

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**WEDNESDAY, 23 AUGUST 1922**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

WEDNESDAY, 23 AUGUST, 1922.

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

APPLICATION TO VOTE BY PROXY.

The SPEAKER: I have to announce that I have this day received the following medical certificate from Doctors William Nathaniel Robertson and Alwyn Tom Hays Nisbet, and a notification under the provisions of the Legislative Assembly Act Amendment Act of 1922 from the Hon. J. H. Coyne—

“To the Hon. the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland.

“We, William Nathaniel Robertson and Alwyn T. Hays Nisbet, legally qualified medical practitioners, hereby certify that the Hon. John Harry Coyne, member of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland for the electoral district of Warrego, 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-third day of August, 1922.

“Wm. N. ROBERTSON.

“A legally qualified medical practitioner.

“A. T. H. NISBET, M.B., Ch.M., D.P.H.,

“A legally qualified medical practitioner.”

“To the Hon. the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland.

“I, John Harry Coyne, member of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland for the electoral district of Warrego, 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 sittings 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

*Hon. W. Bertram.]*

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-third day of August, 1922.

“J. HARRY COYNE.

“Member of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland for the electoral district of Warrego.”

#### DECLARATION BY MR. SPEAKER.

The SPEAKER: 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 notification received by me this day from the Hon. J. H. Coyne are true.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS.

##### APPLICATIONS FOR “PAIRS” FOR ABSENT MEMBERS.

Mr. WINSTANLEY (*Queenton*): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member for Queenton be allowed to make a personal explanation?

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. WINSTANLEY: When the declaration was made yesterday afternoon from members who were absent through sickness the leader of the Opposition got up and asked a question as to whether the applications were in order, and he made the statement that no application had been made to him for “pairs.”

Mr. VOWLES: By the individuals.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: The hon. gentleman said that no application had been made to him for “pairs.” He said that clearly and distinctly.

Mr. VOWLES: I said “by the individuals.”

Mr. KIRWAN: Don't shuffle. You said no application had been made for “pairs.”

Mr. WINSTANLEY: There is no question about it. The leader of the Opposition wanted members of this House to understand, and through this House the people outside, that no application had been made to him for “pairs.”

Mr. VOWLES: By the individuals.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: The hon. gentleman tried to make out that “pairs” had not been applied for at all. He did not say “by the individuals” when he made his statement yesterday. I personally asked the leader of the Opposition if he would grant “pairs.” I told him that there were several members absent through sickness, and asked him if he would grant “pairs” for them. The leader of the Opposition said, as he has said on previous occasions, that the Opposition had decided that they would not grant “pairs,” and consequently nothing could be done. The leader of the Opposition, in his statement yesterday, repeated part of what he said to me, but he did not give all the conversation. As far as he went he spoke the truth; but it was not the whole truth; and, as Tennyson says, “A half truth is the blackest of all lies.” About that there can be no question.

The SPEAKER: Order!

[*Hon. W. Bertram.*

Mr. WINSTANLEY: I am pointing out that what the leader of the Opposition said was true; but he did not finish it. He did not tell this House that an application had been made to him for “pairs” and that he had refused to grant “pairs.”

OPPOSITION MEMBERS interjecting,

The SPEAKER: The hon. member for Queenton may make a personal explanation, but he cannot argue the matter.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. WINSTANLEY: I am not arguing it. I am just stating a fact. If the leader of the Opposition had told the whole truth there would have been no need for me to make a personal explanation to-day; but he did not state the whole truth. He stated only part of it. There are members away sick, and it is only due to those members that I should make this explanation. It is also due to myself that I should make it, and it is due to the people outside that I should state what really happened. It is also due, in the interests of the ethics of political morality, about which hon. members opposite talk so much and practise so little, that I should make this personal explanation. (Opposition interruption.)

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): I desire to make a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the leader of the Opposition be allowed to make a personal explanation?

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: It is up to him.

Mr. VOWLES: When I questioned the procedure yesterday, I did it purely on the question of procedure. I asked you if you had made inquiry as to the truth or otherwise of certain statements contained in the applications for proxies which were before you, and I told you that not one of those individuals—

Mr. HARTLEY: No, you did not.

Mr. VOWLES: I said that not one of them had made application to me.

Mr. FORDE: How could they when they were sick in bed?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. VOWLES: In my opinion, the provision of the Act had not been complied with so far as you were concerned, because provision is made in the Act that somebody may make application for a “pair” on behalf of a sick member.

Mr. GLEDSON: I made application through the “whip.”

Mr. VOWLES: You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that subsequently you recognised the position and put the thing right.

#### QUESTIONS.

##### COST OF TRANSHIPPING GOODS AT WALLANGARRA.

Mr. KERR (*Knoggera*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

“What was the cost connected with the transshipment of goods, etc., at Wallangarra for last financial year necessitated by the break of railway gauge?”

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

“£16,387.”

REORGANISATION OF DEPARTMENTS BY PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSIONER.

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

“What departments were visited by the Public Service Commissioner or his staff in relation to the reorganisation thereof, and what departments are yet to be dealt with in this connection?”

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

“The following departments have been visited:—Home Secretary's, Public Works, Justice, Treasury, Public Lands, Agriculture and Stock, Public Instruction, and Mines. The departments not shown in this list have yet to be visited.”

NOTIFICATION OF OVERPAYMENT OF TAXES.

Mr. CATTERMULL (*Muggrave*) asked the Treasurer—

“Will he instruct the Commissioner of Taxes that all taxpayers, whether of land tax or income tax, must be notified of any overpayment made to the department?”

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

“Any overpayments discovered in the department within the time limits prescribed by the Acts are refunded.”

LAND OPEN FOR SELECTION ON EUNGELLA TABLELAND.

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

“Is any land now open for selection on the Eungella tableland?”

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS, on behalf of the Secretary for Public Lands (Hon. J. H. Coyne, *Warrigo*) replied—

“Not at present.”

AMOUNT COLLECTED AS SUPER INCOME TAX—  
COST OF COLLECTING LAND TAX.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE (*Orley*) asked the Treasurer—

“1. Of the total net revenue from income tax for year ended 30th June, 1922—viz., £2,194,362, what amount was collected by the exercise of the super tax?”

“2. Is there any good reason why the collection under super tax should not be shown separately in the annual report on income tax as it is in that on land tax?”

“3. Can he give the reason why the cost of collecting land tax is 4.42 per cent. as against income tax 1.33 per cent.?”

The TREASURER replied—

“1. The information is not available, but the amount is estimated at, approximately, £330,000.

“2. The extra cost involved in collating the information is considered sufficient reason.

“3. The main reason is that the average tax per taxpayer for income tax is nearly three times the average of land tax. A similar disparity in cost of collection exists in the other States.”

1922—3 G

SUPPLY.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

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

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mirani*): I have listened with interest to the various statements made in this Chamber lately regarding the position of parties in this House. Amongst the other things I have heard, to my great surprise—judging by the statements that have been made by the Premier and others—that there has been an idea that the Premier should change his political creed and become the leader of the Country party. I may say that when I first heard of it, the question naturally arose in my mind why any party should be anxious to have the hon. gentleman as leader. Let us take a cool, dispassionate survey of the hon. gentleman's political record since he and his party have had control of Queensland's affairs. Anyone who dees that will realise that there has been no display of such ability, such capacity, as a State like Queensland requires in its leader. The hon. gentleman has occupied a very prominent position in his party since they came into power in 1915; first he was Treasurer, and since then he has become Chief Secretary and leader. In 1915 Queensland was in a fairly prosperous position—its credit was good all over the world; railway construction was progressing at a greater rate than in any other State in the Commonwealth—I think we built as much in one year as any other two States—and altogether there was a confidence in our future that has never existed since. What is the position to-day? Unemployment is more rife than ever it has been in the memory of man.

Mr. COLLINS: That is not true.

Mr. SWAYNE: We have lost our credit in a centre where we already had borrowed over £50,000,000. There is discouragement of enterprise, and everybody is holding aloof from investment.

Mr. COLLINS: Not true.

Mr. SWAYNE: Altogether, Queensland to-day, after seven years of the hon. gentleman's control of affairs, is in such a position that I cannot understand any political party wanting him to lead them. In plain English, he has not delivered the goods.

At 3.46 p.m.,

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

Mr. SWAYNE: There was a distinct want of capacity and ability on the part of the hon. gentleman. I quite recognise that by means of bouncing and bullying the hon. gentleman has induced his followers to do things in the way of limiting freedom of speech. He has been forcible enough to get them to agree with him, but I am sure they do not lend themselves willingly to such conduct. So far as being a controller of public affairs, and being a fit man to guide the destinies of Queensland, the Premier has shown himself distinctly wanting in ability. He has been a failure, and I cannot imagine any political party desiring him as a leader. Speaking personally, if such a thing did happen—it seems to be absolutely inconceivable—sooner than sit under his leadership I would rather sit in a party by myself. I could give other reasons for my aversion to the hon. gentleman as a leader, but probably I might be transgressing on personal

*Mr. Swayne.]*

grounds, and perhaps, Sir, you might rule me out of order. I think it only requires a comparison of the state of affairs in Queensland in 1915 with the state of affairs existing in 1922 to discover ample reasons why the hon. gentleman is not fit to lead any party or have control of the affairs of Queensland. The hon. gentleman has been courting the farmers in an endeavour to secure their votes, and at the same time has been making himself good with the extremists of his own party, to whom he knows, in reality, he belongs. The hon. gentleman was anxious to secure the return of the Dooley Administration in New South Wales. The Premier addressed meetings in Lowood and Laidley in an endeavour to get the farmers' support, and from those meetings he went down to Sydney and said—

"While there is a Labour Government in Queensland no armed force will be used against the workers."

We know the extent to which the industrial position is being disturbed and prostituted by the extreme element for revolutionary purposes. That will not create confidence in this State. The Premier virtually said that, no matter what excesses might be perpetrated, he would not permit a finger to be lifted to prevent it. We have only to look to the recent disturbances on the Rand to see what might have happened there if no attempt had been made to nip that disturbance in the bud. General Smuts, addressing the Assembly in Capetown in March last, said—

"When I last spoke to the House, practically the whole of the Rand from one end to the other, except Bokburg and a small portion of the centre of Johannesburg, was in the hands of revolutionaries. He paid a tribute to the prompt action of the Minister of Defence in mobilising the burghers, and the latter's magnificent organisation in response. Meantime there was grave danger that the whole of the Rand might become a scene of bloodshed and murder. Indeed, the position was such as would take one back to the days of the French revolution. Not till the early hours of Sunday was it possible to change the situation. After that, rapid progress was made. When he left Johannesburg on Friday, the situation was almost as if nothing had happened. The country had escaped a tremendous danger.

"The strike had been submerged by the revolution, as had been admitted by the resolution of the mine workers' union dissociating themselves from the revolutionary movement. It was clear that the Trade Unions' Federation executive was not a free agent. There were dark influences in the background. The executive made a fatal mistake in not repudiating the movement sooner. The council appeared to be waiting till after all this trouble and bloodshed. The Government had been blamed for not arresting the revolutionary leaders. There was a time when most of them were in gaol, and they ought to have remained there, but the magistrate let them out on the flimsiest possible bail. It might be asked what were the prospects and aims of the revolutionaries? It was clear from the statements made by the leaders that they were really out for a red revolution of

the French Republic type. There was no doubt about that.

"The fact that impressed him most was that if these people, even for a few days before the commandoes came up, had obtained the mastery of the whole of Johannesburg and the Rand, they might have set up revolutionary tribunals, and people might have been executed by hundreds, and Johannesburg changed into an ocean of blood."

These are the possibilities that arise out of these fermentations, if they are not stopped. I say that in a country like Queensland, where there is an industrial tribunal to go to for the settlement of disputes, and where both parties may be heard, there is no excuse for resort to force, and it is only those who are of the most extreme type, and who are at war with the community, who resort to such means. Again we find, as showing what the possibilities are, that recently in the "Worker," in New South Wales, Mr. Gosling, M.L.A., is reported to have said at the Australian Labour Party Conference in Sydney, just prior to the last election in New South Wales—

"If Labour won the next elections the present objective would enable them to do all they wished. It would enable them to nationalise the industries per the medium of the Commonwealth Bank without the spending of a single penny piece."

Then, take the utterances of gentlemen who have been put into positions of trust and public power by the Premier, while at the same time the hon. gentleman is trying to persuade us that he is most moderate. Take, for instance, the utterances of Mr. J. S. Collings, one of his nominees to the Upper House, who said—

"He felt quite sure that some day the workers would realise the absurdity of going, at great expenditure of time, energy, and money to a man like themselves called a judge, dressed up in a horse-hair wig and gown, in receipt of £30 or £40 a week, placing before him the most intimate details as to what they and their families needed to eat and wear, in order that this individual, whose weekly cigar and champagne account probably exceeded the basic wage, should decide whether 12s. 6d. or 15s. per day was a fair thing for those to live upon who produce all wealth, including the cigars and champagne and the horse-hair wigs?"

I ask whether such utterances as those by people in high positions are calculated to bring about that reliance and trust in the Industrial Arbitration Court that are necessary if the system of industrial arbitration is to be a success. One would think that any man in that position, who had the welfare of the State at heart, would do his utmost to instil a reliance on the court, and advise all he came in contact with, that their best method, in case of industrial trouble, was to go to the Industrial Arbitration Court, instead of trying to make them dissatisfied and distrustful. But the Premier, who tells us that he has been asked to become the leader of our party, has always been an extremist. For instance, I have here an article written by Mr. T. J. Lonsdale, in which he points out—

"Premier Theodore was president of the old Australian Workers' Association, and then became president under the new

[Mr. Swaine.

scheme for Queensland. Home Secretary McCormack, who, previous to his election for Parliament, had been general secretary of the Australian Workers' Association (afterwards followed by Attorney-General Mullan), was on the new executive, and these men came then into the limelight as the high-priests of direct action."

I say that, before such a thing could be thought of or even considered, the hon. gentleman would have to dissociate himself from those old associations, but he has utterly failed to do that—I give him credit for being sincere in this—and has declared that he adheres to his old convictions and beliefs. It is necessary that before any trust can be placed in the hon. gentleman these matters should be cleared up. I was rather amazed at an answer which the hon. gentleman gave to a query addressed to him by the leader of the Opposition, regarding the utterance of the Secretary for Agriculture, who I am sorry is not in his place to-day. The Premier virtually admitted that the Secretary for Agriculture had expressed his belief in the possibility of a state of things in which we could produce for use and not for profit. Let me refer to a country where, at the present time, that theory has been tried. I have here the "International Sugar Journal"; and, looking over the position in Europe in connection with the sugar industry,

happened to light on this. I am [4 p.m.] quoting from page 291 of the "International Sugar Journal," and this is what the correspondent of that journal says—

"When we speak of Europe, we must necessarily exclude from our discussions the land reported to be sown with beet-root in Russia. Just as in 1921, the authorities there have ordered the sowing of 200,000 desjatins, and on paper that area has been prepared and sown; but in reality only half the acreage planted in 1921 has borne fruit and the tonnage of that remnant was so exceedingly bad that we are inclined to speak of a total failure instead of a crop."

That is what is taking place in this country, where they are carrying out the ideas of the Secretary for Agriculture by producing for use and not for profit. The farmers in Russia were ordered to produce a certain crop. They put in the crop, but it was only half of what they originally produced, and, as it was not looked after at all, there was really no crop produced. Again, as bearing on the position in Russia, I might quote some of the ideas which we have heard promulgated from time to time by hon. members opposite. In fact, the hon. member for Leichhardt distinctly enunciated something similar to this, which is happening in Russia at the present time. It says in the "International Sugar Journal"—

"Once on a time the great food producer, the Russian Empire does not now send wheat, rye, and barley to Western Europe, and even fails to supply her own wants."

That is what is happening where the ideas enunciated by hon. members opposite are carried into effect. I sometimes smile when I hear hon. members opposite talk about their progressive ideas. They are really retrogressive ideas. At any rate, as far as Russia is concerned, it is the greatest decline of civilisation that has been witnessed for ages past. I think that socialistic

ideas have always been the first step in the decline of all the previous civilisations that have existed and then disappeared. Coming back directly to Queensland, I will show what the position has been under the control of hon. members opposite. I find, as regards secondary industries, that in 1914 there were 5,269 factories in New South Wales employing 116,611 hands. In Victoria there were 5,650 factories employing 118,241 hands, and in Queensland there were 1,796 factories employing 43,382 hands. Now, the latest figures that I can find in the Commonwealth Year Book—namely, for the year 1920, show what the result has been during that period. The Premier talks about leading our party, but I will show what the position was after five years' rule by hon. gentlemen opposite as compared with the same period in New South Wales and Victoria. In 1920 there was an increase in the number of factories and in the number of hands employed in both New South Wales and Victoria, and a decrease in Queensland for the same period. The actual figures were as follows for 1920—

	Factories.	Employees.
New South Wales ...	5,662	144,454
Victoria ...	6,038	136,522
Queensland ...	1,754	40,891

These figures show that there were forty-two less factories in Queensland in 1920 as compared with 1914, and 2,491 less hands employed, after five years under the rule of hon. gentlemen opposite. We have heard a lot about the war being the cause of our trouble in Queensland, but how is it that it did not similarly affect the other States. Dealing with the secondary industries, I find that for the same five years there was an increase in the average number of employees in these industries, but the increases were much greater in the other States. The figures are as follows:—

	N.S. Wales.	Victoria.	Queensland.
	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.
1915-16 ...	0.18	3.95	4.93
1916-17 ...	1.57	2.75	1.16
1917-18 ...	2.17	1.03	1.35
1918-19 ...	5.84	3.47	1.35
1919-20 ...	13.22	11.58	0.24

Queensland increased for the first year because it did not feel the full effect of Labour rule. In the first year the increase over the previous year was 4.93 per cent. The next year the increase fell to 1.16 per cent.; the next year it was 1.35 per cent.; the next again 1.35 per cent.; and last year the increase was only .24 per cent., or less than one-fourth of 1 per cent. I also notice there is a decrease in the acreage under cultivation during the period the present Government have been in office. In 1914 there were 792,568 acres under the plough, but in 1920 the number of acres under the plough was only 779,497. In the face of those figures why should any party be anxious to secure the services of the hon. gentleman under whose control such a lack of progress has been so marked? In plain English, the hon. gentleman has not delivered the goods. There is a homely saying that you judge a cake by the eating of it. I say that the position of affairs in Queensland to-day is such that it does not justify the confidence of the State in hon. gentlemen opposite. Coming to the figures mentioned in the Financial Statement, we are told that economies have been effected which reduce the estimated deficit of last year of £455,000 to £188,000. The question arises, how was that saving effected? It was effected by

*Mr. Swayne.]*

deflation. To make deflation possible there must have been inflation in the first place. In other words, a much greater number of employees were put on than were required, and it was no kindness to them, because, after a brief period of State employment, they had to be turned off or else someone else had to be turned off. For instance, we find that in the railways between 1914 and 1919 there was an increase in the number of employees of 32 per cent., although in the same period there was an increase in the mileage of only 16 per cent., and a decrease in the work done, as shown by the fact that 1,400,000 fewer train miles were run in the latter year than in 1914. Obviously during these years, through mismanagement, they were overmanned, and even now only a paltry sum has been saved. If there had been good management all through there would have been no need for deflation, and no need for the distress that accompanies it.

We have been told that finance was the strong point of this Administration. When hon. members opposite were in opposition, we used to get lectures from them upon Sinking Funds and upon the building of public works out of revenue, upon non-borrowing or very little borrowing, and so on. Yet we find that when the present Government came into power the public debt was £52,270,763, whilst at the present time it has gone up to £85,691,225. In other words, this Government have increased the public debt by something over £33,000,000 in seven years. Yet they talk about the extravagant borrowing of their predecessors. The interest charge has increased to £3,286,095, yet we find in a pamphlet which was issued by the party opposite prior to the election in 1915 the following statement:—

“ If a man borrows £5 and pays back £7 in interest and still owes £5 of the original debt, he is a fool.”

What is going to be the position of Queensland? We shall soon reach over £4,000,000 with our annual interest bill, and we are still owing about £80,000,000. In twenty years or so we shall have paid away in interest a sum equal to the principal of our indebtedness, and we shall still owe the original loans and a little bit more. And this from a party which said in 1915 that if a man did that, or a State did that, they were fools. In the same pamphlet we have this statement:—

“ If a man earns £5 per week and spends £4 per week, he is on the way to insolvency.”

Well, what is taking place with regard to our revenue? We find that there have been four deficits since the Government took office seven years ago, amounting to £1,483,562, whilst the proclaimed surpluses—and, as you know, the Auditor-General in his reports threw very grave doubts upon the genuineness of these surpluses—together only amount to £71,000. Yet hon. members opposite talk about a man who spends £4 a week with an income of £5 a week being on the road to insolvency. Most certainly, under their control, Queensland is in that position.

In 1912, Mr. Theodore, then in opposition, spoke in this way of loan expenditure, as reported on page 1247 of “ Hansard ” of that year—

“ It has been stated here time and again, and I say it again, that because

[Mr. Swayne,

of the financial policy of the Government they are landing themselves in a financial morass. They have been spending increased amounts of loan money year after year, which they could not keep up, and which they knew they could not keep up, and now they have practically closed down all railway construction. The hon. gentleman talked about the intention of the Government to go on constructing agricultural lines.”

I may say that the Government did build agricultural lines. And what is more, they made the railways pay. At that time Mr. Theodore said that the financial policy of the Government was landing them in a financial morass. What about this Government? The estimated loan expenditure for this year is £4,923,660—at the rate of nearly £5,000,000 a year.

On the question of maturing loans also it would be rather interesting to recall the attitude of the party in power, as expressed by Mr. Ryan on page 1407 of “ Hansard ” of 1914—

“ They were not making provision for maturing loans. The hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about. (Laughter.) There is a great difference between making provision for loans falling due and raising money to carry on public works. Here were loans which were falling due on a fixed date and had to be met. The Government showed lack of judgment, lack of foresight, and want of business acumen in landing Queensland into the position in which she finds herself to-day in regard to this loan. Irrespective of the war, I heard the hon. member for Townsville from his place some time ago say that the Government should be taking steps to make provision for the meeting of these loans.”

Now, whatever the position might have been then, it is infinitely worse now. By the end of 1926 we have just under £28,000,000 of loans maturing. Most of that money has been obtained at 3½ per cent., 4 per cent., and 4½ per cent., but it is impossible to foretell what it will cost to renew it. At any rate, we have a pretty shrewd idea that the rates will be very much higher than those at which it was borrowed, but when you remember that an addition of only 1 per cent. on £23,000,000 means an addition to the annual interest bill of £230,000, without getting any return for it, you see the extremity of the position. We know that the hon. member now at the head of the Government was very strong when in opposition upon the subject of Sinking Funds. What has been done by his Government, and how does Queensland compare with the other States in that regard? Looking up the Commonwealth Year Book, I find that the latest figures show that the Sinking Funds of the respective States were as follows:—

	£
New South Wales ... ..	394,000
Victoria ... ..	3,395,000
Queensland ... ..	402,000
South Australia ... ..	1,437,000
West Australia ... ..	6,848,000
Tasmania ... ..	699,000

Even Tasmania beats Queensland! Although so much was said by hon. gentlemen on the other side when they were in opposition about the necessity for making provision for

our maturing loans, we have the lowest Sinking Funds of any State. West Australia, which is weaker in population and in resources than Queensland, has a Sinking Fund of £5,654,000. I have here a paragraph that appeared recently in the Sydney "Bulletin," which, I think, puts the Queensland position very forcibly. Speaking of State finances, it says—

"State finance is mostly a struggle to raise the greatest amount of loan money, absolutely or relatively, and achieve the biggest debit balance. New South Wales won the Deficit Stakes in 1921-22 with a total of £1,329,000, Westralia (£719,600) finishing second, and Queensland (£188,503) third. Judged in proportion to population, Westralia was the winner; but unlike the other prodigals, Sunset State made a substantial contribution (£283,700) to its Sinking Fund. Riotously as it has borrowed since 1911, when a Labour Government burst into office with proposals for brushing the capitalist off the earth by starting State enterprises with his money, its Acting Treasurer is in a position to boast that the interest on the Sinking Fund balances the deficit, and its Premier that the Sinking Fund trustees have bought £6,898,000 worth of Western Australian paper for £5,940,000. That is what it means to provide against the day of reckoning. Part of the money available was invested in goldfields-water-scheme stock. These transactions have been so profitable that the Government, as Premier Mitchell gleefully announces, is now in a position to 'save' £100,000 a year by withholding the interest on £782,910 worth of stock (it was purchased for £690,550) and the Sinking Fund contribution in respect of the balance; and, of course, it will do so. It is that kind of Government. The late Forrest was the author of the goldfields water scheme, and also of the Sinking Fund."

