attack the two men who are before the court. Now, I want to review some of the criticism which has fallen from members opposite of this party and their objective. I do not claim that in the time at my disposal I shall be able to do justice to it. On no occasion do they mention what our objective is. They term it communism, practically not knowing and not wishing to know what it is. I am going to read out the main objective of the Labour party—not the immediate objective—and ask members what is wrong with it. We all recognise on this side that the time is not ripe, that society has not evolved to that stage where Parliament can by legislative act socialise industry—we have sufficient common sense on this side to recognise that fact—and so we have an immediate objective as well as the main objective, which I shall give. The first plank is—

"The socialisation of industry, production, distribution, and exchange."

And in case there should be any misrepresentation as to the methods by which that is to be obtained, they are specifically laid down—

"(a) The constitutional utilisation of industrial and parliamentary machinery;
"(b) The organisation of workers along the lines of industry."

What is wrong with that? Are not the employers organised along the lines of industry? Unionism has evolved from craft unionism until to-day we have the embryo of the One Big Union along the lines of industry.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: What do you think of that?

Mr. FOLEY: I think it is the right line for the workers to take. The next method is—

"(c) The socialisation of banking."

What is wrong with that? What is wrong with the Commonwealth Bank? There is nothing wrong with that. If such circumstances arise that the Government see the necessity to take control of banking it will be a great power in the hands of working-class Governments. Let us go a little further—

"(d) The municipalisation of such services as can be best operated in a limited area."

We find that our municipal authorities are municipalising many services in different parts of the State to-day. What is wrong with extending that if it is going to be in the interests of the people? That will come without any legislative effort on the part of the Government. The evolution of society makes it compulsory. Then there is—

"Government of nationalised industries by boards, upon which the workers in the industries and the community shall have representation."

There is absolutely nothing wrong with that particular clause—that the workers should be represented in our State enterprises, in our railways, and be given a chance of becoming educated in administration and management, so that at a future date, if occasion requires,

Mr. Foley.]

they can run those industries in the interest of the community. The next clause is—

“Establishment of an elective, the supreme, economic council of all the nationalised industries.”

What is wrong with an economic council?

Mr. VOWLES: Sovietism.

Mr. FOLEY: There is no Sovietism about it. We have, at the present time, economic councils appointed for the various industries throughout the State. When something big is necessary regarding some industry, they do not come to members of Parliament, who are not experts in the various industries, to sit on the economic council; they appoint experts, who advise the financial magnates as to what are the best methods to adopt. We find that going on in Europe, in the financial arena—experts visiting Europe with Lloyd George and the other delegates, so that expert opinion can be used to guide the leaders as to what is the best method to adopt to bring about stabilisation. That is what an economic council means. Hon. members opposite will note that society has evolved through various stages. We have had the tribal system of communism away back in the ages—so our historians inform us. We developed through chattel slavery to a state of serfdom. It is only recently that Italy has evolved from the feudal stage. The Prime Minister in that country agreed to the overthrow of the feudal barons by the serfs or peasants and legalised it in the Parliament of Italy quite recently. We have evolved in England, America, and most of the other countries of the world to the capitalistic stage. So we will go on evolving, even though anti-Labour parties are in power in Queensland, in Australia, or any other part of the world. I would like to point to the progress that has taken place in the ideas of men. In Sweden, Branting, the well-known Social Democrat, has quite peaceably become Prime Minister. In Czecho-Slovakia, President Masaryk is a Social Democrat. The Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs are Social Democrats. In Belgium the Social Democrats are the most powerful Ministers in the Cabinet. In Italy no Ministry is permanent that does not reconcile its views with the 156 Socialist Deputies. In France, although handicapped by improper apportionment of votes in the constituencies, the Social Democrats are strongly represented. In Germany the struggle will eventually lie between the Social Democrats and the reactionaries, such as we have sitting on the other side of the House. In England, Labour is gaining ground, and it is predicted that in the very near future Labour will be in power. In Australia, Labour has been in power despite the fact that they have had powerful influences up against them. They are in power in Queensland to-day; and in the very near future I hope they will be in power in the Federal sphere, and will carry on the good work which they have been doing.

In the brief time at my disposal I will quote an article which I have clipped from one of the papers, to point out some of the things that might happen if the workers of this State and the other States ever developed to such a degree that they would insist that a Labour Government shall remain in power and Labour's ultimate and inevitable object be achieved—

“1. First of all it would mean that the wages of the workers would be pro-

[Mr. Foley.

gressively increased until they received, as nearly as possible, the full products of their toil.

“2. It would reduce the cost of living for every one. The trusts being publicly owned and operated at cost and without profit the cost of the necessities of life would be reduced.

“3. Exploitation—or the power of one man or set of men to live off the product of another man or set of men—would be at an end.