Very often during this debate comparisons have been made with other States. I think, in some cases, they have been rather strained comparisons; but I take it that the figures quoted in this article are absolutely correct. It goes on to say—

"Victoria, as usual, is the one State that weighed in with a surplus. It is only a small thing—£25,000 McPherson says, although there may be a few thousands more when the accounts are adjusted—but it makes the pomp of Dooley and Theodore ridiculous. For the Victorian revenue (£12 9s. 4d. per head in 1920-21) is small compared with that of New South Wales (£16 5s. 6d. per head) and Queensland (£16 15s. per head). From the sale and rental of Crown lands the Cabbage Garden draws less than a third of the Queensland total and barely a fourth of what New South Wales gets. Its stamp duties yield about half a million less than those of the Ma State. Its modest income tax, the lowest in the Commonwealth, if not in the world, produces a mere £1 a head, whereas the New South Wales impost turns in about £2 a head and the Queensland one approximately £3. In other words Victoria gets along with three-quarters of a million less income tax money than Bananaland, which hasn't half its population, and three millions less than New South Wales.

When Dooley increased his income tax in 1920 the additions were in most cases greater than the full rates charged in Victoria—and they haven't been altered for six years."

It goes on to point out how, by sound management and economy, Victoria has placed its affairs in a satisfactory position. It is to the benefit of the worker, as well as of every class in the community, that such a state of things should exist. I have here a report of a meeting of the Brisbane Chamber of Commerce, at which one speaker said—

"Taxation was stiff, but no Government would ever endure that made taxation so high that it crippled private enterprise."

The gentleman who enlarged upon the evils of taxation was the Hon. John Fihelly. This was his farewell address before going to Great Britain. It is evident that that gentleman at last had begun to realise the evils of excessive taxation which distinguished his administration. As showing the position in Queensland from the taxation point of view compared with other States, I find that in 1921 the total State taxation in Australia amounted to £18,203,646; and although Queensland contains only one-seventh approximately of the total population of Australia, its share of that taxation amounted to roughly four and two-thirds. I think that will bring home to people a realisation of the intolerable burden that is placed upon the shoulders of those in Queensland who, though they may not be large in number, are energetic, enterprising, and industrious. They are the people who furnish employment. Seeing those figures, it will be realised that one of the causes of unemployment is the taxation under which we are suffering. When revenue is increased in a few years from £7,000,000 to over £12,000,000, principally by taxation, it must be apparent to everyone that on a small number somebody is being hit up most severely.

I should like to revert to the question of our position regarding loans, in that we have only one country from which we can borrow money—the United States of America, which will not admit our people to her shores. I cannot help thinking that the day will come when we shall seriously regret the actions of the Government which led to the London money market being closed to us. I have noticed that, from time to time, the Premier has declared that there has been no repudiation. I have not time to go into the subject now, but anyone who reads the 1905 Land Act Amendment Act will see that it was passed for the express purpose of inducing investors to put their money into Queensland pastoral properties. They were promised, as an inducement, that certain terms would be granted.

Thinking that Queensland would keep its promise, the money was invested, and this Government in 1920 not only went back on that promise, but made that breach of faith retrospective for six years. It is [4.30 p.m.] interesting to see what people who are not called Tories have to say about that matter. The following statement is accredited to the late Mr. John Storey when he was in England:—

"Mr. Storey pointed out to Sir Robert Nivison that New South Wales's position over the Land Bill was not analogous to Mr. Theodore's. There was no semblance

*Mr. Swayne.]*



of confiscation, and the Government would scrupulously pay interest to the landholders' legitimate profits."

Mr. John Storey, who belonged to the same party as the Premier, quite acknowledged that the action of the Government in this regard was repudiatory and confiscatory. At a dinner given at Parliament House to bid farewell to the late Mr. John Storey prior to his departure for England, the Secretary for Railways in Queensland stated—

"Mr. Theodore had been subject to a conspiracy which had been worked up in London. A small Shylock ring controlled the loan money of England, and the ring wished to control Queensland's legislation before it would make money available."

Without desiring to control legislation, if people are asked to lend money and the security is not good, or if the borrower's credit has been impaired in the past by bad faith, it is quite natural that they will refuse to lend any more money. The Hon. Minister, the Hon. W. Forgan Smith, speaking this session on the sugar industry, stated, replying to an interjection—

"That interjection is very opportune."

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. gentleman is not in order in reading from a "Hansard" for this session.

Mr. SWAYNE: It is in connection with the present debate, and I think I am quite in order in reading that. The hon. gentleman said—

"It is well to remind hon. members opposite, and the people outside whom they seek to mislead, what this Government have done for the sugar industry. When we took office in 1915 the industry was in a parlous condition. Owing to the operation of the Price Fixing Boards in the Southern States, and owing to a regulation issued by the then Prime Minister of the Commonwealth—a Nationalist in the person of Sir Joseph Cook—the price of sugar was fixed far below the economic value of the product, and below what was a fair price necessary to carry on the industry in this State. The Denham Government were helpless. We know that a delegation was sent down, but little or no notice was taken of that delegation. The Denham-Barnes Government stood idly by twiddling their hands in a helpless way, and were incapable of putting forward any constructive policy. The first thing that was done by this Government of an important character was to issue a proclamation acquiring the sugar of Queensland, and entering into an agreement with Mr. Fisher, the Labour Prime Minister of the Commonwealth, for its sale at a price to be fixed that was at that time considered adequate—a price which helped to stabilise the industry and gave confidence to the people engaged in it."

The hon. gentleman is confusing 1914 with 1915 in that statement. The Cook Government issued no regulations concerning the sugar industry. On 17th September, 1914, the Cook Government went out of office and the Fisher Government came into office. If I am not very much mistaken, the price-fixing proclamations were after that date, and the action that was taken was taken by the different States. I think the proclamation was made after the 17th September.

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: It was one of the first war measures passed by the Commonwealth Government.

[Mr. Swayne.

Mr. SWAYNE: The hon. gentleman is saying what is not in accordance with facts when he says that the regulations were introduced by Sir Joseph Cook.

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: It is true—he started it.

Mr. SWAYNE: He did not. There was a small crushing that year, and, as shipping was working without hindrance, the sugar was taken away as quickly as it was made. War had been declared the previous August. The Price Fixing Tribunal in the different States had nothing whatever to do with the Commonwealth Government. The price was fixed in Melbourne, Sydney, and Brisbane at a price which was lower than the price ruling on an average for the previous three or four years. There was a Labour Government in power in New South Wales and a Liberal Government in power in Victoria at the same time. The matter had nothing whatever to do with politics. The prices were fixed, and Queensland was powerless, because the sugar was already in the Southern States. The then Premier of Queensland, Mr. Denham, was very much concerned. The matter was brought before the Queensland tribunal, which granted an increase of £2 per ton in the hope that other States would follow suit; but, unfortunately, they did not, but kept our sugar, and, speaking in ordinary English, they robbed us. A delegation was sent down, of which I had the honour to be a member. There was one escape open to us following on the fixation of prices, and that was that, for the first time in our memory, we could have exported the sugar at world's parity.

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: No. Sir Joseph Cook's regulations prevented any exportation. He published a proclamation forbidding exportation.

Mr. SWAYNE: No.

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: I will allow the hon. member to see a copy of the proclamation whenever he wishes.

Mr. SWAYNE: When I went down, the Prime Minister, Mr. Fisher, sympathised with us, but said he could do nothing to help us. I pointed out to him that he could help us by lifting the embargo, but he refused, and told me personally that he could not do it. The Prime Minister closed that door of escape from price-fixation. In support of my statement, I have the statements made by the late Mr. Tudor in reference to the regulations which have been indirectly attributed to Sir Joseph Cook. The "Australian Sugar Journal" of the 3rd December, 1914, says—

"A telegram has been received by the Prime Minister (Mr. Fisher) from the directors of the Mossman Sugar Mills, Queensland, asking that the prohibition on the export of sugar should be relaxed, as in consequence the sugar-growers were losing 2s. per ton of cane. Mr. Pritchard, secretary of the Queensland Sugar Growers' Association, waited yesterday with a similar telegram upon the Minister for Customs (Mr. Tudor) and made the same request.

"In reply, Mr. Tudor stated that the Government had no intention of removing the prohibition.

"The chairman of the Racecourse directors (Mr. Tom Whitcomb) has forwarded a strong protest to Brisbane against the decision of the Federal Government in prohibiting the export of

sugar from Australia, while the States are keeping the price of the product below the average of recent years. He says it is most unjust to impose such conditions on the industry, while growers are being burdened with the latest industrial award, and it is preventing many from increasing the area of cane land."

With regard to the Denham Government's standing by and twiddling their thumbs, I have here the "Sugar Journal" for 7th January, 1915, dealing with the Parliamentary Delegation to Sydney and Melbourne, which says—

"The Premier of Queensland (Hon. D. F. Denham) very heartily endorses the claims of sugar producers for better treatment at the hands of the people of Australia. In the course of an interview with a representative of the Brisbane 'Telegraph,' Mr. Denham said—'I agree most readily that the sugar-growers are not getting a fair deal. The price fixed in Queensland, £22 per ton, is too low. Recently the Control of Trade Board lifted the price from £20 5s. to £22; but the Boards in New South Wales and Victoria have not advanced the price. The price of sugar is lower now than it has been for years, and that in the face of a much higher cost of production. On 27th November, I communicated with the Premiers of Victoria and New South Wales, in the hope that they might move their respective Boards to a bare act of justice towards sugar producers; but so far the prices in those States remain unchanged."

As the hon. gentleman wishes to attach some blame to his predecessor in this matter, we will see what the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite was with regard to the question of price at that time. I am now quoting from Queensland "Hansard," 1914, page 1416. Speaking on the Financial Statement, Mr. Denham, who was then Premier, in dealing with the price of sugar, said—

"We are enlarging the system of co-operative mills to enable them to get a fair price for their cane, but I think that they are not getting a fair price now because sugar is not at a fair price.

"Mr. Ryan: Do you want to see sugar dearer?"

"The PREMIER: That is a fair question, but to be drawn off on that track would take too much of my time.

"Mr. McCormack: You are getting on dangerous ground.

"The PREMIER: No."

Then, hear what Mr. Theodore said, in the same debate, on page 1423—

"Another part of the Government policy, if we can draw a correct inference from the remarks of the Chief Secretary and also of his Ministers, and on different occasions by the Treasurer, is to have dear living.

"The Treasurer: I challenge that statement. You never heard the Treasurer make such a statement.

"Mr. THEODORE: I said, 'If we can correctly draw an inference from their remarks.' As a matter of fact, the Chief Secretary did say that sugar should go up in price on account of things that are happening elsewhere. Every one in the community is a consumer of sugar."

We see there that in 1914, while we were being robbed by the Southern price-fixing tribunal, Messrs. Theodore, Ryan, and other members of Parliament here were approving of that action, and objecting to the course which Mr. Denham, the then Premier, was adopting. The Secretary for Public Works has the effrontery to come here and say that the reverse was the case, and that it was they who wanted a higher price for sugar and not us. All through this matter they were against any rise in price; until they saw the rise in price was about to become an accomplished fact, when they immediately hopped in and tried to claim all the credit. In respect to the answer to a question which the Chief Secretary gave to me the other day, I have here an extract from a report in the "Courier" of 5th April, 1918, of a conference of delegates representative of the sugar-growing interest of Queensland, convened by the Secretary for Agriculture, for the purpose of discussing the question of the price to be asked of the Federal Government for raw sugar during the 1918 season. We find that at that conference Mr. T. A. Powell, President of the United Cane Growers' Association, moved—

"That, in the opinion of this conference, to enable a remunerative price to be paid for cane, the price of raw sugar should be fixed at a minimum of £24 per ton at the mill."

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

Mr. W. COOPER (*Rosewood*): I have listened with interest to the charges made by members of the Opposition in regard to the maladministration of the Government, and also with a certain amount of interest to the manner in which they have endeavoured to wriggle out of the tight position which the recent disclosures have placed them in. I have had a good deal of experience so far as fishermen are concerned, and I have seen eels out of water, but I have never seen eels that wriggled like members of the Opposition do when endeavouring to disclaim any knowledge of the happenings which have been disclosed by the Premier during the last week. I realise that it is of the greatest importance to Queensland to clean up politics as far as possible. Hon. members opposite said that they knew nothing about the matter. I am not going to say that they are not correct in saying that, but there are many people outside who will not take that stand. That is all I intend to say on that matter.

We have had charges made against the Government because there are a certain number of men in Queensland who are out of employment. Hon. members opposite say that that is due to the maladministration of the Government. I remember that, as far back as 1893, in New South Wales and also in Queensland, when there was no such thing as a Labour Government in office, we had many men out of work. The Government at that time, which represented the same policy as hon. members opposite, established soup kitchens. They told the workers that if they were not prepared to accept 6s. a day they could eat grass. If hon. members opposite were in charge of the Treasury benches to-day, they would adopt exactly the same procedure. Personally, I have worked for both sides. I have worked under

Mr. W. Cooper.]

a Labour Government, and also for what was termed a Liberal Government, but the only liberality the Liberal Government showed was to themselves, and not to the workers. I heard one hon. member opposite referring to the shacks which are provided for railway construction workers to live in. I worked under a Liberal Government, when they did not supply the construction workers with anything, and were prepared not only to refuse them any accommodation, but to say that the wives and children of the workers could live on a mere pittance. If hon. members opposite were in power again they would adopt the same tactics, and I should be very sorry to see Queensland under their administration as far as the welfare of the workers is concerned. I also heard an hon. member opposite claim that this Government were in power when the Murphy's Creek accident occurred, and trying to place the onus of that accident upon the Government. I happened to be one of the men who were sent out as a relief gang at Murphy's Creek, when the accident occurred. Had I been one of the relatives of the unfortunate men who were killed by the neglect of the officials, I would never have consented to accept £1,400 as compensation. I remember that very well. I remember when the train came down and pinned the men alongside the bank. I remember the inquiry which was held at the time and the result of it. I remember that the Government of that day were responsible for the reinstatement of those officials who made that terrible mistake in not having the line protected, in consequence of which those unfortunate men lost their lives. The Government reinstated those officials within a very short time. They placed them back in their old positions again. If we had done that we would have been condemned for all time.

Mr. J. JONES: You are condemned for all time.

Mr. W. COOPER: I take no notice of the hon. gentleman. He is not fit to condemn anything. We have been told that this is a spendthrift Government, and that we have spent huge sums of money on unproductive works. We have done something that perhaps is deplorable in the eyes of the Opposition. Why? Because we have been humane. Because we have increased the endowments to the unfortunate orphans in this State. We increased those endowments by 100 per cent. There certainly has been more money spent in the upkeep of these unfortunate children than was the case under previous Governments. That was not mentioned by hon. members on the other side. All they are concerned about is endeavouring to place every impediment it is possible for them to place in the way of this Government carrying on in a humane direction. Again, this Government have been charged with neglecting the country. Members opposite have the daily Press at their backs. They have the "Courier," "Daily Mail," and all the Tory papers publishing all their propaganda. Nine-tenths of what appears in those papers is untrue. Charges are made in the Press against this Government, but fully nine-tenths is not true. If a Government member makes a speech the report appearing in the papers is quite different. If a Government member made a speech outside, and had a verbatim report of it taken by a shorthand writer, and if he compared the verbatim report with

what appeared in the Tory papers, he would not know his speech from mud pies. Hon. members opposite, helped by the Tory Press, have done nothing but try to belittle this side ever since I have been here, and they do all they can to discredit the Government in the eyes of the people. Regardless of all the propaganda of hon. members opposite and the Tory Press, Queensland is the most prosperous State in the Commonwealth to-day. That is recognised by all thinking people in the Commonwealth. We have at least endeavoured to do something for the country children. We spent 100 per cent. more money on education for children, and the biggest percentage of that money has gone into the country. We have established schools there that are a credit to any Government. I am quite satisfied that members opposite have no desire that that state of affairs should take place, because the more ignorant they can keep the people of the country the more likely they are to get back on the Treasury benches.

Time after time you will hear members, particularly the hon. member for Oxley, interjecting about communism. I heard that old gag before the hon. member for Oxley came to Australia. We heard all about communism, socialism, and Bolshevism, but what has happened?

Mr. MOORE: You never came out into the open with it.

Mr. W. COOPER: It has been on the cards for a number of years.

Mr. MOORE: But you kept it pretty dark.

Mr. W. COOPER: The hon. member for Aubigny has been asleep, like Rip Van Winkle. All the time the hon. member has been retreating. Hon. members opposite have been saying that men are not going on the land, but that is not because of this Government. It has been said, particularly by the hon. member for Kennedy, that this Government went in for repudiation—in fact, the hon. member interjected "repudiation" at least ten times.

Mr. PEsSE: He got a refund.

Mr. W. COOPER: I understand the hon. member for Kennedy got a refund. I remember the day that he got a refund, because I saw his smiling face when I met him in the corridor. This question of repudiation is not nearly so bad as what hon. members opposite would like to convey.

At 4.53 p.m..

The CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

Mr. W. COOPER: When hon. members opposite were in office they did nothing else but repudiate. The leader of the previous Government went into the country and told the people that the Government were going to carry out a certain programme, but as soon as they came into this Chamber they repudiated every promise they made to the people. We did not tell the people that we would not raise the rents. We told them that if we got back to power we would raise the rents, and we did so.

Mr. J. JONES: Don't forget that you told the people you would not reduce wages.

Mr. W. COOPER: I admit that perhaps there are a few small men who are labouring under difficulties owing to having to pay a high rent.

Mr. J. JONES: It is too high.

[Mr. W. Cooper.

Mr. W. COOPER: The hon. gentleman says it is too high. He may be one of the unfortunates, but there are squatters out West and in the North-west who do not mind their rents being raised. If the hon. member for Keonely thinks he has been unjustly treated, and he can put up a good case, he should go to the Land Court. If he cannot convince the Land Court that he has a good case, that is not the fault of the Government. We do not dictate to the Land Court as to what rents they must assess.

Mr. J. JONES: Yes, you do.

Mr. W. COOPER: The hon. gentleman may say so, but it is not the first time he has made a statement that is not borne out by facts. The reason that people are not going on the land is not because of any maladministration of this Government. It is because the land values are too high. In my opinion, the land values for agricultural purposes in Queensland are too high. If you endeavour to purchase land for agricultural purposes, you will find that by the time you have paid the principal and interest on your borrowed money it is impossible for you to make a reasonable and honest living.

Mr. CATTERMULL: What about the Crown lands?

Mr. W. COOPER: I say here definitely—I do not go behind anybody's back to say it—that Crown lands are too high; and I suppose one of the reasons why they have not been reduced is that the freeholders would get up such a hue and cry about the reduction of the prices of land that no Government would be able to stand by it.

Mr. CATTERMULL: Two wrongs do not make a right.

Mr. W. COOPER: Hon. members opposite have done more than two wrongs; I have never known them to do anything right. Charges have been made against the Government about land tax. Whilst I agree and say here definitely that land tax upon a man who is working his own land is not a fair tax. I say also that it was absolutely necessary to impose a land tax to break up big estates, because, after all, we

[5 p.m.] know that thousands of men in Queensland are only too willing to take up agricultural pursuits if they can get land at reasonable prices.

Mr. MOORE: You can get land to-day at less than the cost of improvements.

Mr. W. COOPER: It may be so on the Darling Downs, but you cannot do that in the Rosewood electorate. I admit that the hon. member knows something of what he is talking about on the Darling Downs, and I am sorry to hear what he says, but I have never known the hon. member to do much to uplift the unfortunate settlers in his electorate.

Mr. MOORE: We have done nothing to rob them like you fellows did.

Mr. W. COOPER: That is an admission that they did nothing at all—they have done nothing to help them and nothing to rob them. The unfortunate Jimbour selectors took up land on a repurchased estate, not from a Labour Government, but the hon. member's Liberal Government of the past, and found that it was impossible for them to carry on and redeem their promises. Hon. members opposite will tell the people of Queensland that they are the friends of the man on the land, but there we have a clear instance of the hard conditions put upon

them, so that they had to come to this Government for relief. The hon. member may smile; no doubt he is endeavouring to convey to those unfortunate settlers that it was on his representations that they got that relief. The man on the land to-day is grasping the Primary Producers' Organisation with both hands; and in my electorate, at any rate, claims that this is the only Government who have attempted to do anything for him, or give him a fair deal.

We recognise that in Queensland land settlement is necessary, and there is only one way to bring it about—that is, by a reduction of land values. Land, after all, is the chief means of wealth production, and unless we can reduce land values in Queensland, we cannot expect to settle a very great number of men on the land.

Mr. MORGAN: Land is cheap enough now.

Mr. W. COOPER: It all depends on whether the hon. member is selling his land or buying somebody else's. I am quite satisfied that if he got an independent valuator to value his land—

Mr. MORGAN: I am trying to sell it and cannot.

Mr. W. COOPER: If the hon. member cannot, it is evident that he is not trying to sell it, because I am satisfied that he could sell it if he would take a reasonable price. The hon. member is like many more who come from Victoria, and take up freehold land as cheaply as possible, and want to make a small fortune out of it in a few years. I know the hon. member's type of land speculator perfectly well. He comes here and takes up a few hundred or a thousand or two acres, and wants to make a fortune out of the small man, whose friend he endeavours to convince this Chamber he is.

Mr. MORGAN: You can get land for nothing.

Mr. W. COOPER: I am surprised that the hon. member does not own more, because I have never seen him refuse anything he could get for nothing. Hon. members opposite claim to be the friends of the farmer; but can they point out to me anything they ever did for the farmer other than to warn him, "Look out for the dirty Labour party; they will confiscate your farm; watch those navvies"? I remember working once on railway construction, and the navvies went into a small village near, and the people said, "Look out, the navvies are coming along." One of my boys came and asked me once, "Say, dad, will navvies hurt you?" That is the attitude hon. members opposite have taken up towards the worker. I have listened very attentively to them. They have claimed to be the friends to the toiler, but I say that not one of them is the friend of the toiler, judging by their attitude since we have been in power.

Mr. BRAND: You voted for a decrease in their wages.

Mr. W. COOPER: When I gave my vote, it counteracted the hon. member's vote for a 10 per cent. reduction. If hon. members were over here, it would be, not a 5 per cent. reduction, but a 15 per cent. reduction.

Mr. BRAND: No reduction at all.

Mr. W. COOPER: We have to deal with things as they are. Hon. members on the other side have done all they possibly could, both inside this Chamber and outside it, to convince the people of Queensland that it is

*Mr. W. Cooper.]*

necessary to oust this Government and place themselves on the Treasury benches in their stead. Judging from what I know of the hon. members opposite—and I believe I am safe in speaking for a very large majority of the people of Queensland—if they were in our places Queensland would be very differently governed.

Mr. MORGAN: Quite true.

Mr. W. COOPER: So retrogressive would they be that they would last only about twelve months.

Mr. BRAND: They would not require proxies.

Mr. W. COOPER: Judging by the looks of my friend, the doctor who would give him a certificate that he is anything but healthy would be a disgrace to his profession.

I congratulate the Premier on his Financial Statement. I congratulate him, also, upon the exposure he made last week. In spite of the wriggling of hon. gentlemen opposite, I am satisfied that, as far as the minds of the people of Queensland are concerned, they will never be able to dissociate themselves from this incident.

Mr. MORGAN: The less you say about that the better.

Mr. W. COOPER: I could say as much about it as the hon. member. It is just as well that I am not saying as much as I know; the hon. member would not be very pleased to hear it. I have no desire to detain the House at any great length.

Mr. MORGAN: Keep going; it is not often we hear you.

Mr. COOPER: Good things come very rarely; which cannot be said of the hon. gentleman's speeches.

Mr. J. JONES (*Kennedy*): We are very lucky to have an opportunity of speaking. Several times in the last week or two I have been anxious to speak, but have not been able because of the operation of the "gag."

I would like to refer to the interview that is said to have taken place between the Premier and Mr. Garbutt. I would not be concerned about it only that the Premier has stated that Mr. Garbutt said that if he (the Premier) would form a new party the Northern Country party would be prepared to follow him. I am one of that party—I think the biggest half. (Laughter.) I, like my leader, deny that Mr. Garbutt had any authority to make that statement. I am glad that Mr. Garbutt has denied it; and I take Mr. Garbutt's word in preference to that of the Premier—because I have had an experience of the Premier's veracity, and after that experience I do not think his word is worth anything.

The PREMIER: The Country party is bound to attack me now.

Mr. J. JONES: I have always attacked the hon. gentleman, and I always will. Some months ago the Premier came to Townsville, and it was decided to give him a public reception. I was invited to go down, and I went down. It happened—I do not know why—that they placed me alongside the Premier. (Laughter.) Whilst other speakers—including the hon. member for Townsville and the hon. member for Mundingburra—were addressing the gathering, the Premier and I were conversing in an undertone in regard to many things touching the affairs of Queensland. In reply to a question by

[Mr. W. Cooper.

the Premier regarding the chances of the Labour party, these are the words I used—

"As far as you are concerned, there are many people in Queensland to-day who would not mind your being Premier, if you were not leading the gang you are leading now."

Mr. COLLINS: Did you refer to us as a "gang"?

Mr. J. JONES: Yes.

Mr. COLLINS: You ought to be ashamed of yourself.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to withdraw that expression.

Mr. J. JONES: I am not using the expression here. I was referring to what I said in Townsville.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I repeat, the hon. member must withdraw it.

Mr. J. JONES: I will withdraw it.

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): I rise to a point of order. The hon. member was relating a conversation that took place in Townsville.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Mr. Jones.

Mr. VOWLES: I rise to a point of order.

Mr. J. JONES: I am not using the expression here.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! That incident is closed. The hon. member will proceed with his speech.

Mr. J. JONES: Can I go on with my reminiscences? Those were the words I used to the Premier. After the hon. member for Townsville and the hon. member for Mundingburra had spoken, I was asked to speak. I had no wish to say anything in favour of the Premier. I was very glad to go there and meet the Premier of Queensland, because he was the Premier—although one might disagree with his politics. I said that, as I could not say anything nice about him, I would say nothing; and I sat down. That does not show that I was anxious to have the Premier as my leader. When he rose to reply, the Premier, after referring to what the hon. member for Townsville and the hon. member for Mundingburra had said, turned round to me, and with what, I think, was intended to be a jocular sort of smile, but what to me looked like a sickly repudiatory kind of grin, the hon. gentleman said—

"I am sure that Mr. Jones will not mind me telling you what he told me in confidence a few moments ago."

The PREMIER: No; I did not say that.

Mr. J. JONES: That is in the Townsville Press. The hon. gentleman continued—

"He told me he would not mind my being Premier, if I were not leading the Labour party."

The PREMIER: No; I did not say that.

Mr. J. JONES: It is published in the Townsville Press.

The PREMIER: It is not reported in the Townsville Press.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must accept the denial of the Premier.

Mr. J. JONES: I will accept the denial; but it is in the paper. (Laughter.)

Mr. VOWLES: Taken by a stenographer, too.

Mr. J. JONES: I have finished with that incident. You find the Premier twisting

my words in Townsville, to suit his own purpose and to injure a political opponent.

The PREMIER: Not at all.

Mr. J. JONES: I do not think it says much for a gentleman holding the position which he holds.

The PREMIER: If you cannot attend receptions to the Premier without trying to make capital out of him in this House, you ought to stay away.

Mr. J. JONES: I am not trying to make political capital. I was not dishonest; you were.

The PREMIER: If you cannot act more honourably than that, you ought to stay away.

Mr. J. JONES: I do not wish to pose as an authority on finance: I am not; but I do not think a man requires to be a financial expert to realise the unfortunate position that Queensland is in to-day because of the mismanagement and waste of this miscalled Labour Government. You have only to look at the State enterprises, which have been referred to by many hon. members. I am going to refer particularly to the cattle stations. Those stations are supposed to have 200,000 head of cattle on 30,000 miles of country. That works out at, roughly, seven head per mile. No selector in the country would carry under ten head per mile. The Government imagine they have 200,000 head of cattle. I say they have not. Take their brandings. Any man who has been amongst cattle—I have been for a few years—knows that 21 per cent. is ridiculous branding in good seasons. If they had 200,000 head of cattle on those holdings, instead of there being 40,000 head in the branding they would have at least 60,000 or 70,000 head. Take the bullocks. For the year ended 30th June, 1921, they had killed more cattle for beef than they had sold—they killed 1,200 head of bullocks, and they sold under 1,000. Again, the percentage of bullocks that they have sold shows that they have not the number of cattle that they claim to have. They should sell, off those holdings, at least 10 per cent.; and, instead of selling about 47,000 head of bullocks in three years, they should have sold 60,000 head.

Mr. RIRDAN: No private station in the Gulf ever sold 10 per cent.; the average right through has been 7 per cent.

Mr. J. JONES: That is another aspect that I would like to bring before the Committee. The 30,000 miles of country which the Government hold, if cut up in selections—as it should be—would make 600 very decent-sized selections comprising 50-mile blocks. Each of those selections would easily carry a population of five persons, which on the whole area would represent a population of 3,000 people. Besides that, each of those selections would employ labour in improving the homestead; because every selection has to have yards, houses, and paddocks. Here we have the Government trying up 30,000 miles of country whilst men have been looking for country which they could not get. I do not blame the Government for having lost money on their stations in the last twelve months, or since the slump in cattle occurred. Every person who owns a cattle station has lost money. I take no exception to this Government losing money on State stations. When they got £13 and

£14 for their bullocks they showed a loss, and they could only show a profit by increasing the value of their stock.

Mr. DASH: Does the hon. member know that the managers of State stations have proved themselves to be the best managers?

Mr. J. JONES: We have heard a lot about what the Labour Government have done for the "under dog"—the poor working man. I would like this Government to look back thirty or forty years, when there were Tory Governments in power, when there was no such thing as a Labour Government. What did those Governments do at that time?

Mr. COLLINS: Ten bob a week and their tucker.

Mr. J. JONES: In my electorate there are three goldfield reserves, embracing an area of fully 3,000 square miles. This area was thrown open solely for the use of the working man. It was not required that they should have any other land, but so long as they had a miner's right they could run stock on the reserve free of charge. This Government have done nothing to help the working man in comparison with what was done by Tory Governments fifty years ago. There are many selectors to-day who started by having their herds on these goldfields around Charters Towers, Ravenswood, and Pentland. The hon. member for Quenton knows that perfectly well.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: They ran their stock on the reserve for a time, and when it was eaten out they took them back on to their own country.

Mr. J. JONES: These goldfield reserves were a failure because the conditions were too liberal. Anybody could make use of the reserves as breeding stations. Those conditions existed in the eighties, when men started on the fields as dairymen. Charters Towers had more dairymen in those districts then than they have to-day. The drought then came along and cut them out, and on the break of the drought they did not go back to dairying; they simply used those reserves as breeding stations. It was quite a common thing for a man to have 3,000 head of stock on those reserves for which he paid no rent. That is one of the reasons why the goldfield reserves were a failure. If some restriction had been placed upon the number of stock a man could run on these reserves, or if the owners had been asked to pay for agistment, that would have protected the small man, but the small man was crushed out by the big man coming in.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: Why did not the local authorities charge for agistment?

Mr. J. JONES: They had no power.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: They had.

Mr. J. JONES: This matter came up in Charters Towers some years ago, and the local authorities were allowed to charge 6d. per head, but that 6d. per head was paid into consolidated revenue.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: No; that was a matter affecting the Mines Department, and not the local authorities at all.

Mr. J. JONES: The hon. member for Bowen and other hon. members opposite have made references on different occasions to "the hon. member for Kennedy and his friends." When I speak in this House it is on behalf of the man beside, whether he be in a big or small way, but when I do, I have

*Mr. J. Jones.]*

the sneer from the hon. member for Bowen about "the hon. member for Kennedy and his friends" riding about in a Rolls-Royce.

Mr. COLLINS: I never mentioned that.

Mr. J. JONES: I always thought that a Roll-Royce was looked upon as the aristocrat amongst motor-cars. The car that I drive is called a "Nondescript." I would also like to refer to the remarks made by the hon. member for Bowen in describing myself and other cattle men in my electorate as wealthy beef barons. There are three petty sessions districts in the Kennedy electorate—Cape River, Charters Towers, and Ravenswood—and the number of cattle holders in those three districts amount to 645, out of which 493 now hold less than 100 head of cattle. Does the hon. member for Bowen suggest that these men drive about in Rolls-Royce cars?

Mr. PEASE: Who pays Mr. Edkins £3,500 a year?

Mr. J. JONES: There are sixty-five cattle-owners owning 100 to 300 head of cattle, and forty-two owning from 301 to 1,000 head of cattle, and only forty-five owners out of 645 owning over 1,000 head of cattle. These men, who were called beef barons a couple of years ago, are now battling to make a living. When I asked in this House last year for the Government to give them some assistance, I complained that the only relief that was given to the cattlemen was in the way of a 10 per cent. penalty for late payment of rent, and the Secretary for Lands, in a faint voice, said "That is fixed by statute." One would imagine from the way he said that that they had a lot of reverence for the statute. The Government have a lot of reverence for the statute when they do not want to alter it, but you can take it from me that when they do want to alter anything, right from the "head serang" down to the "whip," they can get over the statutes all right. The Government had no respect for the statute when they introduced the Judges' Retirement Bill and the Bill to abolish the Legislative Council. They did not then say: "That is fixed by statute."

Mr. WINSTANLEY: Who fixed it?

Mr. J. JONES: Hon. members opposite are under the impression that taxation is paid by the wealthy man. They seem to be under the impression that the "repudiation rent" is paid by the big squatters. It is, but it is paid from the wages of the working man. That is what is taking place all over the cattle country, and is taking place in my electorate. It is what is causing half of the unemployment. I am not going to say that the Government are responsible for all of the unemployment. We know that the war has caused some of it. This Government are responsible for a lot of unemployment on the cattle stations to-day. Nobody has got any heart to make any improvements. They say: "If the Government will repudiate one thing, they will repudiate again."

Mr. DASH: There was a reduction of 17s. in the wages of men on cattle stations. How many more have been employed?

Mr. J. JONES: I am not in the habit of talking for a long time. I only say a few words. I say what I think, and that is sufficient.

Mr. POLLOCK (*Graciously*): I do not want to drag this debate on any longer than neces-

[Mr. J. Jones.

sary, but merely want to comment on the sneering references that have been made by almost every hon. member opposite with regard to the Speaker or Chairman of Committees giving their casting votes in a certain manner in this House.

Mr. WALKER: They have got to do it.

Mr. POLLOCK: That is a very serious reflection upon the Chair, and the hon. member should be called upon to withdraw that remark.

Mr. WALKER: I do not say it secretly. The party to which the hon. member belongs have adopted a resolution whereby the majority must bind the whole party.

[5.30 p.m.]

Mr. POLLOCK: The hon. member is trying to get out of it in a very peculiar way.

The CHAIRMAN: Do I understand the hon. member for Cooroora to make a reflection on the Chair?

Mr. WALKER: I am not making any reflection upon the Chair. I am reflecting on members opposite.

Mr. POLLOCK: It is one of the insinuations which have been cast, not only on yourself, Mr. Kirwan, but on the Speaker, when the votes were equal and your casting vote was given in favour of the Government. Opposition members have attempted to prove that it is a very bad thing indeed for the conduct of business in this House when the Speaker and Chairman of Committees have to exercise their casting votes. I want to say, in the first place, that these casting votes would not have been necessary if the Opposition had acted in an ordinarily decent way.

Mr. WALKER: The same as you fellows acted many years ago—exactly the same.

Mr. POLLOCK: As long as I have been associated with the Labour party, no member on this side has ever refused to give a "pair" to an Opposition member, and I challenge Opposition members to show any such instance. Only the other day, when the hon. member for Albert desired to leave the House he was given a "pair" by the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, and I admire that hon. member who showed independence of spirit in overriding the decision of his own party.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: With the full consent of the leader and "whip" of my party, I am in the habit of giving the hon. member for Fortitude Valley a "pair," and he reciprocates.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. POLLOCK: I am heartily in accord with that. While members of this party are prepared to give a "pair" to an hon. member opposite who desires to get away, either for business reasons or because he does not feel well, what reciprocity are we getting from them? All we get is a refusal to give "pairs" to men who are absolutely unable to attend the House through illness. That is the reciprocity which hon. members opposite have indulged in.

Mr. WALKER: You should have done it years ago.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: We did give it.

Mr. POLLOCK: I do not know of any instance since I have been a member of the Labour party where "pairs" have been refused. The Premier said the other day

that he would give a "pair" to any member of the Opposition who desired one at any time.

Mr. VOWLES: He refused last session.

Mr. POLLOCK: We all know that he offered to withdraw the Bill to provide for proxy votes, if hon. members opposite would give "pairs" to those who were incapacitated. I notice that the more decent members of the Opposition refused to have anything to say upon that Bill, possibly for that reason.

Mr. MORGAN: Almost every man on this side spoke. The "gag" was applied on the second reading.

Mr. POLLOCK: Anyone with a sense of fairness can come to no other conclusion than that the debate should have been "gagged," because there is no doubt that members of the Opposition were expressing platitudes and tediously repeating what other hon. members had been saying for nearly two hours. Their attitude on that Bill was one of total obstruction. They even divided on the question, "That the Chairman leave the chair and report to the House." On every conceivable occasion they divided the House. Their idea of political strategy is to wear out the division bells of the House—beyond that they seem to have no capacity for anything. In regard to the casting vote of the Speaker or the Chairman of Committees, there is nothing unusual in a Speaker or Chairman of Committees giving his casting vote in favour of the Government.

Mr. MORGAN: Not all the time, and on important principles.

Mr. POLLOCK: "May" lays it down that it is an unusual thing for the Speaker or Chairman of Committees to give a casting vote; and why? Because in the House of Commons, where there are over 600 members, there is never such a close division that the vote of the Speaker or Chairman of Committees is required to hold the balance of power, either for or against the Government. Then, again, a different procedure is followed in the House of Commons, on which "May's" statements are based, to what prevails here. In the British Parliament no Speaker is ever opposed by the Opposition. Mr. Speaker Lowther, who occupied the chair for almost twenty years, and who was retired and offered a peerage, such as every Speaker of the House of Commons has received, was never opposed right from the time he contested his seat as a member of Parliament, nor was any opposition offered to him. He came in as an unopposed member on every occasion, and, consequently, he could fairly be said to be a non-party man.

Mr. VOWLES: In your organisation has the Speaker to contest a plebiscite this coming election?

Mr. POLLOCK: You had better ask the organisation—I know nothing about it. The Speaker and the Chairman of Committees in this House represent a certain party. The Opposition, by their churlish refusal to give "pairs," rendered it necessary for the Chairman, in the interests of the party which he was returned to support, and in order to carry out his functions, to vote for the Government if he so desired, and he did so desire. What is wrong with that, and why are hon. members opposite sneering at the Government because the services of those whom they term "officers of the House" are utilised in passing a Government measure?

Mr. MORGAN: Why do they take instructions from the Premier?

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member to withdraw that statement.

Mr. MORGAN: In deference to your request, I will withdraw it.

Mr. POLLOCK: I think I have made it clear that it is not the usual thing, by any means, for the Speaker or Chairman of Committees to have to vote; but in all Australian Parliament, where it was necessary for a Government to carry on, and the Speaker was a member of a definite party, it was always considered the function and duty of the Speaker to vote for his party, and that was done. I could give numerous instances. Even Mr. Speaker Bell, in this Chamber, voted to keep the then Government in office from time to time, but no notice was taken of that, simply because he did not happen to be a member of the Labour party or to be keeping the Labour Government in power.

I listened to the remarks of the hon. member for Kennedy, who blamed the Government for the unemployment existing in the cattle industry. A large amount of that unemployment is due to market conditions, over which neither this nor any other Australian Government have any control. Any hon. member who says that a reduction of wages of men working in these industries will lead to more employment does not know what he is talking about, or is talking with his tongue in his cheek. In almost the whole of the Gregory electorate, every pastoralist who can decently do so is entirely evading the provisions of the award. That is rather a sweeping statement to make; but in almost every sheep station in the Gregory electorate, where an employer can evade the award by employing a larger number of jackeroos than the award allows, it is done. Many of the Government inspectors will tell you that the scheme is so worked by the pastoralists that it is almost impossible for the inspector to obtain a conviction against anyone who adopts this method. It is only a few weeks ago since the Attorney-General and myself were travelling north of Cloncurry, and we discovered up near Urandangie a manager who was rearing holes in the atmosphere in an endeavour to down this Government, and pointing out that his company was going "broke" through being forced to pay the wages fixed by the Arbitration Court. We found on investigation that, out of thirty men working on the place, over twenty were jackeroos brought up from Brisbane or imported from the other States. We know that the rate of pay for jackeroos is a good deal lower than that provided for the ordinary station hand. That applies in a good many instances to other stations.

Mr. VOWLES: How could he have such a large majority of jackeroos out of thirty hands employed when the proportion is only one to four, according to the Act?

Mr. POLLOCK: Portion of his station property is in the Northern Territory and portion in Queensland. Portion is exempt from the award. You cannot get the ordinary station hands to work in the Northern Territory for less than the Queensland rate, but in the Northern Territory it is quite legal to have a majority of jackeroos amongst the employees so long as they are stationed in the Northern Territory. On a big station in the Central district, not far from Longreach,

*Mr. Pollock.]*



I know that thirty out of the forty employees are jackeroos. That is worked in such a cunning manner that no conviction can be obtained against the offenders. Yet the hut inspector will tell you that, although he received complaints that there were more jackeroos than the employers were entitled to keep on the place, it was so cunningly arranged that he was unable to prosecute with any hope of success.

Mr. MORGAN: Tell us why.

Mr. POLLOCK: A jackeroo would be employed for three weeks, and then he would be supposed to be put off temporarily, and another man put on in his place. Various other dodges are worked. I am sure if the leader of the Opposition cared to talk, he could explain just as well as I can how these things are worked. So could the hon. member for Murilla.

Mr. MORGAN: Not at all.

Mr. POLLOCK: I stake my political faith on the question. The hut inspector knows that the award is being evaded in a wholesale way, and yet he is unable to take out a prosecution with any hope of success.

Mr. MOORE: Don't you find that the jackeroos are as keen after the award rates as the men?

Mr. POLLOCK: No. If the jackeroos were as keen after the award rates as the average station hands, they would not be employed at all, because the jackeroo certainly has had no experience compared with a station hand, and if the employer has to pay the same rate of wages, he will certainly employ the man with the most experience.

In regard to the Financial Statement, I am very pleased to notice that an amount has been placed on the Estimates for the construction of the Longreach-Winton Railway. I am convinced that that connection is urgently needed. While I am fair enough to admit that the North Coast line now under construction has taken away some of the arguments which were used in previous years for the necessity of building the Longreach-Winton connection, still I recognise that the Government, in placing £50,000 on the Estimates to start the work almost immediately, are at least doing something in the direction of making this permanent link. Mr. Evans, the late Commissioner for Railways, in his report for 1914, said it was a good idea to have the Longreach-Winton line, because at that time the Queensland Government were paying, on an average, £25,000 per annum for the transit of rolling-stock by sea from the Southern to the Northern division. He pointed out that the construction of the Longreach-Winton line would certainly save £25,000 annually. Of course, as the Northern Railways grow, the amount of money necessary for shifting rolling-stock would be greater every year. The building of the North Coast line, however, will mean that most of the rolling-stock will now be taken along the coast line, and that will remove a good deal of the argument in favour of the Longreach-Winton connection. However, the connection with Winton will prove of great benefit for the removal of starving stock, and I am satisfied the money will be well spent.

There are many matters one could deal with on a Financial Statement, but most matters that require attention have been dealt with by members on both sides of the

House. The figures show that the Government have been economising in a very sound way, and have been reducing the expenditure in various departments.

Mr. KEAR: Do you say that retrenchment is a sound way of economising?

Mr. POLLOCK: I will leave the hon. member to give his own views on retrenchment in his own way and in his own time. I am certainly not here to be put in the witness-box by any hon. member. That question will be answered by me at the proper time and in the proper place. I say, in conclusion, that I believe the Government are administering the various departments wisely, and I am hoping that the deficit will not be so large as the Treasurer anticipates.

Mr. CATTERMULL (*Musgrave*): In looking through the Financial Statement, I notice that we have borrowed huge sums of money during the last seven years. During the period that the present Government have been in office they borrowed £34,000,000 or £35,000,000, and I think it is high time that we called a halt in the matter of borrowing. The deficit for the financial year just closed was nearly £200,000, and for the next financial year it is anticipated that it will be somewhere in the vicinity of £500,000 or £600,000. It is very peculiar how men change their opinions regarding borrowing. I would like to draw attention to remarks made by the present Premier, Mr. Theodore, when he was in opposition in 1912. Mr. Theodore was condemning the Denham Administration, and he said—

“Mr. THEODORE: It seems to me that there is an avenue for great reform regarding our finances. The hon. gentleman never looked at it in that light before. Hon. gentlemen opposite cannot get away from the old borrowing policy. They always want to go to some other people and some other land to borrow money for the construction of work in our country. . . . If our taxation was adjusted a little better, we would be able to raise sufficient revenue to carry on the necessary public works out of revenue at the present time. We could build over 200 miles of railway in a year at a cost of a little over £1,000,000. . . . I consider that £1,000,000 could easily be raised by a slight adjustment of taxation. We could have a fairer adjustment of the income tax and we could have something in the nature of a land tax.”

“Mr. Denham: I do not want to increase taxation.”

“Mr. THEODORE: You do not want to increase taxation on your political friends.”

“Mr. Denham: They are the only ones who are paying it just now.”

“Mr. THEODORE: Everyone in the community is paying, because it is being passed on. The consumers are being paying the tax; it is passed on to them.”

It is surprising, after reading those remarks, to notice the attitude adopted by the Government of to-day who have borrowed more money in seven years than any previous Government borrowed in fourteen years. The Premier was right when he said that another £1,000,000 could be raised from taxation, but where are the 200 miles of railway that he said could be built with that money? We would be better off if we did not borrow so much. If we go back to

[*Mr. Pollock.*]

the time when the United States of America had a quarrel with the mother country, we know that they could not borrow a penny piece, and they had to fall back on their own resources. That was the making of America. There is no doubt the same thing would apply here. I consider that we use too much borrowed money in this country altogether. During the last seven years, in spite of all the borrowed money that has been coming into the country, there has been more unemployment than ever before in the history of Queensland. Only last July between £700 and £800 was spent in Bundaberg on Government rations. One wonders why there is all this unemployment. I say without hesitation that it is owing to the fact that the Arbitration Court has fixed wages higher than the industries can afford to pay. The moment you do that you kill industry and create unemployment. I am quite convinced that a lot of men have come from the Southern States, not only looking for work, but to get rations as well. At this juncture I would like to quote the following paragraph from the Maryborough "Alert," edited by Mr. Demaine—

#### "UNEMPLOYMENT RATIONS.

"We are most decidedly pleased to note the protest entered against the free-ration system by the Bundaberg Branch of the Australian Workers' Union last week. The whole system is wasteful and degrading, and we have been surprised at the Government in so long persisting in it. Scores of thousands of pounds have been spent, and not 1 cent is there to show for it. We know, of course, that people cannot be allowed to starve; and where the applicants for relief are unable, through sickness or other reasonable cause, to give some service for the rations, they should be given freely; but where the applicant is able to work work should be provided, nay, demanded, as a condition of the rations being granted. We are satisfied that 90 per cent. of those receiving rations would greatly prefer to work for them rather than have them as a dole, and the person who is able and won't work for them should not get them. There is no need, in this connection, to cut down wages; let the work done be paid for at ruling rates, but let us have some work done and not have our people degraded by doles of food. We will be courting the same disaster as Rome when the people were given bread and circuses."