“4. No one being able to live off the labour of another, all would be compelled to work—to render some useful service. All who are able to work and refused to do so, if there should be such under socialism, would receive what they produce—nothing if they produce nothing. The Bible says, ‘If a man will not work, neither shall he eat.’

“5. There would be no unemployment—no hungry, weary, hopeless, disheartened men tramping the city streets and country roads begging for work and unable to find it. The State, controlling all natural resources and public utilities, would find work for all.

“6. Every young man and woman being able to earn a living, marriage would be promoted, the home will be saved, and prostitution and vice will be robbed of their victims.

“7. Every adult receiving the full product of their toil there would be no need of child labour, which forthwith would cease.

“8. The fear of want and poverty would be removed; all children would be given an equal opportunity for an education, and the aged and disabled would be pensioned and protected.

“9. The workers receiving their full and just due, strikes and lockouts would end. Henceforth industrial peace would prevail.

“10. Socialism would establish international peace upon the earth. There would be no need to fight for foreign markets. The economic reason for wars would be removed.

“And finally many of the most devoted believers in the golden rule, the brotherhood of man and the spiritual ideals of religion, have discovered that in socialism is the programme by which their hopes may be realised.—‘The New Day.’”

I am not claiming that this Government think that the socialistic system can be put into operation by legislative measures to-day or to-morrow, as is inferred by hon. members opposite. If we do evolve to such a state of affairs—I do not think it will be in my time, but I hope that it will—the fallacious idea that a person who has a few pounds at the bank, or who has got a small home or a small store in the community, or a small manufacturing concern, will lose what he has struggled to save. That idea has been put forward by hon. members opposite. That idea is not behind the mind of any socialist in any part of the world. No socialist ever advocated such a thing. It was never advocated that one individual should be turned out of a home in order that another could go into it. I have pointed that out in order to eliminate a few misconceptions that are being continually poured into the ears of the people with the idea of conveying the impression

that this Government, when they get into power again, will bring in a communistic state, and that we will have bloodshed and slaughter right throughout the land. That is a false idea, and hon. members opposite know that. The socialistic tiger stunt has been preached ever since the birth of the Labour movement, and right along the line the same argument has been used by hon. members opposite; but in spite of that the Labour party are in power in Queensland and will prevail in the future. What can be done by nationalisation can be observed from the good work being done by our State or nationalised butcher shops. An article appeared in the "Sun" last Sunday, showing the profits that were being made by private butchers, and yet those butchers had the audacity to ask the Commissioner of Prices to allow them to increase their prices. I want to point out what has been done for the people of Queensland in connection with the establishment of State butcher shops. I have a list of the prices ruling for 1920, 1921, and 1922, which I obtained from the Commissioner of Prices, and they show a gradual reduction. The price for prime rib roast in 1920 was 8d. a lb., whereas in 1922 it had fallen to 4d. a lb.

Mr. MORGAN: Where?

Mr. FOLEY: In the nationalised shops, which hon. members opposite have tried to infer would mean the ruination of public spirit and public conscience. These prices have been reduced notwithstanding the fact that the shops have competed on the same terms as the private shops.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: That is not so.

Mr. FOLEY: We have the Western Butchering Company.

Mr. MORGAN: Selling cheaper than the State shops.

Mr. FOLEY: No. They attempted to cut the prices so that they could cut the State shops out. What is the result? The State butcher shops cut their prices, and practically cut the other fellow out. That is the position to-day, despite the fact that we are competing on the same terms as private institutions. We are buying our cattle in the open market, slaughtering them at our own slaughter-yards, and retailing the meat over the counter, at 1½d. a lb. less than private butchers charge. The same thing applies to practically all cattle which are sold in the butcher shops. I have quoted prime rib roast. We find that rump steak, which was 1s. a lb. in 1920, is now reduced at the State butcher shops to 4½d. a lb., and it is 3d. a lb. at the private institutions. Yet, notwithstanding that, the private butchers have had the audacity to come along to the Commissioner of Prices and ask him to give them a further increase. I may mention that the Commissioner of Prices has outlined an extensive list of articles he has dealt with, although he has not been successful in reducing the price of every commodity that is sold throughout the State, owing to the various economic laws over which he has not control. But since he has been appointed Commissioner of Prices he has done good work, having reduced a list of about forty-five articles, which in 1920 cost 45s. 9d., to 30s. 8½d. in 1921, and to-day they can be purchased for £1 7s. 5d.

The CHAIRMAN indicated that the time allowed the hon. member under the Standing Orders had expired.

The House resumed.

The CHAIRMAN reported progress.

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

APPLICATIONS TO VOTE BY PROXY.

DECLARATION BY MR. SPEAKER.

The SPEAKER: I have to announce that, pursuant to the requirements of the Legislative Assembly Act Amendment Act of 1922, I declare that I am satisfied that the matters stated in the notifications received by me this day from the Hon. W. McCormack, Hon. W. N. Gillies, and Mr. J. T. Gilday are true.

The House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.