I say that the Government, instead of giving doles, should provide work. I agree that 90 per cent. of those men would like to get work, and the Government could easily find them work by developing the land and making ready-made farms. On this same subject Mr. Lennon said in 1914—

"I want the Treasurer to understand that unemployment is worse than the bubonic plague or smallpox. It is worse than any disease that anyone can name. Unemployment is the curse of the working classes. It is the duty of the Government to do everything they possibly can to avert the disaster of unemployment to a very large degree in Queensland."

And yet there has been more unemployment during the last seven years than ever before.

Mr. COLLINS: Fifty thousand soldiers came back from the war.

Mr. CATTERMULL: That had nothing to do with it.

Mr. COLLINS: It had a lot to do with it.

Mr. CATTERMULL: During the last three or four weeks the Government have gone to the Arbitration Court for reductions in the pay of public servants, and reductions are also being made in the pay of some of those officers who have not been allowed to take advantage of the court. When men have been allowed to go to the court and then reductions are made, I say it is all right, but where officers have not been allowed to get any advantage by going there, their salaries should not be decreased. I think the Premier should go fully into the matter and see that justice is done to such men.

I supported the Primary Producers' Organisation Bill, and I hope it will do good. There is only one way in which it can, and that is by extending the organisation beyond Queensland. It has to extend to the whole of the other States.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear!

Mr. CATTERMULL: If that is done, something may come of it, and it may achieve what we all hope for. I notice from the returns that the workers are paying a tremendous amount of the income tax. We have been told, times out of number, that this Government do not tax the worker. I would like to read an extract from the Commissioner's report—

"Although the number of assessments for the year ended 30th June, 1922, increased by 11,135 as compared with the number for the previous year, the amount of tax collected showed a decrease of £215,806. This falling off from the collections was due mainly to the slump in the cattle industry and to the fact that the profits of persons and companies engaged in mercantile pursuits showed a considerable decline. Had it not been for the large increase in the number of employees' assessments, and for the fact that manufacturers and those engaged in the sugar industry, experienced a much better year in 1920-21 than they did in 1920, the falling off in the revenue would have been very much greater."

On another page of the report I find that the number of employees receiving under £500 per year who paid tax was 11,605, with a total taxable income of £1,093,482 and a tax of £24,532. The number of employees receiving between £501 and £1,000 was 368, with a total taxable income of £258,568, and a tax of £14,070. Then, 6,180 public servants receiving less than £500 paid £15,725, on a total taxable income of £530,096, and forty-seven receiving between £500 and £1,000 paid £1,750 on a total taxable income of £33,810. On another page I find that the total number of employees who paid tax was 15,769, who paid income tax amounting to £160,978, or 15.45 per cent. of the total tax. The public servants who paid tax numbered altogether 8,003, and they paid £30,165, or 2.69 per cent. of the total tax, so that those two classes of persons paid altogether 18.34 per cent. of the tax collected. Not only is that so, but no doubt taxation which is paid by [7 p.m.] other men is passed on, and ultimately the worker pays the whole of the taxation. I want to emphasise this,

Mr. Cattermull.]

because the party occupying the Treasury benches have repeated, time and again, the statement that the worker does not pay the taxation at all. Practically one-fifth of the taxation collected is paid by the workers.

MR. PEASE: Is that what you said when you belonged to this party?

MR. CATTERMULL: I was never a member of the Labour party. I think that the hon. gentleman who made that interjection knows very well that he is uttering something which is not in accordance with facts.

HON. W. FORGAN SMITH: Did you not desire once to get from this party a position in the Legislative Council?

MR. CATTERMULL: If the hon. gentleman can produce any correspondence from me relating to that, I will be quite willing to give a donation to the hospital in Brisbane; provided that, if he fails, he will do likewise. These interjections are very poor ones, and they have no effect so far as I am concerned.

HON. W. FORGAN SMITH: Did not you ask the hon. member for Musgrave to put your name forward as a prospective member of the Legislative Council?

MR. CATTERMULL: The hon. gentleman knows that he is telling a deliberate falsehood when he says that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order! That language is not parliamentary, and I ask the hon. member to withdraw it.

MR. CATTERMULL: I withdraw; but I say that that hon. gentleman is uttering a statement which is not in accordance with facts.

MR. PEASE: What about the statement in the "Sun"?

MR. CATTERMULL: The hon. member who has interjected may have had something to do with the statement in the "Sun."

MR. PEASE: No, it would not take any statements from me.

MR. CATTERMULL: I think it is absolutely unfair to be compelled to furnish the stock returns asked for by the Commissioner of Taxes. I do not think that the people should be asked for any stock returns. As long as a man pays on his sales, that is all that should be required. To-day a man is compelled to pay on his one-year brandings as 15s. per head. The next year they are taken at stock values—£3 per head. Many a man pays taxation on something he never receives; and that is absolutely unfair. In a young country like this, where we have so much undeveloped land, there should be no land tax levied on land which is used for agricultural purposes, no matter what the area may be.

Price-fixing, which was brought in by this Government, possibly was a necessary measure during the period of the war. Having to study economy, I think the time has arrived for that department to be abolished. I do not think we are getting out of it all that we should get, and I would like to see it cut out. On that matter I will quote a statement made by the present Secretary for Agriculture, as reported in "Hansard," volume cxx., pages 759-760—

"I maintain that to attempt to fix prices by proclamation in normal times is unsound and unscientific, and is going to discourage production."

[Mr. Cattermull.

I thoroughly agree with that statement, and the sooner the Government put that principle into effect the better it will be for all concerned, and they will be able to save money. I hope that they will agree with one of their Ministers in his statement in 1916, and that they will wipe out the position of Commissioner for Prices.

There is no doubt that this Government, and past Governments, have done a lot for education. I am in accord and in sympathy with the Agricultural Education Bill introduced this session, and I hope that it will become law. I think it is a good thing. It happened to be at the Childers show and I saw a very fine exhibit from a rural school. I was surprised at the work which was done by the children.

HON. W. FORGAN SMITH: There was a very fine exhibit at the Brisbane Exhibition, too.

MR. CATTERMULL: I thoroughly agree with the work done in the rural schools. I think it is wonderful. If the Government could have more of those schools established in various places, so that children could obtain the benefit of the education that is required by a man settling on the land, so that he can do and act for himself, it would be of very great benefit. Dealing with high schools, I think it would be far better if the Government would provide hostels in connection with those schools. The high schools at the present time are all right for the people living within a certain radius, but people who are living outside that radius cannot get the benefit of those schools. Many children pass an examination and qualify for admission to high schools, but when they come down to Brisbane or other centres to attend those schools, they find that they are unable to get the accommodation required. I would suggest to the Secretary for Public Instruction that he do something in the way of establishing hostels where high schools exist now. I do not say for one moment that they should be free. I believe that the parents would be quite willing to pay for the accommodation of their children. If that were done, the children who secured the desired pass would be able to get the education offered at the high schools. I know of children who have gone to the State schools and have passed examinations and have gained admission to the high schools, and, as a result of the education received at the high schools, they have obtained very good positions. Do not debar children living in an outside area from going to the high schools. Let the department erect hostels, so that children living in the country districts can take advantage of that education. In dealing with schools, I would like also to deal briefly with the Department of Public Works, which works in conjunction with the Department of Public Instruction in connection with the work required at various schools. Very often I find that, although the Secretary for Public Instruction and his department agree that some work is required to be done at a certain school, they have no say in the matter. It is passed on to the Department of Public Works, and probably that work is deferred for a considerable time. I think that the Department of Public Instruction should have sole control of the amount voted for that department in connection with work on schools.

HON. W. FORGAN SMITH: What advantage would that be?

At 7.10 p.m.,

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

Mr. CATTERMULL: I am very pleased to see that the Secretary for Public Instruction has visited a number of schools in Queensland. During his visits, he has seen that certain improvements are required at the various schools. He goes back to his office and he agrees that it should be done, but, unfortunately, he has not the final say in the matter. The matter is sent on to the Department of Public Works. That department might hold it in abeyance for six, eight, or twelve months, which I think is wrong. If the work were carried out by the Department of Public Instruction it would be far better, because that department is in touch with the work and knows all the requirements, and knows what work is most urgently required. The present system is absolutely wrong, and I hope that it will be altered.

I am very pleased that the Government are giving considerable attention to cotton production, and I am also pleased to see that the agreement in connection with cotton production has been extended for a period of five years after the present year. A certain price will be paid on condition that cotton of a certain staple is supplied. The length of staple obtained depends entirely upon the soil from which it is produced. You may plant the same seed in one piece of ground and get cotton with a staple of 1 inch, and in other ground the same seed will produce cotton with a staple of  $1\frac{1}{4}$  inch or  $1\frac{1}{2}$  inch. That will cause difficulty, because the people will not know what staple the seed is going to produce until the cotton is grown and the length of staple determined. There is no doubt that we have hundreds of thousands of acres of land in this country which will grow cotton, and I trust that the opportunity which will be available to settlers of growing cotton will be availed of. I do not agree with the limitation of areas to 50 acres. If two or three men can combine and go in for a larger area for cotton-growing, every facility should be offered them. I would also draw the attention of the Government to the cotton-picker machine. I see from a copy of the "Scientific American" in the library that they have a cotton-picker in America which is now fairly perfect. I would suggest that the Government look into this matter, as it would be a very good thing to try one of those cotton-pickers here.

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: Have you any idea of the cost?

Mr. CATTERMULL: No; I have only seen the diagram. It is very light, and is wheeled about by a man.

Mr. BUTLOCK: It takes eight rows at a time.

Mr. CATTERMULL: I see that there is a loss on the railways this year of £1,772,000. There seems to be a huge loss in that connection every year. If the Government want to avoid that loss, they should free the railways from political control, and let the Commissioner run them on business lines. Their system of construction is wrong. Instead of starting one line at a time, and completing it, the Government start half a dozen, and leave them unfinished. If the Government would complete the lines which they start, there would be a chance of the lines paying.

There is one reform which is very urgently needed to-day. We know that instructions have been issued to the police to put all the names they possibly can on the roll, but instructions have not been issued to take off the roll the names of men who have left the district. Under the present system of enrolment, a man can enrol himself in Brisbane, and go to Bundaberg and enrol himself there, and similarly at Mackay and Cairns, and there is no way of getting him off the roll.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: That is not right.

Mr. CATTERMULL: It is so.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It is not so. The principal electoral officer would knock him off.

Mr. CATTERMULL: When the quarterly and annual lists were published giving the names of people who had left the district, the Government did something that was necessary, because we knew then when names should come off the roll. But that system has been abolished, and a man can now be on half a dozen rolls and there is no hope of taking him off again.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: That is not so.

Mr. CATTERMULL: There is no system in existence to-day whereby you can check the names of people leaving a district. A man can be on the Bundaberg roll in the name of Tom Smith or Jack Jones, and he can come to Brisbane and get on the roll under another name. There is no system for checking the names.

Mr. PEASE: Give us your remedy.

Mr. CATTERMULL: There should be ways and means provided for getting names off the roll as well as putting them on. I suggest that the police magistrates from various centres should be allowed to publish lists of names of people who have left the district. When these people fail to show that they have not left the district then their names should be struck off. We know that there are far more names on the State roll at the present time than there are on the Federal roll, and the Government should bring in some electoral reform to get over that. The Government know that that is bad, and it is up to them to remedy the mistakes they have made.

I desire to speak briefly on the question of sugar. In the Treasurer's Statement there is a reference to the appointment of a Royal Commission to report on new mills. If the Commission is to report on new mills, I hope they will consider the advisability of not building mills to suit small areas, but to build mills to suit districts. Some twenty years ago a lot of mills were scrapped in Queensland because they were too small, and larger mills took their place. A lot of the present mills will have to be scrapped and larger mills erected to take their place. To-day we have in Queensland some modern machinery. We have the South Johnstone Mill, the Babin'da Mill, and the mill at Kalamia. Those three mills are of the same pattern. They have a capacity of 800 to 900 tons of cane per day. Those mills could be triplicated or even quadrupled and three or four times the quantity of cane crushed without building new mills.

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: You said the Kalamia Mill. That is not a big mill. I think you refer to the Inkerman Mill.

Mr. Cattermull.]

Mr. CATTERMULL: I beg your pardon. I meant the Inkerman Mill. The three mills of the same pattern are South Johnstone, Babinda, and Inkerman. The Government are carrying out an irrigation scheme at Home Hill, and according to the hon. member for Bowen that irrigation scheme is going to irrigate 16,000 acres of land. That area will yield from 12 to 20 tons to the acre, or a total over the whole area of something like 240,000 tons of cane. The only mill in the district to take any surplus cane is the Proserpine Mill, which is 100 miles away, and that mill can only take 25,000 or 50,000 tons.

Mr. RYAN: Why not have another mill?

Mr. CATTERMULL: When the Government launched out on the irrigation scheme at Home Hill, they should have made provision to put a crushing plant there to crush the cane.

Mr. STOFFORD: Could they not take the cane to Proserpine?

Mr. CATTERMULL: How can the Proserpine Mill treat 240,000 tons of cane? An additional 25,000 or 30,000 tons of cane would be the maximum it could take. There is no mill in the district which will be able to take the cane that will be grown in that district.

Mr. COLLINS: There is someone there to look after that.

Mr. CATTERMULL: It is no use looking after it when the cane is grown. I hope that the Commission which is to be appointed to report on the advisability of erecting more mills will take into consideration the erection of mills to mill the districts. In the Bundaberg district we have five mills, and if we had bigger mills we would get rid of overhead charges and secure more efficient work and a reduced cost of production. The Gin Gin and Bauple Government mills are, unfortunately, not fully supplied with cane, and consequently fail to pay their interest and redemption. If the Government would only assist the mills by pushing out railway lines they would bring a lot of land within the areas on which cane could be grown, and the mills would be fully supplied. If the Goondoon-Kalliwa line were extended another 7 miles it would bring within the ambit of the Gin Gin mill another 6,000 or 7,000 acres of good cane land—5,000 acres of which is first class—which would produce enough cane to keep that mill going. I understand that 4 miles of the route have been cleared and the trees burnt off; a culvert has been put in, and the rails and sleepers were there, but the Government, unfortunately, took them all away; and if the line were completed the mill would become a paying concern. The same thing applies to the Bauple mill. There is a first-class scrub—the Goomborian Scrub—within a few miles, and if it were connected by rail that mill also would be fully supplied with cane, and there would be no need to show a deficit at the end of the financial year, as both mills are doing. There is no doubt that no mill, whether a Government mill or a private mill, can pay its way unless it is fully supplied with cane; and I commend these extensions to the Government as necessary to put these mills on a sound financial basis.

Mr. PEASE: It would be better to move the mill to North Queensland.

[Mr. Cattermull.

Mr. CATTERMULL: No. I am rather surprised at the hon. member. What we want in the North is to mill the districts with mills that can crush from 3,000 tons to 4,000 tons of cane a day. We do not want small mills. I notice that the sugar question has been debated in the Federal House of Representatives from all sides. I am sorry to see that appalling condition of affairs there. Nothing is more pleasing to me than to see members on this side and members on that side of this House at one on the point that we should have an extension of the sugar agreement. I am pleased to think that it is regarded here as a national question, not a party question. Unfortunately, once you get into the Federal arena, you find the sugar industry the butt of party politics.

Mr. FORDE: Many of the Federal Country party are opposed to a renewal of the agreement.

Mr. CATTERMULL: The hon. member for Rockhampton, a few weeks back, was in the Childers district, and he admitted that he did not know anything about cane. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. FORDE: Nothing of the kind!

Mr. CATTERMULL: He wanted to know what was plant cane and what was first ratoons, what was 205 and what was D 1135—yet he professes to be an expert. (Opposition laughter.) Now I notice that the member for Capricornia—(Government laughter)—in the Federal House has made a statement that our sugar representative sent to Melbourne is not doing his work. I want to refute that statement. Mr. Higgs complained that our sugar representative had [7.30 p.m.] not been doing the work he was sent down to do, because he had not communicated with every Minister in the Federal House. Mr. Higgs went so far as to write to each Federal Minister, and to get a reply stating that the sugar representative had not been in communication with him. When I was coming back from the Hobart Conference, in company with other representatives, I called on the Prime Minister in Melbourne in connection with the sugar agreement. The Prime Minister's words to us were—

“Send your man down into Victoria. Get among the fruitgrowers and convince them that you have a good case. If you do that, we will give you an agreement.”

We have carried that out. There was no occasion for our representative to go hobnobbing with the Federal Ministers.

Mr. FORDE: I thought you were a supporter of Mr. Higgs.

Mr. CATTERMULL: The hon. member thinks a lot.

Mr. FORDE: The trouble is, that you do not think at all.

Mr. CATTERMULL: I want to clear this matter up, because I think that Mr. Higgs has made an unfair attack on the representative whom we sent down there. That gentleman has been in touch with all the fruitgrowing districts, and within the next three weeks I think he will have finished his campaign. While going through the particular districts, he has done excellent work; and I think that we will get results. I regret that while, during the last two or three years, the Melbourne “Age” and

"Argus" have been writing letters and leaders against the sugar industry, not one of the Queensland Federal representatives has done anything to counter it; they have not looked after our interests.

Mr. FERRISS: Not one of them spoke on the sugar question on the tariff this year.

Mr. CATTERMULL: The Federal Government, I am sorry to say, have bungled very badly in having bought sugar from Java and other places. The Queensland growers cannot be blamed for that; it is outside their sphere of influence. To-day the Queensland growers are getting only 2.15d. per lb. for their raw sugar. Because the Federal Government have made losses, we should not be held accountable. If the Federal Government had had no loss or would cut their loss, and the cost of distribution were lessened, refined sugar could be sold at 4½d. per lb. If "mill whites" were allowed to come on to the market, they could be put on the market at 3½d. per lb. The Government last year promised that they would make inquiries into the question of "mill-whites," yet they have done nothing whatever. If the people want mill white sugar at 3½d. per lb., they should be allowed to get it, rather than pay 6d. per lb. The Marian mill made white sugar last year which was equal to any refined sugar; its keeping qualities were good, and the mill manager told me it could be put on the market at 3½d. per lb.

Mr. PEASE: The Colonial Sugar Refining Company will not allow the Federal Government to make that sugar; you know that.

Mr. CATTERMULL: I admit that the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, years ago, compelled mills to make raw sugar instead of "whites." That is the reason that I suggest to the Royal Commission, when they go out, that they should not recommend the erection of small mills, but that they should be seized with the idea of putting rails down to mill the districts. If they do that, mills will be built which will deal with the crop in four months, which would permit of the base price of cane being reduced by 3s. per ton; and the grower will be better off because he will be getting his cane cut at a time when the c.e.s. is highest and the commercial value is greatest. That mill will be able to boil up its first grades, make "mill white" sugar, and boil to a grade or sample. The seconds and thirds would be refined in the slack season of that mill. The by-products of the mill could be dealt with as well. We then would be stabilising our industry, and turning out our manufactured article in the place where the raw material is grown. Why should we send our raw material down South when we could manufacture it here? I commend that to the Government, as an instruction to that Royal Commission when it goes out.

I believe that the ultimate end of the sugar industry will be the system of new protection, which I have always advocated. In Australia we are growing sugar under conditions which do not obtain in any other part of the world. That being so, we are entitled to protection. If a Commission were appointed comprising representatives of the workers, the growers, the millers, and the consumers, they would go into the matter and fix the wages of the workers and the price to be paid to the grower, the miller, and the refiner. If we adopted such a system in conjunction with our present Cane

Prices Board legislation, I think everyone would be satisfied; the consumer would be getting his sugar at the cheapest price, the worker and the grower would be getting a fair deal along with the miller. We should try and bring that about; it is the one system whereby we will be able to regulate the sugar industry. If we can do that we will be able to stimulate our production, because we have any quantity of land in the northern area which will grow cane.

Mr. STOPFORD (*Mount Morgan*): I have watched events this session with a considerable amount of interest. I have listened to the debates, first on the Address in Reply, then on the want of confidence motion, and now on this Financial Statement. I have searched "Hansard" for some tangible reason to support the contention of our opponents that this Government should resign office. I am more convinced than ever that, in the best interests of the mass of the people, this Government should use every legitimate effort to place their legislation on the statute-book. If you take away the petty things affecting members' particular districts, and get down to legitimate criticism, you will find that the criticism which members on the other side have levelled against this Government amounts to a charge of extravagance, taxation, and carrying on the Government of the country by the casting vote of the Speaker or Chairman.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: All quite true.

Mr. STOPFORD: Those three items would cover the whole field of criticism worthy of notice. Hon. members opposite base their contention that this Government are an extravagant Government on the fact that the Estimates disclose that a considerable amount more money is required for the services of the State than was required during the period that their Government held office. I want them to-night to be honest and answer any question I may put to them so that we may clear up, for the betterment of the public, what they really charge us with. In the first place, they say that we have been extravagant in our loan expenditure. Do I take that to mean that the hon. member for Townsville objects to the loan expenditure to complete the North Coast line? And does the hon. member for Nanango object to the loan expenditure to complete the Murgon-Proston line?

Mr. EDWARDS: That line should have been completed six years ago.

Mr. STOPFORD: Does the hon. member for Burnett object to the loan expenditure for the construction of the line in connection with the Burnett scheme? If the hon. gentlemen do not object to the loan expenditure in the directions I have mentioned, how can they legitimately say that the action of the Government in giving effect to their policy of constructional development of this great State of Queensland can be regarded as something to level against the Government and something upon which to base a case in asking for our resignation? Loan money has been expended by this Government only after careful and proper inquiry.

Mr. EDWARDS: Does the hon. member know that loan money is being used to build tents?

Mr. STOPFORD: The hon. gentleman objects to loan money being expended to give the workers in the construction camps decent

*Mr. Stopford.]*

tents to live in. I remember when I was organising on the first section of the line in his electorate that men were living under conditions that I would be ashamed to see reverted to again. We are embarking upon a scheme of development in the Burnett district which, I hope, will bring to Queensland thousands of settlers, and which will offer them facilities for settling on the land, and thus help to exploit the possibilities of this great State. We intend to embark upon another huge undertaking which I will refer to later on, and which will require a considerable amount of loan money. Is there one hon. gentleman opposite who can stand before the public and say that he has one legitimate argument against that loan expenditure?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: The trouble is that the Government do not get value for their money.

Mr. STOPFORD: On what does the hon. gentleman base that argument? Simply because this Government refuse to "grease" some fat contractor in connection with our public works and we are carrying out the work and giving the men better conditions, hon. members opposite object to our policy.

Mr. KERR: The Government are not getting any return for their loan expenditure.

Mr. STOPFORD: Now we have the second chapter of this charge—that we are extravagant in our expenditure from revenue. Only one of two things can be done—either the Government must meet the demand of the public service for the different departments or they must cut the "votes" down to a minimum. I want hon. gentlemen opposite to be honest and to admit that, to give effect to a reduction of expenditure from revenue, it would be necessary to curtail the expansion of the State Insurance Office, which is responsible for a considerable amount of our revenue. That office is in every way a profitable undertaking, both in its direct results to the State and in its indirect results to every worker within the State. Do hon. members opposite suggest that we should curtail the expansion of that office?

Mr. KERR: How much revenue comes from the State Insurance Office?

Mr. STOPFORD: It is not a question of how much revenue comes from the State Insurance Office. The question is that on the Estimates for the year provision must be made to meet the expenses and salaries of public servants in that office.

Mr. FLETCHER: Does that office not pay its way?

Mr. STOPFORD: Yes. I am dealing with what hon. members opposite call the extravagance of this Government in the way of expenditure from revenue when compared with the expenditure from revenue during the period when their Government held office. That is a comparison which they have placed before the public, and it is on that ground that I am attacking them to-night.

Mr. FLETCHER: The illustration that the hon. member gave was a very poor one.

Mr. STOPFORD: Do hon. members opposite object to the expansion of the Public Curator's Office? That department has grown under the sympathetic administration of this Government.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: That department charges higher rates than private companies.

[Mr. Stopford.

Mr. STOPFORD: That has not been my experience. The hon. gentleman has become a bitter opponent of the Public Curator's Office since the establishment of an auctioneering section in that department. When the Public Curator did that, there was a howl almost as loud as the howl of repudiation when this Government asked the squatters to do a fair thing towards the cost of maintaining this great State. If we are going to refute the charge of extravagance, it is necessary that we should compare the amounts voted by this Government and the amounts voted—as the records of this House will show—during the period when hon. members opposite controlled the destinies of this State, in order to show where the added expenditure is going. For the year 1913-14, the amount voted for the Department of Public Instruction was £523,958, and for the year 1921-22 the amount had grown to £1,303,367, and for the year 1922-23 the amount set down is £1,299,945. Is there any hon. member opposite who is game enough in a public place in Queensland to say that that is extravagance, and it is something to justify this Government resigning office?

Mr. EDWARDS: The Government are wasting half of it.

Mr. STOPFORD: Does the hon. gentleman suggest that money spent in building schools in country electorates is wasted? In 1913-14 the amount expended on State schools was £435,745; in 1921-22, it had grown to £1,076,724; and in 1922-23, it has grown to £1,095,155. If the hon. gentleman thinks that this Government's ideas in affording facilities for educating the children of this State are a waste of money, then I welcome them and the reception they will get when they go to the country on that argument. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not like these figures. In three debates they have been allowed to rise in their places, and they have made wild and unwarranted statements without being brought to book. When they are confronted with these figures it hurts them, and that is why they are howling. I will now take the Home Secretary's Department. In 1913-14 the amount voted was £771,059; but because of the humanitarian nature of this administration, and because this Government desired to give justice to the bottom dog, who never had an opportunity during the fifty years that the class represented by the hon. members opposite ruled this State, this vote in 1921-22 was increased to £1,513,464. In the year 1922-23 the amount placed on the Estimates is £1,405,624. Hon. members opposite call that extravagance. It is expenditure which is rendered necessary by the efforts of this Government to do justice to the class which were denied justice when hon. members opposite controlled the destinies of the State, and I am proud to be associated with such a Government. Let us take the arguments of hon. members opposite about the extravagant administration of the railways of the State. Hon. members opposite contend that we, as a Government, should be removed from office because we have not squared the ledger in connection with our railway administration. How do hon. members opposite propose to square the ledger? Do they suggest that the railway service is overstaffed, that we are paying too high a rate of wages, or that we are not charging proper freights and fares? They must know that during the period of

the war, and at the present time, the Government had to pay a high price for material necessary to carry on our great railway service. If hon. members opposite admit that that is correct, is not that an argument to justify the position the railways are in to-day?

**AN OPPOSITION MEMBER:** Does not the cost of material come out of the Loan Fund?

**MR. STOPFORD:** No; not material necessary to carry on the services of the traffic department and maintenance. The material for construction comes out of Loan Fund, but the material necessary to carry on the services of the railways—which is an enormous amount—comes out of revenue, and is pitted against the earnings of the Railway Department. Hon. members opposite attribute the present position to a lack of management on the part of those charged with carrying on the railway service. I would refer to the Mount Morgan Gold Mining Company, and to the Newcastle steel and iron works—which is one of the greatest concerns in Australia—who are loudly howling that the cost, not alone of wages, but of materials necessary to carry on their businesses, has increased to such an extent that they cannot carry on.

**MR. VOWLES:** They cannot compete against imported stuff—that is the reason.

**MR. STOPFORD:** They claim that, until the price of coal and other things necessary to carry on their undertakings comes down, they cannot compete with outside. I contend that, if those factors operate in connection with those large industrial concerns, they operate against our railway service. I want to ask hon. members opposite, who are so fond of criticising the Railway Department, to recognise that many railways in the State are to-day showing a loss on the working cost; but those railways have returned to the State indirectly a greater amount than the original capital expenditure. Hon. members opposite, on every occasion, criticise the railway service, but what is their remedy? Do they say that they can curtail the number of men working on the railways, or are they going to increase fares and freights? I want country representatives to recognise that the greatest portion of the deficit on our railways is in connection with agricultural lines. I will take the Dalby to Bell line, the capital value of which is £43,125. In 1919-20 the revenue was £2,970; expenditure, £4,051; net loss on revenue, £1,081; and interest on cost of construction, £1,762, showing a loss of £2,842. In 1920-21 the revenue was £3,805; expenditure, £4,630; the net loss on revenue, £825; and interest, £1,811, or a loss of £2,636. How would the hon. member for Dalby square that? Will he say that the line is overstaffed and extravagantly worked, or will he contend that the freights and fares on the line should be increased?

**MR. VOWLES:** You cut down the service, and motor-cars are competing against you.

**MR. STOPFORD:** Have the products of the district decreased? The hon. member cannot answer my question, because there are only two ways of meeting a deficit of that description—one is to increase the cost to the consumer, and the other to decrease the wages and the number of men employed. Let us take the Theobald-Nanango line, the capital value of which is £518,303. In 1920 the revenue was £54,594; expenditure,

£62,303; net loss on revenue, £7,706; interest, £27,263; or a loss of £32,969. For the year 1920-21 the loss was £35,797.

**MR. EDWARDS:** It paid interest under a previous Government.

**MR. STOPFORD:** The line never paid 4 per cent. The hon. member will have his opportunity to speak, and can quote from the Commissioner's report later on.

**MR. EDWARDS:** That shows ruinous legislation.

**MR. STOPFORD:** The second argument levelled against the Government as to why they should resign is that, in order to meet the added expenditure, which has been incurred so as to give effect to our desire to help the class of people we have been helping in connection with our charitable institutions, and in giving increased assistance to our primary producers and increasing the facilities for education, we have had to increase our taxation. It is not really the fact that we have increased our taxation which hurts hon. members opposite, but the fact that in allocating that taxation we have placed it on the shoulders of those who find the political funds of hon. members opposite. If you look at the tables in the Income Tax Commissioner's report you will find that 2,000 pastoralists pay 24 per cent. of the total income tax of the State—2,000 pastoralists, who squeal because we said that they should at least pay for their land a rent equal to what the grazing farmer was paying. Hon. members opposite, when they passed the Bellevue Hotel during the carnival week, would see the wealth and splendour there, as the so-called poor pastoralist was jazzing to the best jazz music. Go down to any of the motor garages here, and see what is happening. Ask the hon. member for Oxley what business was like during Exhibition week. Every one of the motor firms in this State will report that they have had one of the most successful years.

**MR. ELLIOTT-STONE:** People are buying cars and taking them away from Queen street.

**MR. STOPFORD:** They have had a jolly good time during this year. Hon. members opposite have not adduced any argument as to what they are going to do if they take the Treasury benches. The only constructive idea that I have heard during the debates of this session was that they would repeal the Land Acts Amendment Act and would give an extension of the franchise to the Brisbane Tramways Company. They say that the Government are bungling because the local authorities in the metropolitan area do not want to have control of the tramways. The only inference I can draw from that is that, if they get in possession of the Treasury benches, Mr. Badger at least will get an extension of the franchise. I am pleased with the speech that the hon. member for Musgrave made to-night, because he openly stated that he favoured an alteration in the franchise. He also favours going back to the conditions when it was easy to get a man off the roll. Before the public are done with a certain matter which is now occupying their attention, to which I have no desire to refer openly to-night, they will get sufficient evidence as to what are the intentions of hon. gentlemen opposite regarding the voting power of the masses of the people. One argument used by hon.

*Mr. Stopford.]*



members opposite as to why the Government should leave office is that we do not possess the confidence of the people of this State.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. PEASE: What about Paddington?

Mr. STOPFORD: It was stated further that we are hanging on to office by the casting vote of the Chairman.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. STOPFORD: Hon. members opposite say "Hear, hear!" to that, but I never heard one word of criticism when the mayor of Brisbane, who is in possession of a primary vote as chairman of that body, used his primary vote and the casting vote as well—or, in other words, cast two votes—to determine a matter of public interest. The matter on which the mayor of Brisbane cast two votes was on the question of adopting the contract system or day labour; and the mayor gave his primary vote, and also his casting vote, in favour of the contract system. Both primary and casting votes were used to determine an important matter like that. His worship the mayor also gave his primary vote in the selection of the council's representatives to the Health Board. I say that when a member is returned to this House he occupies a position of trust, and it is not right that his constituency should be disfranchised just because that member is a man who enjoys the confidence of the majority of this House either as Speaker or Chairman of Committees. I claim that the Speaker and the Chairman of Committees should have a primary vote, and if the voting is equal they should have a casting vote. Anyone reading the papers in the city to-day, if they did not understand the procedure of Parliament, would think that our Speaker and our Chairman of Committees represented their constituencies with a primary vote and then gave a casting vote to decide the matter. It is just as well that the public outside should understand that on every occasion when a vote is cast by the Speaker or Chairman of Committees it is the only vote he gives as a vote for the constituency that he represents in this House.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FERRICKS: Sir Joseph Cook carried on for fifteen months on the casting vote of the Speaker.

Mr. STOPFORD: It is well known that Sir Joseph Cook, the present High Commissioner in London, and formerly Prime Minister in Australia, carried on the Nationalist Government for fifteen or eighteen months with the casting vote of the Speaker. Another matter charged against this Government, and to which I have heard "hear, hears," from hon. members opposite, was that we did not represent a majority of the country. I claim emphatically that we do. I claim that this Government are the only Government in the British Empire that lived during the war period without changing and without disruption. We went to the country with all the forces of organised capital against us. The Tory Press were roaring from one end of the State to the other that not one penny of loan money would come to Australia if we were returned, and there would be a crop of unemployment such as was never seen in Australia before. We faced the electors with these disadvantages, and we were returned

[Mr. Stopford.

to this House with a majority of four constituencies voting in our favour.

Mr. GREEN: You selected the time of the year for the election.

Mr. STOPFORD: The hon. member for Bulimba asked for a certain period and the Government obliged him. The result was that we had a majority of constituencies voting for us, including the electorate of Normanby, which is still a Labour constituency. The desertion of the hon. member for Normanby from the ranks of the Government left us with a majority of two. I find myself in agreement with the hon. member for Bulimba when he says that when a man is returned pledged to a party that is returned on a definite programme, and which has the confidence of the electors, he has no right to betray the trust given to him unless he returns to the electors and lets them pass judgment on him.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. STOPFORD: I claim that this Government can still claim Normanby as a Labour constituency.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. STOPFORD: I claim that every vote cast by the hon. member for Normanby on the Opposition side of the House can only be regarded as a personal vote, because he does not represent the majority of his constituents at all.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. STOPFORD: Until he submits himself to the will of the constituency that returned him here, we can justly claim that on our last appeal to the country we were returned with a majority of four votes. (Hear, hear!) If we were to resign, who would take office? (Government laughter.) However, I do not wish to raise the hopes of hon. members opposite, because we are not going to resign. It would be like mixing oil with water to assume that the men who claim to represent the primary producers can amalgamate and form a party with the old Nationalist party, whose name is known from one end of Queensland to the other.

Mr. BRENNAN: The old "diehards."

Mr. STOPFORD: I have no disrespect for the Nationalist party. In fact, I have the greatest respect for a man like the hon. member for Bulimba, who has stood consistently, time after time, in favour of a certain policy, which he fearlessly believes in. But I claim that the country does not want the Nationalist party, and I claim that hon. gentlemen in direct opposition are afraid to openly associate themselves with the Nationalist party.

Mr. J. JONES: I am sitting with the hon. member for Toowong now.

Mr. STOPFORD: I was speaking politically. Let us consider the spectacle we had in this Chamber on the occasion when an important vote was taken on the Primary Producers' Bill. We had the spectacle of members of the Country party coming over here and leaving our middlemen friends sitting over there in the cold shades of opposition. When the abolition of the Upper House was before the Chamber, we saw members of the Country party hesitating, looking for somebody to give them a lead, and then sheepishly coming over to this side.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: How many parties are there on your side?

Mr. STOPFORD: We belong to only one party—a party of reform, a party of progress, the party that are going to rule Queensland in the years to come. I always think that the Country party are like one of those second-hand shops one sees in Stanley street—they get second-hand lots from every political constituency that wants to get rid of its member. I cannot believe that a Cabinet could be formed with the hon. member for Bulimba, the hon. member for Oxley, and the hon. member for Port Curtis—(Government laughter)—so that, in the interests of those gentlemen themselves, the determination of the Premier to stay here and give effect to his platform is very wise indeed. And I am supported in my contention by an authority I do not very often quote—the “*Courier*” of the 29th November, 1921, in a leading article headed “*The Political Bankruptcy of Mr. Vowles*”—

“Mr. Vowles and his party recently circulated a long, dull, ad misericordiam and apologetical excuse to the electors, complaining of the tyranny of the Government in the last session. To anybody with a knowledge of parliamentary procedure the appeal carried in itself a seething condemnation of the utter vacuity of the Opposition and its leadership. It is quite true that the Government adopted autocratic methods—methods repugnant to all notions of democracy—but it is equally true that that was made possible because the Country parliamentary party acted and behaved in a manner which indicated that it was far more concerned with its own party and personal interests than with the welfare of the State.”

Further down they say—

“The failure of the Opposition lay in its utter lack of direction, in its want of combination, and in its tactics, which were distinguished more for their guerilla methods than for concerted planning.

“Mr. Vowles says he sees a bright future for the Country party. If he reserved some of his vision for the welfare of the country and a little less for party interests it would be a great deal better for Queensland.”

And the “*Courier*” of 15th December, 1921, in an article headed “*The Non-co-operation of Mr. Vowles*,” said—

“Mr. Vowles says that he is the organisation which is backed by the United Graziers’ Association; but we would not be at all surprised to hear that the United Graziers’ Association claim to be the Spenlow in the business, anxious and desirous of co-operating, but frustrated every time by some unbending Jorkins.

“Mr. Vowles says that he does not advocate sectional politics, but in the very next breath he charges the metropolitan area with having absorbed £15,000,000 out of the £50,000,000 that is invested in railways. Mr. Vowles must know that he is talking the sheerest nonsense. Either he is grossly and unpardonably ignorant of the very basis of railway finances or he is encouraging an erroneous impression to arouse animosity between the city and the country.

“One thing that is expected from the gentleman leading an important party

is, at least, a little accuracy when he attempts to discuss the public finances.

“We said at the opening of this article that every student of politics with a good memory and a sense of humour ought to be able to derive considerable amusement from a comparison of the different statements made by Mr. Vowles. If his statements are closely analysed it will be found that he is floundering in a morass of illogical verbiage. He asks the ‘*Courier*’ to tell him how it is possible for thirty-five Oppositionists to defeat thirty-six Ministerialists.”

I quite admit that he has not a possible hope of doing so. It shows how “old Granny,” who is so deeply concerned in the interests of the country, recognises that the Labour party would provide a Government considerably better than would hon. members opposite if they occupied these benches.

I think I can claim that this party are determined to stand behind the Premier in his determination to put into practical being the big schemes he has in mind for the benefit of this State. One of those big schemes that I am pleased to see coming into practical effect is the development of the Burnett lands. Already, I find, efforts are being made in that district by a large syndicate to establish the growing of cotton on a large scale. They have bought land sufficient to enable them to plant 300 or 400 acres of cotton. I sincerely trust that, as that land is opened up, the Minister for Railways will see that rails are laid as speedily as possible, so that settlement may creep along gradually with the railway.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Why, they are capitalists.

Mr. STOPFORD: I do not care whether they are capitalists or what they are. I am perfectly certain that the Premier and the Government desire to see that land taken up. We recognise that no capitalist is going to get any large hold on cotton land in the possession of the Government. What they get through buying from other capitalists is no concern of ours. On this subject I desire to make a plea with the Premier that a certain area of that land be reserved for the benefit of the men I represent in this Chamber. In Mount Morgan we have an industry which, I am sorry to say, at present is in a very poor way. The unfortunate condition of mining and the metal markets is such that I am looking forward to the development of the Burnett lands as an outlet for many men working there to-day.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: Do you want freehold?

Mr. STOPFORD: No, I want perpetual leaseholds. I want the men who have capital to be able to reserve it for the development of their farms instead of having to pay it to some landlord, and I am going to take the opportunity to speak at greater length on that subject when the Lands Estimates are before the Chamber.

There is another scheme which the Premier has initiated—that is, irrigation of the Dawson Valley—one of the biggest schemes of its kind that we have ever had in mind in Australia, and one which I believe—from the opportunity I had of accompanying the Premier to that locality—will have effect given to it in the near future.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Will it pay?

*Mr. Stopford.*]

Mr. STOPFORD: The hon. member is so accustomed to looking at things from the pounds, shillings, and pence point of view that he cannot perceive the national character of this great big undertaking. It is not a question of whether it is going to pay immediately. It is a question, according to our experts, of opening up for profitable settlement 100,000 acres or irrigable land. I am going to quote the authority of a man who has visited the locality, and who rose to his official position in this State from that of a civil engineer. I refer to His Excellency the Governor, who, in an address, is reported by the "Rockhampton Bulletin" to have said—

"It is estimated there will be 100,000 acres irrigated, and it will, in addition, give access to good dairying and grazing country. But the project enjoys another advantage. It is engaging the full attention and deep interest of the Premier. I will not, of course, touch on politics; but a eulogy of the chief Minister of the Crown in this State does not seem to me to come under that head. At any rate, if I say that the Premier has the power to carry out great projects I am not going beyond the opinion even of his political opponents, and I can say from my own knowledge and experience that the Premier also has the will to carry out every project which is for the benefit of the State."

One of the big things upon which the Premier and the Government deserve to be congratulated is the establishment on a sound basis of the cotton-growing industry in this State. I am going to pay a tribute to one who pioneered the cotton industry in Queensland; one to whom I was pleased to hear the hon. member for Oxley give some recognition in his speech the other night; that is Dan Jones. (Hear, hear!) I had an opportunity, many years ago, of listening to Mr. Jones when he was advocating the culture of cotton in this State. I heard him during the war period; in fact, I spoke with him in Mount Morgan with another enthusiast whose name will be found in the Department of Agriculture—Stephen Hart, a chemist of Mount Morgan. Both those gentlemen did excellent pioneering work; but their voices were like the voice crying in the wilderness until the present Premier and his Cabinet listened to them in a sympathetic way.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. STOPFORD: In paying a tribute to Mr. Dan Jones, hon. members opposite condemn themselves for not having given sympathetic consideration to his ceaseless advocacy of the growing of cotton. Hon. members opposite have objected to cotton culture in this State; they have used the same argument that they used in connection with the sugar industry—that it could not be carried on by white labour. It was only when the Premier took the matter up and guaranteed the price that we saw any fruitful result. I am not quoting my own words when I advance the opinion that the Premier and his Cabinet are responsible for that. I have heard it stated in debate that the man who has been responsible is Mr. Crawford Vaughan.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: Hear, hear!

Mr. STOPFORD: I am going to let Mr. Crawford Vaughan answer that "Hear,

[Mr. Stopford.]

hear" himself. This is from the "Daily Mail" of 16th June, 1922—

"OPENING OF COTTON GINNERY AT  
WHINSTANES.

"Mr. Crawford Vaughan said, 'I must take this opportunity of saying that to the Queensland Government the cotton industry owes a great deal. It was Mr. Theodore who had the vision to see the possibilities of this new primary product. His Government, by giving a guarantee, gave the needed stimulus to the industry, which will, I believe, send it far on the road to success. In other ways, indeed in every way—the Government, especially Mr. Gillies, Minister for Agriculture, and his Under Secretary, Mr. Scriven, have supported and encouraged and developed the cotton-growing in this great State.'"

A paragraph appeared in the Melbourne papers purporting to be an interview with Mr. Crawford Vaughan, in which he was said to have stated that his company had paid a certain sum of money for this year's crop. As soon as Mr. Vaughan had this brought under his notice, he wrote to the "Courier" on 6th July, 1922—

"PAYMENTS FOR COTTON.

"GOVERNMENT, NOT ASSOCIATION.

"Referring to a telegram from Melbourne, which appeared in this paper yesterday, Mr. W. Crawford Vaughan (secretary of the Australian Cotton Growing Association, Queensland, Limited) writes to the effect that the association has nothing whatever to do with paying for cotton. All payments are made by the Queensland Government, which already has distributed £71,000 in this way, and not £50,000, as stated in the paragraph."

That is conclusive evidence—evidence that is supported by every farmer in the Dawson Valley, who recognises that a large amount of the success of the cotton industry is due to the sympathetic consideration of the present Ministry. I congratulate the hon. gentlemen comprising the Cabinet on their determination to extend the guarantee until July, 1923. The original intention was that it would cease on 30th June. The extension to 30th July, 1923, will give the farmers an opportunity of having their full crop taken off before the guarantee is altered in any way.

There are many aspects of the cotton industry that require careful consideration. I have stated that, in the Burnett areas, a Sydney syndicate is purchasing land to go in for large plantation areas. There are some 300 acres of cotton land in Midgee, and I understand from people who have visited this district that they are using tractor ploughs there and working day and night with electric light to try and get that huge area under cotton. That will not affect the position of the cotton guarantee from the Government, because that 900 acres belongs to a firm of Sydney manufacturers who will utilise the product they produce. I understand that along the railway line from Mount Morgan to Rockhampton another large plot of land, some 300 acres in extent, is being put under crop. I can see an evil in large plantations in this State. I have been associated with the industrial movement long enough to know that the large plantation areas invariably bring an ill effect in the shape of industrial troubles. There

is no industry in which there is greater waste of effort than in the shearing industry, largely due to lack of organisation. I have been in the West. I have met a man in Blackall, whose next shed was somewhere over towards Charleville; and as he would be making in the direction of Charleville a man would be leaving Charleville to take his second shed in the Blackall district. I believe a lot of that could be averted if proper consideration were given to the matter in the early stages of this industry. Speaking as a member of the Executive of the Australian Workers' Union, we desire to see this industry progress; we desire to see an industry that will offer a healthy occupation to our members; we desire that it should proceed along sound lines. I think we are justified in asking that, if the producer is assured of a fair price for the products of his farm, the labour engaged producing that article also should be protected.

Mr. COLLINS: Hear, hear!

Mr. STOPFORD: It will be too late when the cotton-picking season is here for us to contemplate any system of organisation. A measure was introduced into this Chamber last session, which, I regret to say, through another influence, did not become law. I refer to the Unemployed Workers Bill. In that measure provision was made for a council which would control to a large extent, and organise, the industrial forces of this State. So far as I remember, that council was to have been composed of a Judge of the Arbitration Court, the Director of Labour, an employers' representative, and an employees' representative.

Mr. FLETCHER: What outside influence was there that prevented it becoming law?

Mr. STOPFORD: I did not say "Outside influence"; I said "another influence"—another Chamber that does not exist to-day, fortunately.

Mr. ELLIENSTONE: The hon. member for Toowoomba condemned that measure after it was rejected.

Mr. STOPFORD: I do not know what the hon. member for Toowoomba does. He does some excellent things at times. (Laughter.) I ask the Premier to give careful consideration to that matter. Unless we organise our supply of labour in this State, we may not get our next cotton crop off. I do not mean that there will be industrial trouble. There is such a popular cry for cotton to-day that the labour at our disposal may not be adequate to meet the demand. If we can foresee an evil of that description we will not be doing our duty to the men who are embarking on that enterprise unless we try to remove the obstacle.

Another aspect of the cotton industry, which is of peculiar interest to me, was that touched upon by the leader of the Nationalist party in his speech the other night: that is, that we should not be content only to produce cotton, but that we should manufacture the cotton we produce.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. STOPFORD: That hon. member made a most excellent suggestion—that even if the Government were to expend something in the vicinity of £250,000 to encourage manufacture in Queensland, he would give it his whole-hearted support. I recognise that, sooner or later, the same fate must befall Mount Morgan that has befallen Gympie and

Charters Towers, and when this commission that is coming out here to advise on the different aspects of the cotton industry reaches Australia, I want to ask whether this Government will be prepared to approach the Federal Government to co-operate with them in offering a bonus or some inducement to companies or others to manufacture cotton cloth in this State. I sincerely trust that the Premier will bring that matter under the notice of the Federal authorities, and, failing any co-operation on the part of the Federal authorities, I think this Government will be justified in taking the matter up on their own. I do not want the Government to take any hasty action, but I want them to give the matter calm and deliberate consideration, and act with the Federal Government, if possible. We have, in Mount Morgan, one of the most expensive plants to be found in Australia, and we have power being produced at the cheapest rate in Queensland. We have there a contented population, and I can see that, in the future, the industry being carried on there to-day will be gradually diminished. There are £500,000 invested in public buildings, private homes, and other property round about Mount Morgan. We have there an excellent, contented, and happy community, and I think that if the climatic conditions lend themselves to the manufacture of cotton cloth, then it would be an excellent place to establish that industry. Although I do not know much about the manufacture of the article, I have read sufficient about it to know that climatic conditions play a very important part. I understand it is necessary to have a damp atmosphere, and I have been informed by Mr. Dan Jones, with whom I have discussed the matter, that Rockhampton is an excellent centre for the establishment of that industry. Mr. Jones assures me that it is similar to the Lancashire climate so far as humidity is concerned, and he considers that it is the best place for that purpose.

Mr. FLETCHER: What about Gladstone?

Mr. STOPFORD: He mentioned Gladstone also. I do not pretend to possess a technical knowledge of this particular matter, but I sincerely hope that when that commission reaches Australia the Government will go carefully into the matter and endeavour to select a site in Queensland and will give some attention or consideration to this particular project. I believe—seeing that the Mount Morgan Gold Mining Company have altered their articles of association so that they can embark on other businesses—if sufficient inducement was offered they might be induced to take up a project of that description.

I desire to refer briefly to the question of the decline of our mining industry. When one speaks of the mining industry of this State one must bear in mind that that industry contributed more to the development of this State than any other industry. The mining industry has been the means of pioneering along our railway tracks. In places where mining was commenced the railways speedily followed, and after the construction of the railways came the settlers, so that, when the mining ceased, the people were left behind in a producing centre. The mining industry is under a cloud to-day, but I am not one who believes that the mining industry is finished so far as Queensland is concerned. I believe that there are plenty of unexplored places, and that what is

Mr. Stopford.]

required to-day is a more scientific method of searching for new fields or for new metals. I believe that the Minister should get a report from the wardens in the different mining districts in connection with the old abandoned claims.

Mr. COSTELLO: They do not know much about it.

Mr. STOPFORD: The wardens may not know anything of a practical nature about mining, but in their offices they have a record of all the "shows" that have been abandoned. Many of these shows have been abandoned because of lack of finance and lack of methods of treatment. The refractory ores of twenty years ago offer no difficulty in treatment to-day. Yet there are dozens of places that were cast aside because the best method of treatment was not at the disposal of the State. We are spending a certain amount of money in prospecting, but the prospecting is of a spasmodic nature. I venture to say, without discourtesy to any officer of the Mines Department, that the Mount Morgan company, the Japanese Government, and the Broken Hill Proprietary Company have more up-to-date knowledge of the mineral wealth of this State than the Mines Department itself. I know that when the treatment of ore in Mount Morgan offered a certain amount of difficulty, requiring a difference in the methods of treatment, the company went about their work in a scientific manner. They sent out search parties looking for different metals or flux that they required and accompanying those parties was a mining engineer. When they located it, they trepanned it, took samples, and sent it to Mount Morgan. If it was any good it was taken up; but, if it was not, the party simply moved on and went through practically the whole of the Central district. I know that the Japanese Government have agents right throughout the Central district prospecting, locating, sampling, and sending away. I venture to say that there is not an iron-lode mine of any magnitude in Queensland that has not been exploited by the Broken Hill Proprietary Company. I want to see a scientific system like that adopted. A member of the geological staff should go with a mining engineer to inspect certain fields. I do not say Charters Towers, Gympie, or Mount Morgan, but to some place where there has only been shallow sinkings. I cannot speak of North Queensland—I am speaking of the Morinish and the Ridgeland fields and other districts in Central Queensland. If the Government were to expend a certain sum of money, even on a £1 for £1 basis, and it cost £50,000 to locate one "show," that would revive the mining industry. So far as gold is concerned, during this period of depressed prices for copper it would more than compensate for the money expended.

HON. W. H. BARNES (*Bulimba*): I think that every member of this Committee has followed the hon. member for Mount Morgan with some interest. Evidently the Government realises the seriousness of their position, and they have put up an apologist to-night in the way of the hon. member.

Mr. PEASE: The hon. member offered no apologies.

HON. W. H. BARNES: There is no question that the hon. member was put up for a specific purpose, and that specific purpose evidently was to apologise for the Government. In justice to the hon. member, I

[*Mr. Stopford.*

would state that probably the Government could not have selected a man more able to do the job, because it is perfectly certain that the hon. gentleman had certain figures supplied to him so that he might deal with the subject, and deal with it in an effective way. If hon. members had followed the hon. member for Mount Morgan closely, they must have come to the conclusion that some of his arguments were absolutely beside the question, and, when analysed, really could not be borne out by facts. The hon. member again and again set up certain premises—which he knocked down again—for the purpose of trying to build up the Government, which are at present in extremis. That seems to be the principal object he had in view. The hon. member dealt, first of all, with the question of extravagance, and he sidetracked it very skilfully. He dealt with the North Coast Railway line, and asked if hon. members on this side desired that that line should not be proceeded with. It is not the present Government who were responsible for the North Coast line, or the majority of lines in Queensland; it was the Liberal Government which introduced those lines. There is no one here who will say, in connection with railway building which is going to be for the benefit of Queensland, "Stay your hand," but there are directions in which we have to stay our hands in the expenditure of loan money. Whether we like to admit it or not, I think it will be shown that we have gone along since this Government came into power at such a rate as to impose a great burden on the community, seeing that there is not a great increase in population as compared with the money spent. Extravagance has come in in two ways. Let me deal with it from the point of view of the money which the Government have spent in doubtful enterprises, such as the State stations—enterprises which are showing no returns, and are adding to the burden of taxation. We know that every enterprise the Government have put their hands to has meant a material addition to the burden which the people have to carry. It has only been a myth to suppose that the community has benefited by these things.

Mr. BRENNAN: During the war.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. member has been a myth all his life.

Mr. FORDE: He was not a myth when Sleeman went to see him.

HON. W. H. BARNES: When there have been legal men required on the other side, some accident has happened, and the hon. member has never got there.

Mr. BRENNAN: He has not squealed.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. member knows better than I can tell him the reason for this. There are some references which I cannot make to-night. The extravagance of the Government in conducting the affairs of Queensland is manifested by the tremendous burden which they have laid on the community in the shape of deficits. They have received double the amount of money, by way of revenue, that their predecessors received, but they have landed the people in debt. The Premier says, in his Financial Statement, that at the end of the present financial year he expects to show a big deficit of £500,000. The Government, who are supposed to be heaven-born financiers, are making no provision whatever for that deficiency.

Extravagance is written upon everything which the Government do. One hon. member made some remarks about motor-cars. You have only to see the motor-cars waiting here at night to take members home.

The TREASURER: You left me a motor-car.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Yes; there were two motor-cars when the hon. gentleman took office.

The TREASURER: More.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I suppose there are about eighty now. The motor-cars were supposed to have been dispensed with; but I believe that, if we had the bill for motor-car expenditure, we should find it is infinitely more than the cost of the motor-cars which were originally kept by the present Government, and some of which were dispensed with. The hon. gentleman laughs, but he knows how true it is.

The TREASURER: You bought a car for the Treasury.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Yes, for the Treasury and the Works Department, but there were only two.

The TREASURER: There were more than two. You know that.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. gentleman, when we were over on that side and got a car, was one of those who squealed against it. He was frequently standing on a soap-box and speaking to the people before he occupied the high and important position he now occupies. That was the way in which he got to where he is—by reason of his denunciation of what other men were doing. The hon. member who has just left the Chamber spoke about the Government being charged with carrying on on the casting vote of the Chairman. If we could get right down to the bottom of the heart of the Treasurer, we should find that he is ashamed that a party which has had in its ranks great men, and which claims to be a democratic party, should have become so conservative as to adopt a method of voting by proxy, which was discarded in the House of Lords many years ago. This so-called democratic Government are hanging on to office because they are afraid to face the people of Queensland.

Mr. PEASE: What about Paddington? You said that about Paddington.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Paddington is what you would call the home of extreme Labour, though even there there was a diminished vote.

Mr. PEASE interjected.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. member is named Pease, but he is a very noisy man; he does not know his name. I was accused by one hon. member of having said before the last election that certain things were going to take place. Those things did take place. I was told that it was done to gratify me. If the Treasurer would gratify the people of Queensland at this crisis, and gratify me, he would act as any decent leader would and go straight to the country. There is one thing I want to congratulate the hon. gentleman upon—he is the luckiest man I ever struck. Yesterday three proxies came in, and another came in to-day.

HON. W. FORGAN SMITH: Do you think it is lucky to get a proxy?

HON. W. H. BARNES: No, I do not think it is lucky; and I regret very much that anybody is ill. This Government have introduced things which are obsolete—they are a "proxy Government," a "Diehard Government," and a Government who are clinging to office like leeches.

The TREASURER: Keeping wolves out.

HON. W. H. BARNES: They are a Government which hang on to office, knowing that once they go out they will never get back. The other night the hon. member for Merthyr said something about the Government having a majority of two. He called it "two-up." He meant that they simply had a majority of two. Years ago members opposite used to wax warm in attacking those who had to do with gambling, but when it touches men of their own party who have to do with gambling they simply say it is a right thing, and attempt to smooth it over.

Mr. FOLEY: How many tickets have you taken in the "Golden Casket"?

HON. W. H. BARNES: I have never taken any; but, no doubt, the hon. gentleman has taken a good many, as he wants to get rich quickly. That is not the point in dealing with a question like this. The point we have to consider is that the moral effect on the community is disastrous indeed. (Hear, hear!) It is not a matter of how many tickets a man has taken, but the moral effect on the community.

We have heard a great deal with regard to certain gentlemen who went to see the Premier. All I can say is, that when previous Governments were in office, by reason of their high standing, so far as political morality is concerned, no one would have dared to approach them in the way that the hon. gentleman was approached. Previous Governments set such a high standard of political morality that a man would be ashamed to go to them on such a mission, because he knew that he would be shown the door. This Government, however, have fallen so low politically that they can be approached any way, and it is considered a fair thing to approach them because they are so low politically.

The PREMIER: You consider that offering a bribe is a fair thing?

HON. W. H. BARNES: It is dragging down political morality in this State to the very dust. The Premier himself has dragged it down.

The PREMIER: You have bags of money to bribe members.

HON. W. H. BARNES: What does the Premier mean?

The PREMIER: You have bags of money to bribe members.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I scorn anything in the direction of bribery.

The PREMIER: Then, why do you excuse it?

HON. W. H. BARNES: No man will dare to go to the Premier's office in future unless he has someone with him. The Premier has got right down to the gutter, politically. No honest man should go to see the Premier unless he has got someone with him.

The PREMIER: I welcome honest men.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The leader of the Government party talks about honest men. I say to him "Physician, heal thyself." when he casts innuendos across this Chamber.

*Hon. W. H. Barnes.]*

The PREMIER: You are annoyed because the bribers were unmasked.

HON. W. H. BARNES: If any man goes into a Government department he will have to look behind the door to see if there is anyone behind the screen who may put a different complexion upon their business, because a Premier who would stoop as the hon. gentleman has stooped in this connection, and do as he has done, would do anything to a man in order to down him. The Premier would do anything to a man he desires to down.

Mr. FORDE: What about the lady behind the door?

HON. W. H. BARNES: There, we have the ladies' men interjecting. The hon. member comes from Rockhampton, where he has a "young lady" of about sixty years of age as his chief champion.

Mr. FORDE: Yes, I have many champions. You insulted one lady who asked you questions.

Mr. PEASE: I can produce a lady who says that you had a stenographer behind the screen when you were Treasurer.

HON. W. H. BARNES: That is absolutely incorrect. Suppose a man has to see the Minister for Public Works or the Home Secretary, he will have to have someone with him.

The PREMIER: Let them go honestly.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I can say that my reputation stands every time for straight-going and honest doing.

Mr. BRENNAN: You had a woman behind the door. She was the lady in the case.

HON. W. H. BARNES: What is the position to-day? The Government had their detectives here, there, and everywhere because they were so eager to trap. The Premier said he had been seen more than once. I know nothing of those people who went to see the Premier; but is it not reasonable to suppose that they were asked to go and see him? Personally, I would rather jump into the river than follow the Premier at any time.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BRENNAN: You want to be like Nicola. (Laughter.)

HON. W. H. BARNES: Is it not reasonable to suggest that the Premier himself thought he had a certain chance with the people? Is it not reasonable to suggest that he was seeking to leave his party? The Premier threw out a bait in connection with his Bill.

Mr. COLLINS: You took the bait.

HON. W. H. BARNES: He threw out the bait and he thought the Country party were going to take the bait, but their ideals were evidently too high to take the bait, and they would not take it.

The PREMIER: What do you think of the hon. member for Oxley?

HON. W. H. BARNES: When the Premier found that the bait would not be taken, he started smooching again to the men he was seeking to desert and run away from.

Mr. FORDE: What about the hon. member for Port Curtis and the hon. member for Oxley deserting your party?

HON. W. H. BARNES: They will be able to answer for themselves.

Mr. COLLINS: Judge not that ye be not judged.

[Hon. W. H. Barnes.]

HON. W. H. BARNES: I see the hon. member for Brisbane on the other side, and he is a member I respect very much. But is it a fair thing in a debate when important matters have to be decided; is it a fair thing that a gentleman occupying that position should dismiss a subject without allowing it to have any further consideration? That is opposed to all usage in this House.

The hon. member for Mount Morgan referred to the railways, and said what the Government had done with regard to the railways. He trotted out the big deficits that had been accumulated. I am going to answer the hon. member by giving a few figures to show the vital difference between business management in running the railways and political management in running the railways.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am just going to give two or three figures, and I believe the Committee and the country will agree with me that the figures I am quoting in reply to the hon. member for Mount Morgan will answer him most effectively. What is the position? In 1913-14 the percentage of profits to capital was £3 16s. 2d. per cent. and in 1914-15 it was £4 0s. 8d. per cent. Now look at the difference when we have political controlled railways. I met a railway man to-day. I do not know him from Adam. I do not know his name. I met him coming through the Post Office lane, and I said to him, "Have you plenty of work?" He said, "There is not so much work as there was during Exhibition week."

Mr. DASH: How did you know he was a railway man?

HON. W. H. BARNES: I could tell by his uniform. He said to me, "The trouble is that men are planked down into Brisbane and they are told that work will be coming to them." He also said, "I was speaking to a man the other day about it, and he said, 'It will be all right. Wait until the political pull comes. Wait until the pressure is put on and your position will be all right.'" And that is one of the reasons why the railways have got into the

[9 p.m.] condition in which we find them to-day. What will happen in connection with these proxies and in connection with railways generally? Proxy votes will have to be sent to the Trades Hall and the votes of Ministers for absent members will be controlled. In 1920-21 the return from the railways was 10s. 7½d. per cent. Just look at it—I want to rub it in—10s. 7½d. in 1920-21 and £4 0s. 8d. in 1914-15. This extravagant Government, who do not know how to manage things, have landed the country in this mess. Everybody will admit that it is a great country, but it is a great country shamefully mismanaged by the present Government. Reference was made by one hon. member, who I am sorry is not in his place, to the Theebine-Kingaroy Railway, amongst other country lines. In 1914-15 that line paid 3 per cent.; in 1920-21 it lost £35,707. I want the country to remember that in 1914-15 the railways paid to the Treasurer, after allowing for interest on both open and unopened lines, and for working expenses, £48,650 11s. 5d., whilst in 1920-21 they had only £230,914 with which to meet an interest bill of £1,970,389, leaving a deficiency of £1,739,475. And this is the Government who say that they have been able to finance and so guard the affairs of

this great State as to make it a State that brings their name into good repute. Well, men must have very elastic consciences when they get up and make statements of that kind. And the Public Curator does not do his business for nothing. I saw a bill of costs to-day, at which I was amazed.

Mr. BRENNAN: What was it.

HON. W. H. BARNES: It was a bill of costs that would be in keeping with a bill of costs of the hon. member for Toowoomba. It would be a decently big one—or, rather, I shall not say "decently," but a pretty big one.

Mr. BRENNAN interjected.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I could tell the hon. member of some little things he did up at Warwick. Then, the hon. member dealt with the money spent on education. He was to some extent barking up the wrong tree. I am prepared to admit that the tables show that the expenditure was greater last year than some years ago, but I was told the other day that in a certain case a simple convenience of the very plainest type cost £129. Money has been wasted on education buildings, even allowing for the increased cost of material and labour.

Mr. PEASE: The vote he quoted did not include buildings.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am going to show that instead of increasing the vote the Government have diminished it.

Mr. PEASE interjected.

HON. W. H. BARNES: They say the hon. member's name is "Pease," but sometimes he gets astray. The fact remains that the amounts spent on buildings by the Works Department for the Department of Public Instruction have been less than formerly, and I shall show that as I proceed. Then, again, we know that insurance salaries are paid out of the profits that are made, and are not shown at all on the Treasurer's sheet. Yet they were trotted out here—side-tracking again. The hon. member also dealt with cotton. Any man, whatever his politics, must feel that anything that can be done to help any industry should be done, because, after all, it is going to be the very salvation of Queensland. But what really has brought about the prominence of the cotton question?

Mr. FORDE: The guarantee of this Government.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Oh, no. There is that parrot chirping again. I withdraw that expression, because I think a parrot would be more intelligent. As a matter of fact, the world's market is responsible for the uplift in cotton, and we should be delighted that such is the case. I would remind this Committee that originally the industry was started at Ipswich, and subsidies were given, not for one year, nor even for two years, but what brought about the closure of it was the fact, not that they could not grow cotton, but that the prices obtained were too low.

Mr. FORDE: This Government guaranteed a price of 5½d. per lb.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. member knows that the guarantee is not likely to leave the Government in the lurch at all. They were on pretty safe grounds in making the guarantee, and now they are making political capital out of it.

Mr. FORDE: As a matter of fact the Government have lost on that figure.

HON. W. H. BARNES: A while ago I referred incidentally to loan expenditure, and let me say here that the way out of the difficulty is to give encouragement to private enterprise to bring its capital to this State to develop industry.

Mr. PEASE: We are getting it.

HON. W. H. BARNES: It is afraid to come.

Mr. PEASE: What about your building?

HON. W. H. BARNES: If the hon. member lived for a thousand years he would never be in a position to put up a building like that. The burden on the people must be removed by getting people to come in from outside to assist industry. I can remember that when the Australian Meat Export Company's meatworks were established there was a perfect wail that they were going to down the worker and hurt Queensland. What has downed the worker has been that members on the other side have, at every turn, been trying to get at men who have been spending their money and seeking to establish industries. The result is that they have been so uncertain that to-day every worker who was engaged in that industry realises that it would be a good thing for them if these people were able to operate their works to the fullest extent; it would be a good thing for the people of Queensland, too. Would it not be a good thing, too, for the pastoralists of Queensland? We have to get away from the idea that any section of people lives by itself, whether it be the pastoralists, the farmers, or the workers; we are interdependent one upon the other, and we are never going to have a great country built along the lines of narrow sectionalism. This Government should wake up to the fact that they must not down the man who is prepared to come and help develop our State, but should assist him in that particular direction.

Mr. FORDE: You know that we are out to assist.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Did you notice, Mr. Dunstan, the emphasis which was laid upon that "we"? Here is an hon. member who proposes to get out if he can, and he says "we."

These remarks have been, to some extent, prompted by the speech of the hon. member for Mount Morgan. I want to deal, for a little while, with the Financial Statement. That Statement is notable for two things—the indications it contains of a very hasty preparation, and the absolute lack of information in it. Let me deal with the first. It seems to me that the Treasurer met some ghosts at night in his sleep, and he said, "We must get this Financial Statement on the boards as soon as possible. We know that until we have our Estimates through there is danger ahead." So, all of a sudden, a hasty Financial Statement was prepared. Then there is abundant proof that there is an absence of information in the Statement. Look at it. There is very little in it.

Mr. PEASE: There is a great deal of "meat" in it.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. member is easily satisfied. His political digestion must be disturbed just now; he says there is a good deal of political meat in it. Let me draw attention to some of the inaccuracies in connection with the Estimates for

*Hon. W. H. Barnes.]*



1920-21 and 1921-22, and the realisation. A paper, which at one time "boosted" the Premier—I do not think it does now—the "Advocate," of 10th July, reported the Premier as having said that the wages represented 50 per cent. of Government expenditure; that the deficit this year was £400,000—that was before the Financial Statement was laid on the table—and that next year it would be £800,000. What I want to stress is that the former Treasurer was very much out in connection with his Estimates of receipts and expenditure. A disparity in regard to taxation is shown on page 1. The taxation was estimated to bring in £3,227,500. The hon. gentleman received £3,420,296—a difference of £192,796. I am going to be fair enough to say that it is always difficult to estimate revenue and expenditure. We have been criticised by hon. members again and again in connection with these matters. There is the other grave factor which I want to emphasise, that we have been drifting every year; that apparently nothing has been done to overtake the leakage and make provision for the deficits which have accumulated. Any sane Government, any Government who believed in straight finance, would certainly have worked along those lines in order to meet the difficulty.

I want to deal for a moment with the question of maturing loans. I do not think that many members have noticed the apology of the Treasurer on page 7 of his Budget Speech. He says—

"On 1st January, 1922, Treasury bills amounting to £1,124,750, which were originally issued to cover revenue deficits in the years 1900-1901, 1901-1902, and 1902-1903, became due, and, as provision had to be made to meet them, it was decided in October last to make a conversion offer to the holders of the bills. It should be remembered that at this date money was very dear and there were no indications of an immediate cheapening; consequently the conversion rate now appears to be over-generous. The prospectus gave holders of the bills the right of converting into bonds or stock bearing 6½ per cent. interest and maturing on 31st January, 1936, and entitled them to a bonus of £2 for each £100 of maturing bills so converted. Holders of £755,600 accepted the conversion offer, £363,250 were redeemed by cash, and there are still unrepresented bills amounting to £900."

Have hon. members noticed how the Treasurer has apologised for his lack of foresight? Why? Because, until America came to his assistance, he was practically tied up as far as the getting of loan money was concerned; he did not know what to do, and I believe he would have been willing to pay 8 per cent. or any figure in order to get out of the wood in connection with these maturing loans. We have maturing in 1924 and 1926 loans amounting to many millions. We have no evidence whatever that a single move has been made to deal with these maturing loans. It seems to me that the Treasurer does not care what is going to happen this year; loan moneys are going to be thrown broadcast irrespective of the effect it will have on the people who, by and by, will have to deal with the finances of this great State. These moneys are being thrown

broadcast because the Government want to try and win back that which they have lost as far as the workers of this State are concerned. The workers are up against the Government; the democratic forces of this State are up against the Government.

Mr. PEASE: What about Paddington? We gave them an opportunity of putting us out, and what did they do?

HON. W. H. BARNES: The Secretary for Mines, who was returned, said there would be no unemployment in two or three months. That was a bait which was thrown out, and again these people bit at the bait. But has that been realised? We know that it has not. We know that this Government have made a great mess of everything that they have handled. The methods adopted by this Government are a disgrace to any Government, whether it be a Government in Queensland or elsewhere. When the history of the Parliament of Queensland is written by a man with the ability of Mr. Bernays, he will feel that it is a sorry thing to have to write about the Premier in connection with trapping men, apparently, into his office, and then having a stenographer to secretly take down confidential matters communicated to him. I do not say that Mr. Bernays would write the history of the Parliament of Queensland, for I believe that he would be wise in keeping quite clear of it.

Mr. PEASE: The men had no right to come to the Premier's office for such a purpose.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. member for Murilla asked a question in this House in connection with expenses incurred by various Ministers, irrespective of whether they were Liberal or Labour Ministers. So far that information has not been forthcoming. I wrote to the Auditor-General and the Treasury Department, and when I spoke last I said I had not had time to receive a reply. I have since received a reply, which I think is a very ingenious one, and I am certain that the writer, when he submitted it to the Premier, must have felt that the department had got to a sorry pass when he had to reply in that way. The reply states—

"In reply to your letter of the 8th, I am directed to inform you that particulars relating to expenses drawn by you while occupying the position of Secretary for Public Instruction, Secretary for Public Works, Treasurer, and Acting Premier will be compiled and forwarded to you as soon as possible."

HON. W. FORGAN SMITH: What is wrong with that reply?

HON. W. H. BARNES: When are the Government going to bring to light the expenses that have been incurred? So far they have refused. The Government, by reason of their extravagances, are afraid to place the figures on the table of the House. I challenge the Hon. Minister, the Hon. W. Forgan Smith, who is the only Minister present, to place upon the table those figures. He will not do it, because he is afraid and knows that the exposure would be such that the reputation of the Government, bad as their odour is outside, would be infinitely worse.

HON. W. FORGAN SMITH: The Government can justify every penny of expenditure.

HON. W. H. BARNES: For the sake of the fair name of Queensland, place the statement of expenditure incurred by individual

[Hon. W. H. Barnes.]

members of the Ministry, past and present, upon the table, and let the public know it. That is a fair and proper challenge, and I do not go behind a screen to ask for it to be done. I am doing it in the proper place. The Government stand for ever condemned if they do not comply with that request, which is made, not by one hon. member, but by many hon. members, and by the country. If the Government have any sense of propriety they will do it.

MR. RIORAN: Have you seen the expenses of "George's jazz" up North?

HON. W. H. BARNES: I would like to know something of the expenses in connection with the "jazz" by the Attorney-General. Those expenses concerned a short period, but if it had covered a long period, it would have been most expensive, especially in connection with the bill for spirits. I believe they needed their spirits kept up on that occasion. No attempt has been made in the Budget to lighten the burdens of the people. We have often heard the remarks from hon. members opposite of "squeeze, squeeze." That has been said over and over again. There is a sense in which you cannot squeeze the pockets of the people. It was with very great interest that we read that the Commonwealth Government, realising that the people generally were carrying a load which was preventing development, have tried to rise to the occasion and reduce it, but no attempt has been made by this Government. The Government have broken solemn promises given at the elections. They told the electors that there would be no retrenchment, and on their return they make use of a new word, "deflation," to cover up their tracks.

MR. BRENNAN: What did Fuller do?

HON. W. H. BARNES: Here we have this brainless member for Toowoomba making an interjection like that. We want to know what Queensland is doing, and not what Sir George Fuller is doing. Sacred promises have been broken by this Government. One of the most important factors in connection with the development of Queensland is getting people on the land, and the Government are not doing very much in that connection. They are not issuing parchment to men who are prepared to take up freehold land instead of leasehold.

MR. BRENNAN interjected.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I believe that the hon. member for Toowoomba has bought land at Toowong or Taringa and he has parchment. There is no leasehold for him; he is a wise man. I had an ex-soldier come to me the other day in connection with the granting of money by the department. I give the instance for what it is worth.

MR. WINSTANLEY: It is not worth much.

HON. W. H. BARNES: This man stated he wanted to buy certain property, but he had been told by the department that if it was leasehold he could get it, but if it was freehold he could not.

HON. W. FORGAN SMITH: That is wrong. Give me the details of that matter.

HON. W. H. BARNES: If I see him again I will bring the man along and allow the hon. gentleman an opportunity of seeing him.

MR. FORDE: That is an untrue as the hon. gentleman's statement that Kidston was drummed out of Falkirk.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Here is this hon. member—this ladies' man, a man seeking election for Capricornia and who will never

get there—chirping again. Everything that has been done to assist the primary producers is in the nature of a bunch of carrots. In the first instance, the Government increased the railway fares and freights, thus seriously injuring the primary producers, and then they impounded their butter at a time when the farmers could have got a fair profit. The Government have made a mess of everything that they have dealt with. I believe that if the Government would give consideration to allowing men to embark upon enterprise, feeling that they would not be disturbed, Queensland would go ahead by leaps and bounds, notwithstanding the Government that are in power. The Government are a handicap to everybody.

HON. W. FORGAN SMITH: This Government encourage everybody.

[9.30 p.m.]

HON. W. H. BARNES: I wish to refer to the question of the money which has been advanced in connection with workers' dwellings. The Treasurer, in his Financial Statement, says—

"The loans granted for the financial year aggregated £514,747—namely, £232,233 to settlers and £282,464 for workers' dwellings."

The explanation given is twofold—one that the war was on, and the other that building was too dear.

HON. W. FORGAN SMITH: That is true enough.

HON. W. H. BARNES: There is another thing that is truer still. It is opposed to the Government's policy of leasehold. When the Bill was brought in they were absolutely opposed to it, and stood against the men whom they represented.

MR. WINSTANLEY: That is not true.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I will quote from "Hansard." On the second reading of the Bill in 1909 the following comment of a then Labour member, Mr. Lesina, will be found on page 247 of "Hansard" of that year. Mr. Lesina was a member of the Labour party, and a very active member. He said—

"This is an Act to help workers with small incomes, who have in some mysterious way secured an allotment—perhaps it was purchased by their fathers fifty years ago.

"Mr. Murphy: Why not try to help them get an allotment?"

"Mr. LESINA: Perhaps that would be much better; but, personally, I am not going to help any worker to get a freehold, because I am against that principle.

"The Treasurer: It is against your platform.

"Mr. LESINA: It is against the principles of the Labour party. Our platform is for State ownership of all lands, and it is against any attempt to encourage freeholds. If we are going to give workers freeholds, then we strike at once at the very principle of State ownership."

HON. W. FORGAN SMITH: You are pretty hard pushed when you quote Mr. Lesina.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am on pretty safe lines, and the hon. member knows it. The only time we find a departure from it

*Hon. W. H. Barnes.]*

is when hon. members want to get a place of their own. They do not want leasehold then, because the other man has got freehold. Where does this new Jerusalem come in? The people from Russia whom the hon. member for Toowong mentioned will all want leasehold. Then, the Secretary for Public Works will want leasehold. On page 248 of "Hansard" for 1909 Mr. Allan, the then member for Bulloo, said—

"I do not intend to delay the House very long at this late hour, but at the same time I desire to record my protest against what appears to me to be a most hollow measure. It is the result of the hollow promises made on the hustings a few weeks ago. I do not think I will be far wrong in prophesying that it will be as useless as the Agricultural Bank Act."

The Government have no sympathy with workers' dwellings—they do not believe in the principle. If they will look up their platform, as it appears in the "Worker," they will see that they do not believe in it. Because they do not believe in it, they do everything they can to block it, and the worker will never get any sympathy from them. Hon. members opposite have not changed their platform. There is an ode written by Kipling which reads—

"Lest we forget, lest we forget."

Looking down the headings in the "Standard" you will find the names of some members of the Cabinet who are directors of the concern. On 12th January, 1917, the following appeared in the "Standard" under the heading of "Jack Cade"—

"Australian democracy wants no voice in the councils of an empire whose history and ideals to-day, despite what interested politicians say to the contrary, are based, not on the welfare of the toilers, but on their enslavement and degradation. An empire which, like every other empire, is owned, ruled, and used by a caste of power, privilege, and wealth which is distinctly and often bitterly opposed to the workers, who abjectly submit to Imperialistic domination.

"Australian democracy wants no dealings with such schemes and policies, which are repellant to the whole spirit of the people, and bring nothing but disaster and misery to the workers. Australian democracy, with all its faults, has a far higher ideal than the Imperial one of universal land-grabbing, race exploitation, and questionable secret diplomacy. Australia desires and intends, unless the Imperialistic plotters succeed in their plot, to remain aloof from the dirty schemings, dark machinations, and hidden diplomacies of the chancelleries of Europe, with their savage methods and inhuman customs. The blowing of the patriotic trumpet will not suffice to convince the workers that 'Imperial unity' will prove anything but a curse to Australia."

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

Mr. KIRWAN (*Brisbane*): I would not have risen at this late hour, neither had I any intention of taking part in the debate, had it not been for the strictures passed by hon. members opposite regarding the privilege of the Speaker exercising his casting

vote on certain occasions, and also the exercise of it as an undoubted right by myself as Chairman of Committees. One would imagine that, until the right was exercised by the present Speaker and myself, it was an unheard of thing as far as Australian parliamentary history is concerned. What are the facts of the case? In 1913, when the Cook Ministry took over the reins of power in the Commonwealth with a majority of one, and held office for something like fifteen months, it was quite a common thing for the Speaker in the House of Representatives, and likewise the Chairman of Committees, to give their casting votes on important measures. On one occasion the Speaker, Mr. Elliot Johnson, was challenged for having delivered, at a Liberal picnic in Sydney, a speech which was regarded by a member of the House of Representatives as displaying partisanship. The speech was delivered at Lane Cove, and reported in the Sydney "Daily Telegraph" on Monday, 18th August, 1914. I am now quoting from the "Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates," volume 70, page 542. Speaker Johnson said—

"This places the Speaker in an unenviable and responsible position; but, of course, everybody recognises that it is inevitable under the circumstances that the Speaker in this case must be largely the arbiter in the legislative arena.

"A Voice: Stick to the party.

"Mr. Johnson: Of course, so long as the party sticks to its principles, and the principles of the party with which we are all associated are equal liberty for all, and we are sent there for the purpose of breaking down the restrictive barriers upon the freedom of a free people that during the last three years have been raised to the detriment of the progress of the community."

Mr. FLETCHER: Very fine sentiments.

Mr. KIRWAN: His remarks were greeted with loud applause. The Speaker was challenged with delivering a partisan speech outside while he was Speaker of the House of Representatives, and this was his reply, to be found on page 543 of the Commonwealth "Hansard," 1914—

"My acceptance of the Speakership does not involve the forfeiture of my rights as a private member representing the constituency which elected me, or as a member of the Liberal party outside the House, though while in the chair I know no party inside the House. The hon. member for Cook has no right to question me as to what I propose to do on a coming division, or to interfere with my judgment in any way. I have told nobody how I intend to vote. I allowed the hon. member to put his question as a matter of courtesy, not as a matter of right. He has no right to ask such a question, nor to catechise me in anticipation of what I may do, nor to hold out any threats, direct or veiled, in the event of my vote not meeting with his approval. My vote will be given in accordance with the dictates of my judgment and my conscience. I trust that the irregular practice which has developed on the part of certain hon. members of trying to entangle the Speaker in argument with hon. members by means of debatable and other questions addressed to the Chair will be discontinued. It

[Hon. W. H. Barnes.

adds nothing to the dignity of the House nor its proceedings. I hope that there will be no further attempts to try to involve the Speaker in arguments with honourable members."

There is a good Nationalist Speaker who gave his ruling on that question.

Mr. VOWLES: How often did it occur?

Mr. KIRWAN: It occurred every time that it was necessary for the hon. gentleman to vote with his party. I find no fault with Mr. Elliott Johnson, who occupied the high and dignified position of Speaker of the House of Representatives, giving a specific vote in the House. I see no reason why, because he occupied the position of Speaker, he should be denied that vote. I see no reason why the Speaker and Chairman of Committees should be denied the right to give a vote for the constituencies they represent, yet that is the attitude taken up by hon. gentlemen opposite. I find, on reference to volume 73 of the Commonwealth "Hansard," on a motion of leave to introduce a certain Bill entitled "Government Preference Prohibition Bill," that an amendment was moved by Mr. McDonald in the direction of referring a Bill to a Committee to report thereon. On page 955 we find where a vote was given by Mr. Speaker, who made the following remarks:—

"Ayes 32, Noes 32. The voting being equal I give my casting vote with the Noes and declare the question resolved in the negative."

At a later stage, on page 976, we find the voting was equal again, 33 all, and the Speaker said—

"Ayes 33, Noes 33. The voting being equal I give my casting vote to the Ayes and declare the question in the affirmative."

Mr. VOWLES: That sounds quite familiar. (Laughter.)

Mr. KIRWAN: Then, on page 980, another division took place and the voting was again equal, and the Speaker said—

"Ayes 34, Noes 34. The voting being equal I give my casting vote with the Ayes, and declare the question in the affirmative."

Mr. RIORDAN: Who did that?

Mr. KIRWAN: Mr. Speaker Johnson, in the Federal Parliament. Then, in volume 74, page 1330, we have the division on the second reading of the Bill. The Speaker then said—

"Ayes 31, Noes 31. The voting being equal I give my casting vote with the Ayes, and declare the motion in the affirmative."

Then, on page 1625 of the same volume, the Speaker said—

"Ayes 36, Noes 36. The voting being equal I give my casting vote to the Ayes, and declare the question resolved in the affirmative."

The carrying of that Bill raised one of the most important issues ever raised in the political arena of Australia, and yet it was decided on the casting vote of the Speaker.

Mr. FLETCHER: They did not represent a minority of the people.

Mr. COLLINS: The British Government always represents a minority of the people.

1922—31

Mr. KIRWAN: Hon. gentlemen opposite are always shifting their ground. When they are beaten they shift to something else. I listened to the hon. member for Bulimba making an extensive reference to the principle of leasehold. Anyone would think that, so far as the principle of lease is concerned, that only supporters of the Labour party favoured it. You will recollect, Mr. Dunstan, that this party had to consider the advisableness of doing something in the direction of offering some encouragement to the Jimbour settlers who were placed on the repurchased estate, to induce them to remain there. You will recollect that a Bill was passed through this House to allow the Jimbour settlers to take up leasehold. As you are interested in the daily Press of Gympie, you will recollect that a deputation from the Widgee settlers waited on the Government, asking for the same concession as the Jimbour settlers. What is the use of hon. members opposite talking continually as they do about the principle of leaseholds when leasehold is asked for by a number of people who are opposed to the principles and tenets of this party?

Mr. VOWLES: I say it should be optional. Those who want freehold should get it.

Mr. KIRWAN: The hon. member for Pittsworth, when speaking the other night, made reference to a speech which I delivered in this House in 1912. It was kind of him to read extracts from one of my speeches in the first year that I came into the House. I was speaking on the Financial Statement, or on the Railway Estimates, and was dealing with railway matters. When I offered my congratulations to the Minister for Railways, Mr. Paget, I referred to the increased wages the railway men got, and took advantage of the opportunity to give it as my opinion that the Queensland railway service was the most efficient one in Australia. I have no reason to retract that. I subscribe to those sentiments to-day, but there is this difference: I came into this House in 1912 after the big general strike. The party opposite occupied the Treasury benches at that time, and because of the attitude I took up during that strike, I was victimised because I had the courage to stand up for my principles. Because of that victimisation I stood as the Labour candidate for Brisbane and won a seat that was looked upon as almost impossible to win. I have remained here ever since, and hope to remain as long as the people of Brisbane have confidence in me (Hear, hear!) Notwithstanding my definite political convictions and my allegiance to the Labour party, it did not prevent me getting up and paying a compliment to a political opponent. I had the manliness to get up in this House and congratulate the Minister. Contrast that with the attitude of hon. members opposite, who have never a good word to say for members of this party. As the hon. member for Pittsworth gave me a reference, I will give him one. I will quote from the "Queensland Times" of 11th July, and I will give the hon. gentleman something about the Country party. It is as follows:—

"ROSEWOOD QUEENSLAND FARMERS' UNION.

"DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.

"A Non-Political Body.

"Downs Officials Criticised.

"The president, A. W. Johnstone, discussing correspondence from Fassifern

Mr. Kirwan.]

Divisional Council regarding the formation of West Moreton District Council, said: Mr. Cecil Roberts had been the means of persuading them to join the Nationalists in the first place, and he was for a time a vice-president of the National Democratic Council. The Queensland Farmers' Union was persuaded, through his instrumentality, to withdraw its association with the National Democratic Council. Then Mr. Roberts got them to join up with the Primary Producers' Union, which he afterwards repudiated. The Downs people were also the means of having the 'Producers' Review' recognised as the official organ of the Farmers' Union, and now they wanted that arrangement to be cancelled. He was of the opinion that the leaders of the Downs organisations had placed their personal views before consideration of the benefit of the union. He urged the Rosewood council to stand where it was at present, and not to affiliate with any other body at present. A motion was carried unanimously not to form a divisional council."

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: It was carried on the casting vote of the chairman.

At 9.50 p.m.

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

Mr. KIRWAN: In reply to that sneering reference, I might retort that the resolution was moved by Mr. Muller to the effect—

"That the letter be replied to, stating that under the present circumstances the Rosewood District Council did not intend to join in the formation of a divisional council at present. Mr. Watherston seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously."

Hon. members opposite have had a great deal to say recently about gambling. The hon. member for Bulimba worked himself up to a terrible pitch of excitement, and pointed his finger in a scornful manner at me on one of the back benches, when he asked what I was doing by supervising this awful "Golden Casket," which, he contended, helped to corrupt the community. I am not ashamed of being associated with the drawings of the "Golden Casket," which I find people whom the hon. member for Bowen described the other night as beings born in the purple and blue-blooded aristocrats of England associate with. I have here an advertisement from an English paper in which it is stated—

"Under the patronage of His Grace the Duke of Devonshire, the Right Hon. Lord Riddell, the Hon. Sir Arthur Stanley"—

who, I might mention, for the information of members who do not know, is an ex-Governor of Victoria—

"and Sir Napier Burnett. Proceeds to be divided between St. Thomas's Hospital, the British Red Cross Society, Infant and Child Welfare. First prize, £2,500"—

Not as good as the "Casket." (Laughter.)

"Second prize, £1,000; two prizes of £500; four prizes of £250; ten prizes of £100; fifteen prizes of £50. Tickets, 5s."

[*Mr. Kirwan.*

And in order to push the sale of the tickets they advertise peerless pearls. No doubt, some of our lady friends are here and will be able to judge whether they are a proper adornment for ladies or not. Possibly the hon. member for Kurilpa might be inclined to offer one as a prize for the coming year for the best behaved girl in the West End School. If he wants to get one cheap all he has to do is to send a guinea to this address and he gets a peerless pearl necklace and a ticket thrown in. If an hon. member wants a safety razor, or if a member of the Opposition wants a fountain pen with which to take notes, all he has to do is to send along his guinea and he gets a ticket thrown in. There you have a "Golden Casket" running in the heart of the Empire, about which we have heard so much from the hon. member for Bulimba to-night: running, too, under the patronage of the blue-blooded aristocracy of England.

Mr. KERR interjected.

Mr. KIRWAN: The point I am endeavouring to make is that I am in pretty good company. Now, I want to refer to statements made by the hon. member for Drayton, who had a good deal to say about the action of the Premier in connection with interviews with two gentlemen, and tried to make the Committee believe and to impress on the people outside through the Press and "Hansard," that he, at any rate, believed in a very high ethical and moral code. Yet there is no member in this Committee who is less reliable or whose statements are wider of the truth, or who, I contend, should have less notice taken of him than that hon. member; and I am going to prove it right up to the hilt. Last year, speaking on the guarantee given by the Government for wheat, as reported in "Hansard," page 476, he said—

"If the guarantee is good to-day, why is it that L.A.Q. wheat is being sold in the Brisbane market to-day at 5s. and 6s. per bushel?"

"The Secretary for Agriculture: Talk sense."

"Mr. BEBBINGTON: I have a sample here, and the Minister can inspect it. It is a thing that the Minister should look into. Fair average quality wheat is being sold in the market for 6s. per bushel and under. Is that wheat finding its way into the mills in Brisbane and being gristed into flour, and are the public paying for their bread a price fixed on wheat sold at 8s. per bushel? If I were the Minister, and I was told the same things as I am telling the Minister now, I would go straight to the market and see what is being done. I would stand no nonsense. The farmers' wheat is being sacrificed."

What are the facts? I call as my two witnesses the "Brisbane Courier" and the "Daily Mail." The latter paper of Saturday, 3rd September, 1921, said of the market of the previous day—

"Wheat was more plentiful, but was of very poor quality generally, and all lines were passed in at 2s. 6d., 3s. 3d., 3s. 4d., and 3s. 6d."

And the "Courier" of the same date said—

"All lines of chick wheat failed to reach reserves, and were passed in at 3s. 6d., 3s. 4d., 3s. 3d., and 2s. 6d."

Both journals agree in stating that no fair average quality wheat was sold that day—that no wheat of any kind was sold. The statement of the hon. member for Drayton can be taken for what it is worth, and it is a fair sample of the statements of hon. members on the Opposition benches.

[10 p.m.] Perhaps it would be just as well to give the hon. member for Drayton a reference. I am going to quote an authority to which I do not think there will be any objection—

“A most important meeting of the Central Downs District Council of the Queensland Farmers' Union was held yesterday morning, at the Café Alexandra, when a lengthy discussion took place respecting the disposal of farmers' wheat. The chairman, in the course of his address, said—

Mr. Bebbington had not seen fit to come to their assistance from 20th November, and they were not now going to turn round and ask him to come to their assistance. They wanted the assistance of those men who had from the outset given their services, and who had openly declared themselves to be in favour of a wheat pool. . . . The time was coming when they would have men in the House who would say straight out on any question, and there would be not so much of this d— shuffling. The shuffling at the present time was terrible.”

The reference is from the hon. member for Pittsworth. (Government laughter.) That hon. member also gave the hon. member for Warwick a reference on that occasion. This is what he said—

“ . . . Mr. Barnes, at the conference in the morning, turned his eyes to heaven, and said that he would do anything in the interests of the poor unfortunate farmer, and in the evening Mr. Barnes went on the same old track.”

Then Mr. Fisher gave the Country party generally a reference which I think ought to go into “Honsard.” He said—

“The masterpiece of some of their country members of Parliament seemed to be the opening of State schools, etc., in preference to helping the farmers on the wheat question. . . .”

The hon. member for Pittsworth on that occasion said that the only member of the Opposition who had done anything was the hon. member for Aubigny. (Laughter.) It can hardly be imagined what would have happened if the hon. member for Drayton had got that portfolio which, he said, was offered to him. If the Country party had obtained the reins of office it is just possible that something like this might have occurred—this is from Victoria, about which we hear a great deal from hon. members opposite, particularly the hon. member for Murilla. I want to quote, for the benefit of the Committee and for the information of the country generally, the methods which are adopted there for the slaughtering of a cow which suffers from tuberculosis. The Executive Council draft a minute of this kind—

“Whereas, by section 10 of the Stock Diseases Act, the Governor in Council is empowered, upon the report of an inspector of stock or otherwise that any

stock is diseased, to order the destruction of the same; and whereas a report has been received to the effect that one yellow and white motley spotted cow, named Pettie, branded “P” on the right ramp, with small looped and cocked horns, owned by William J. Arthur Smith, of Harvest Home Lane, Epping, is suffering from contagious pleuro-pneumonia, now therefore His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor of the State of Victoria, in the Commonwealth of Australia, with the advice of the Executive Council of the said State, doth, by this order, order the destruction of the said cow, and the Honourable Henry Angus, His Majesty's Minister of Agriculture for the State of Victoria, shall give the necessary directions herein accordingly.”

(Laughter.) Just imagine what this State has escaped. If hon. members opposite got into power, something of that kind might occur.

Now, I want to develop my argument about the attitude generally adopted by hon. members in this House and by their supporters outside. I want to refer to the policy of misrepresentation regarding the aims and objects of this Government, and particularly with regard to any legislation that is brought in or any scheme of national development that is entered upon. We heard the hon. member for Drayton the other night, after he had voted for the second reading of the Primary Producers' Organisation Bill, get up and say that the farmers under that Bill had been sold like donkeys in a fair. Just imagine any hon. members who held that opinion having the effrontery to vote for the second reading of a Bill which did that. There has been a considerable amount of misrepresentation with regard to the Burnett scheme. The Premier had to put up a fight with the Federal authorities to get loan money to develop that scheme; and eventually, as a result of the influence of the Nationalist members of this State in the Federal Parliament, the Premier was turned down.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: That is not the reason.

MR. KIRWAN: That is the correct reason. THE PREMIER: Hear, hear!

MR. KIRWAN: The Premier was given that as the reason the last time he went to Melbourne to get the agreement drawn up and signed. The Government were able to raise in America a loan with which they were able to enter upon the work. No sooner was the work entered upon than a campaign was started in the daily Press to discredit it. It was pointed out that the land was no good, that it was a wild-cat scheme, that we would never be able to settle a large number of farmers in that particular district. It went so far that even a gentleman who at one time was connected with the Lands Department addressed a meeting in Brisbane. I am now quoting from the “Daily Mail” of 7th April, 1922—

“UPPER BURNETT.

“SCHEME CONDEMNED.

“‘Much Poor Land.’

“Cost Estimated at £5,000,000.

“At a meeting of the council of the Taxpayers' Association of Queensland, held at the offices of Messrs. Hutton and

Mr. Kirwan.]

Macfarlane yesterday, evidence was given by Mr. J. S. P. Bourne, formerly land commissioner for the Maryborough, Gayndah, and Bundaberg districts, which includes the Upper Burnett.

"Mr. J. S. P. Bourne said: . . . It was absolutely wicked and cruel to mislead the public as they were being misled. One of the many untruths which had been told in connection with the Upper Burnett was that it was all good country, from Mundubbera right through. The fact was that about 2 miles outside Mundubbera very inferior land was met with, and it continued on past Eidsvold to within 3 miles of Mulgildie station, which was about 45 miles from Mundubbera. From the point mentioned on the spot known as 'The Dog Holes,' near Cania homestead, the flats were good, but there was virtually no agricultural land beyond that homestead. . . ."

What I want to call attention to particularly is that this gentleman, who once occupied a high and responsible position in the office of the land commissioner for that district, made a report to the Secretary for Public Lands at that time, which is quoted by the Minister in his reply in the "Daily Mail" next day, and which states—

"BURNETT LANDS.

"CRITICISM BY MR. BOURNE.

"*Minister in Reply.*

"Throwing Mud at the State."

" . . . In fact, Mr. Bourne himself in his report, said: 'It is almost impossible to write about the possibilities of the Upper Burnett country without giving the impression that one is exaggerating.' . . . To quote a few instances, Mr. Bourne admits that there is good land on several creeks mentioned, but states that the adjacent country would not carry a beast to 300 acres. Mr. Bourne, in his report, refers to this as rolling hills and slopes studded with happy and prosperous homes; gently sloping forest country, with sandy loam suitable for vines, pineapples, cereals, etc. In another case, he refers to the Cannindah Range as being dreaded by all who have to cross it; much of it is so rugged as to be useless; the rest, with the exception of a few acres, all cattle country. In his report he refers to this as being very rich scrub, stony in parts, but will grow good Rhodes grass, and regards this whole scrub range as a very rich asset, rich vine bottle-tree scrub, much decayed vegetable matter. 'The soil is rich volcanic, chocolate, and black, and this scrub,' he says, 'I am told, extends southwards along the range for a distance of about 30 miles.'"

In further support of my statement that the scheme has been submitted to a considerable amount of misrepresentation in the Press and by hon. members opposite, I want to point out that as far back as 1910 a report was prepared by Mr. J. C. Brännich, whom, I understand, was a first-class chemist in the Department of Agriculture and Stock. The report states—

"Towards the end of last year Crown Land Ranger A. E. Winterford, under instructions from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture and Stock,

[*Mr. Kirwan.*

made a collection of soils from various parts of the Upper Burnett district. The analyses of these soils have just been completed. The great majority are found to be soils of exceptionally high fertility."

Further on, the report states—

"The amounts of lime, in which so many of our Queensland soils are deficient, are in nearly all the samples analysed remarkably high, and also in a very available form."

That goes to show that the reports made under a Liberal Government indicated that the soil was of good quality, and that it was attractive country and should be made available for agricultural settlement; and evidence goes to prove that there were splendid prospects for the settlers; but now that the Labour Government are in power and are going on with the scheme, which the Liberal Government failed to carry out, we have all this deliberate and wilful misrepresentation. Hon. members opposite have spoken about the tremendous taxation imposed by this Government and about the alleged disastrous effects of the policy of this Government during their seven years of administration. The hon. member for Townsville said—

"Taxation is crushing the lifeblood out of industry, which is stagnating and declining."

The hon. member for Drayton said—

"The people are driven to desperation by taxation and a feeling of insecurity."

I desire to take the different producing industries and make a comparison of figures relating to 1915 and to 1920. They are as follows:—

	1915	1920.
Butter . . . . .	lb. 25,496,714	lb. 40,753,373
Cheese . . . . .	4,333,410 Tons.	11,312,262 Tons.
Sugar . . . . .	140,496	167,401

When the hon. member for Bulimba was Treasurer, he was never tired of referring in his Financial Statement to the fact that the best barometer of financial stability in this State was the Savings Bank deposits. The number of depositors in 1915 was 196,569, and the amount deposited £10,389,658. The number of depositors in 1920 was 327,065, and the amount deposited £18,587,942. We are told that the legislation of this Government is bad, as far as production and the general prosperity of the State are concerned; but how is it that a record achievement in connection with the Government Savings Bank is to be found under the administration of this Government?

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: That is no criterion.

Mr. KIRWAN: It is a criterion. I remember money being taken out of the Savings Bank in 1902 by the people, who were compelled to draw on their savings. From 1901 to 1904 the deposits in the Government Savings Bank fell by nearly half a million. I can also remember the time when anyone could get a house in the suburbs of Brisbane, if they would keep the children from breaking the windows and keep the goats off the

verandas. That is a sample of the state of affairs under an anti-Labour Government. At that time I remember you could get shops and offices in any part of the buildings known as the City Buildings, in Edward street. It was absolutely without a tenant. That was in 1902, when there was no land or income tax, and no Labour Government in power, and every fourth shop in Queen street was vacant. If hon. members will compare the deposits in the Government Savings Bank for the seven years prior to the advent of the Labour Government with the deposits in the seven years during which we have been in power, they will find that this State is more prosperous than it has ever been under previous Governments. I will quote an extract from the annual address of the president of the Brisbane Stock Exchange, Mr. A. E. Harte, as reported in the "Daily Mail" of 1st February last—

"IMPROVED PRICES.

"Contrary to experience at the end of 1920, when there was a depression in prices, 1921 ended with a strong upward movement, which was fully maintained when the market reopened after the Christmas vacation. The notable feature amongst the banks has been the purchase by the National Bank of Australasia of the business of the Bank of Queensland Limited."

The National Bank of Australasia is the strongest bank in Australia next to the Commonwealth Bank. Notwithstanding all the speeches of hon. members opposite, and the jeremiads of the daily Press of Brisbane, this strong financial institution comes to Queensland and buys out the Bank of Queensland lock, stock, and barrel. Hon. members opposite are always saying that people want to get out of the State and that there is no capital coming into it. I have given an example of where over half a million of Victorian capital came into the State. The people I am talking about do not earn the basic wage by swinging a pick in a railway cutting; they are out to invest cash, and to get the best return they can from their investments. They would not invest money in Queensland if they believed the statements of hon. members opposite. Mr. Harte said—

"The successful establishment of such an important bank in our State is the subject for congratulation, and goes far to contradict those who think it necessary to say publicly that 'Queensland is practically bankrupt,' as well as those, who, having decided to go elsewhere with their money, think it necessary to write to the papers about it."

How does that cap fit hon. members opposite. I do not know Mr. Harte's politics, but I have reason to believe that he is opposed to the Labour party. We will take the opinion of the manager of this bank. In the "Daily Mail" of the same date, I find this—

"MONEY MARKET.

"BANKER'S OPINION.

"Demand for Capital.

"National Bank's Policy.

"Wholesale optimism is the chief characteristic of the comments made by the chief manager of the National Bank of Australasia, Limited, with regard to the future of Queensland.

"He added that the National Bank would now control funds totalling about

£33,000,000, and it was the intention to considerably expand the business and connection of the bank in this State.

"He added that the management of the bank had confidence in the future of Queensland, and was glad to have the opportunity of participating, as it believed it would to a greater extent than heretofore, in the prosperity which undoubtedly lies ahead of it."

There are no stinking-fish sentiments about that man.

Mr. MOORE: Read what appeared in the "Daily Mail" this morning.

Mr. KIRWAN: Let us now come to another important question. The Christmas trade in Brisbane, and in every other town in Queensland, was a record one. I pointed out on a previous occasion, when speaking in this House, that the hon. member for Bulimba and the hon. member for Warwick and other gentlemen who have got the capital to spend were not afraid to launch out in an extensive business in the Valley, in my electorate, and I trust their enterprise will be fully rewarded. I believe that they opened in time to catch the Christmas trade and share in the record trade which was experienced. I have an extract here from the "Telegraph" of the 23rd December, 1921, which reads as follows:—

"PHENOMENAL TRADE.

"Almost every other department of the big city emporiums is having a large rush of business.

"We are experiencing a record in Christmas trade in Brisbane this year," remarked one perspiring floor manager. 'Phenomenal is the exact word to describe it.'

"The poor shop assistant has hardly time to breathe these days. The sultry weather and the extraordinary rush of customers are giving him (and her) a trying time. The shop assistants of Brisbane will certainly have earned their three and a-half days' holidays, which commences on Saturday.

"In almost every shop in Brisbane one sees the same remarkable sight—people emptying their purses in seemingly wholesale fashion on purchases such as it is their wont to make at the Yuletide season. The grocery shops are doing a roaring trade.

"Conversing with a 'Telegraph' reporter, the principal of one of the big Valley drapery firms said—

Both our town and country trade are the heaviest on record. It takes us all our time to execute the many orders. It is the first time for ten years that our workshops and clothing factory have worked overtime.

"This year's Christmas trade," said the manager of another large Valley establishment, 'is miles ahead of that of any previous year. I have been connected with the firm for twenty-five years and have never witnessed such a volume of Christmas trade.'

"The managing director of a Queen-street concern declared that the gross turnover this Christmas would be considerably ahead of last year. Although values had fallen, on an all-round average, at least 20 per cent., the increase in

Mr. Kirwan.]



the actual quantity of goods sold as against the previous year was much over 20 per cent.

" 'There seems to be no great scarcity of money,' continued this gentleman, as though to confirm what the reporter had already heard in almost every other establishment he had visited. 'Although large numbers are out of work, those who are employed are still earning the higher wages fixed by the Arbitration Court.' "

With regard to the producing industries, there is no evidence to prove that they are in that precarious condition that hon. members of the Country party would endeavour to make the Committee believe. I find, on looking at the exports for the year ended 30th June, 1922, that, so far as Queensland is concerned, the exports show an increase over the imports of £8,932,416. In the same period the exports in Victoria showed an increase of only £229,794 over the imports. That goes to prove that, so far as the land legislation is concerned, as well as the general administration of the Government, it has not had a disastrous effect on production in general. As a matter of fact, the producing interests are exporting more to-day than ever they exported before.

Mr. MORGAN: How do you account for the fact that there is so much back rent due to the Government, which the selectors cannot pay.

Mr. KIRWAN: I am surprised to hear the hon. gentleman, who gets up and speaks as an authority on the cattle question and on the land question, say that a number of pastoralists are unable to pay their rent to the Government. The reason is that we are in this unfortunate position to-day—that, while Australia sacrificed 60,000 of her sons in assisting Great Britain, the people in Great Britain are now eating Argentine meat, while the Germans, whom we fought against, are eating Australian meat. If the hon. gentleman could induce the patriots in Great Britain to eat Australian meat, especially when we supplied them during the war with the cheapest food in the world, it might be of some advantage. It is also well known that during the war we got 5s. 3d. per bushel for Australian wheat, while Canada got 9s. 6d. I do not say that the farmers are complaining about it; but, in view of the tremendous sacrifices which Australia made in men and in regard to supplying primary products at a cheap rate, one would think that they would do better and show their gratitude, instead of eating Argentine meat while the Germans are eating Australian meat. If the people in Great Britain could be induced to eat Australian meat, we would be in a better position and the pastoralists would get a better price for their cattle.

Mr. MORGAN: Don't you think you should find new markets?

Mr. KIRWAN: Yes. I am strongly in favour of finding new markets; but I also think, in view of the sacrifices which we made, that the people in Great Britain should eat Australian meat.

Now, I want to refer to the Queensland Trustees Limited, one of the business firms of this city who deal largely in estates left to them for administration. I want to make this point, too, in making this quotation,

[Mr. Kirwan.

that now that the Public Curator has started, they have a competitor and have not the same wide sphere for their operations as they had previously. The "Daily Mail" of the 25th of July, 1922, said—

"A RECORD YEAR.

"QUEENSLAND TRUSTEES.

"At the annual meeting of the shareholders of the Queensland Trustees Ltd. yesterday the 34th annual report of the directors, for the year ended 30th June, was presented, showing a net profit of £7,774 7s. 7d. It was decided to capitalise £5,050 from the reserve fund.

"The chairman of directors is Mr. R. J. Archibald"—

That gentleman is, I understand, to be the Nationalist candidate for Ithaca at the next election, and, no doubt, he will go round the electorate pointing out what a disastrous effect the actions of the Government have had on the prosperity of the State, and I hope that the hon. member for Ithaca will have this speech printed in the form of a pamphlet and circulated throughout the electorate—

"... The chairman (Mr. R. J. Archibald), in moving the adoption of the report, said: 'From the directors' report and audited accounts that have been circulated, you will see that we have had another successful year. I have scanned the figures that have been presented for the past thirty years, and you will be pleased to hear that the value of the new business entrusted to the company during the last twelve months is the highest on record. The number of new wills of which the company has received notice of their appointment as executors and trustees also establishes a record.' "

Now, I want to call attention to the fact that in 1914, just before this Government came into power, the amount at the credit of trust estates with this company was £2,991,277 14s. 3d., whereas, at the 30th June, 1922, the amount had increased to £5,679,335 9s., an increase of over £2,000,000. You will see that the Queensland Trustees are very far from being ruined. We know that the State is prosperous, but recently we had a tribute paid to us by no less a person than the celebrated Shakespearean actor, Mr. Allan Wilkie, who had been giving the people of Brisbane an opportunity of witnessing performances of Shakespearean tragedies of a very high class. The mayor of this city considered it to be his duty to tender to him a mavoral reception, and on that occasion Mr. Wilkie said—

"It should be a source of pride to Queenslanders for him to say that his previous season in Brisbane had been the most successful to date. In no other State had he received the same support, either artistically or financially. Inspired by the success of that tour he had decided on this visit to go as far north as Mackay, Townsville, and Charters Towers..."

Nobody will dispute the fact that a gentleman of Mr. Wilkie's attainments would not waste his time in North Queensland if he did not think he would be suitably rewarded with large and appreciative audiences for his excellent acting, as well as being able to recoup his expenses. Then, again, the last Christmas season constituted a record for traffic on the railways and for the coastal steamer traffic.

Mr. MORGAN: There was a record loss on the railways.

Mr. KIRWAN: That has nothing to do with my argument. What I am hammering home is that the statements of hon. members opposite as to Queensland being on the rocks of insolvency are untrue. I can remember the time, when we were young men, when we could not go to places like Redcliffe or Tweed Heads or Coolangatta, because the wages we received were not sufficient to enable us to do so.

Mr. MORGAN: You were not a member then.

Mr. KIRWAN: I was not a member of Parliament then, and if I am a member now I think I can claim a little credit for it. I know something about the difficulties of the working class when members opposite were in power. I can remember that my old father worked at Pettigrew's sawmill, not 200 yards from where I am speaking to-night—the Electric Light Company's premises—for the magnificent wage of £1 10s. per week. I can remember the time, when, twelve and a-half years of age, with only a fourth-class education to finish me off, I had to go out and supplement the family income.

Mr. MORGAN: You were not the only one.

Mr. KIRWAN: I know I am not the only one. The position I am endeavouring to illustrate is that under a Labour Government it is not necessary for men to compel their young lads to leave school—the high schools or the grammar schools—and go out to supplement the family income. I can remember the time when the [10.30 p.m.] shop assistants in this city, and the typists, were not able to go to Coolangatta, Tweed Heads, and Redcliffe; they did not earn sufficient to clothe themselves decently and respectably. Now they can dress in the best—all the more credit to them—and, when Christmas and Easter come, they can go to the seaside and enjoy their holidays. That is due entirely to the upward trend of conditions, brought about by the accession to power of this Government. I will quote the experience of Caloundra as an illustration of all the seaside places. The "Daily Mail" of 27th December, 1921, said—

"An unprecedented rush of visitors from all parts of the State still continues. All the boarding-houses are taxed to their utmost to find accommodation for the invasion."

The poor, overtaxed farmer! The poor 10 per cent. squatter! All those people are able to come to Brisbane and go to the seaside. During the reign of this Government they have practically started a new seaside resort—Coolangatta. In 1914-15 there was practically no seaside resort there. Go down there to-day and see if you can get accommodation. A friend of mine is paying £4 10s. a week for a four-roomed house next Christmas.

Mr. MORGAN: I bet he is not a farmer.

Mr. KIRWAN: No, he is not a farmer. The hon. member for Murilla made reference to the attendance at the Brisbane Exhibition, and endeavoured to impress the Committee with the fact that the increased attendance was due to the increase in the population of Brisbane.

Mr. MORGAN: Quite true, too.

Mr. KIRWAN: It is quite wrong. I will allow, for the sake of argument, that his statement is correct. If the population of Brisbane has increased, is it not evidence of the prosperity of the State?

Mr. MORGAN: No.

Mr. KIRWAN: If the statements of hon. members were correct, Brisbane should be losing its population the same as it did in 1902; they should be going on every available boat to New Zealand. I will quote the attendance at the Brisbane Exhibition in 1914 and 1922—

	1914.	1922.
Monday ... ..	5,200	5,500
Tuesday ... ..	9,000	9,500
Wednesday ... ..	48,000	70,000
Thursday ... ..	25,000	47,000
Friday ... ..	11,000	22,000
Saturday ... ..	25,000	18,000
Totals .. ..	124,200	172,500

That shows an increase in 1922 of approximately 48,000. On the two days on which business was in full swing and the Brisbane people were working, the attendance totalled—Thursday, this year, 47,000 as against 22,000 in 1914; and Friday 22,000 as against 11,000 in 1914. That is the prosperous farmer. How can the people who are not working find money to pay their way into the Exhibition?

Mr. KERR: We find them going to the races day after day.

Mr. KIRWAN: Let us take a comparison in receipts. The Prince's year was a record year for the Brisbane annual show. Everybody knows why. A large number of people came to Brisbane not only to see the show but to take advantage of an opportunity to have a look at the future King of England. In 1920 the receipts were £11,500. This year—which constitutes a record—they were £11,816; which means that the increase over the record Prince's year amounted to £316. An hon. member has referred to races. The majority of those who go to the races—particularly those who go into the saddling paddock and are able to cough up 11s. before they get inside—

Mr. MORGAN: They are not the farmers.

Mr. KIRWAN: They are not the farmers. They are not the people on the basic wage. They are the people who were jazzing over at the Belle Vue during Exhibition week; they were the people who attended the Golf Club ball down at the Hamilton, where they had to refuse to sell tickets because there was such a rush; they were the people who went to the ball over at the City Hall in South Brisbane, and those who gave expensive dinners at the various hotels in the city. They are not the people who are on the basic wage; they are the friends of hon. members opposite, who subscribe liberally towards their electioneering funds. (Opposition dissent.) These people, when they come here, take advantage of their presence in the city to visit the races.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: Do you object to their spending money there and not on Golden Casket tickets?

Mr. KIRWAN: I do not. Under this Government they have more money to

*Mr. Kirwan.]*

squaander at the races than they had in 1914, prior to this Government being in power. In 1914, at the Exhibition meeting, £36,101 15s. was passed through the "tote." At last Exhibition meeting the amount was £46,125 5s., an increase of £10,023. That goes to show the amount of money the people have to spend.

Mr. MORGAN: A lot of the money is leaving the State.

Mr. KIRWAN: There is a lot of money coming into the State. Since we adjourned last session four new insurance companies have been formed in Queensland, employing large staffs of agents and managers at high salaries. These gentlemen are not putting their money into these companies for fun, but because they know that they are going to get good dividends. They know that there are good prospects in Queensland, and they are taking no notice of hon. members opposite. The hon. member for Murilla had something to say about Victoria. I desire to quote what the president of the Victorian branch of the Returned Sailors and Soldiers' Imperial League had to say, as reported in the "Melbourne Age" in May last. The report reads—

"'God's own country,' 'the land of sunshine and plenty.' How readily those praises came to the lips of our 'diggers' overseas, and how implicitly they believed in their truth. But the irony of it! Why, to-day, in this so-called 'land of plenty,' some of those men whose deeds and sacrifices have given us that prestige and place among the nations we so proudly boast of are actually on the breadline."

The "diggers" are on the breadline down there.

Mr. MORGAN: They are receiving doles here.

Mr. KIRWAN: In Victoria the soldier-worker and his wife and family have to line up at soup kitchens. We have not got anything like that here. No matter what might be the political views or the view on the affairs of State generally held by the hon. member for Toowong, I want to say that he has done good work in connection with returned soldiers. The following figures will show what has been done in Queensland to assist the returned soldiers:—

	No. of Positions Offered.	No. of Positions Filled.
Queensland ...	435	455
Victoria ...	115	83
New South Wales ...	108	29
South Australia ...	...	55
West Australia ...	...	141
Tasmania ...	...	94

The number of positions filled by returned soldiers in Queensland exceeded the total for all the other States combined.

The executive of the Queensland Returned Sailors and Soldiers' Imperial League, in conjunction with the hon. member for Toowong, is largely responsible for that result.

Mr. KERR: I do not think the hon. member quite understands those figures. (Government laughter.)

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

At 10.37 p.m.,

[Mr. Kirwan.

The PREMIER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move—

"That the question be now put."

Question—That the question be now put—put; and the Committee divided:—

In division,

The PREMIER: Mr. Speaker, I claim for the "Ayes" the votes of Messrs. Coyne, Gilday, Gillies, and McCormack.

AYES, 36.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Huxharr
" Bertram	" Jones, A. J.
" Brennan	" Kirwan
" Bulcock	" Land
" Collins	" Larcombe
" Conroy	" McCormack (Proxy)
" Cooper, F. A.	" Mullan
" Cooper, W.	" Payne
" Coyne (Proxy)	" Pease
" Dash	" Riordan
" Dunstan	" Ryan
" Ferricks	" Smith
" Foley	" Stoford
" Forde	" Theodore
" Gilday (Proxy)	" Weir
" Gillies (Proxy)	" Wellington
" Gledson	" Wilson
" Hartley	" Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Bulcock and Mr. Foley.

NOES, 31.

Mr. Appel	Mr. King
" Barnes, G. P.	" Logan
" Bell	" Macgregor
" Brand	" Maxwell
" Cattermull	" Moore
" Clayton	" Morgan
" Corser	" Nott
" Costello	" Roberts, J. H. C.
" Deacon	" Roberts, T. R.
" Edwards	" Sizer
" Elphinstone	" Swayne
" Fletcher	" Taylor
" Fry	" Vowles
" Green	" Walker
" Jones, J.	" Warren
" Kerr	

Tellers: Mr. Fry and Mr. Kerr.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—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"—put and passed.

The TREASURER: Mr. Pollock, I beg to move—

"That you do now leave the chair, report progress, and ask leave to sit again."

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): Before you leave the chair, Mr. Pollock, I would like to draw attention to the fact that when the debate on the Address in Reply was curtailed, the Premier made a definite promise that every member would have a full opportunity of debate on the Financial Statement. I wish to place on record that that promise was made, and that the Premier has broken his promise.

The PREMIER: If the hon. member wants it, I will give him, with other hon. members, an opportunity of debate on the Appropriation Bill.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN reported progress.

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

The House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.