

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**WEDNESDAY, 30 AUGUST 1922**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

WEDNESDAY, 30 AUGUST, 1922.

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

QUESTIONS.

EXAMINATION OF TRADE APPRENTICES, CENTRAL TECHNICAL COLLEGE.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*) asked the Secretary for Public Instruction—

"1. How many examinations have been held, the dates, number of candidates, those 'qualified' and 'not qualified,' of trade apprentices at the Technical College, Brisbane?"

"2. How many of the qualified candidates were placed in apprenticeship, and at what trade; how many were not absorbed prior to the date of the last examination; and how many were debarred by 'over age' because 'no vacancy' offered?"

"3. Is it correct that in certain cases where lads were put on, subject to examination, that on failure their services were dispensed with, irrespective of the fact that the employer was highly satisfied; also, that such examination subjects in which failure was returned would be difficult to connect with the particular trades engaged in?"

"4. Is he aware that certain awards contain clauses requiring that the result of proficiency examinations must be submitted by an apprentice to a union secretary?"

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

"1. Four.

Examinations.	Number Sat.	Number Passed.	Number Failed.
December, 1920 ..	72	54	18
June, 1921 ..	104	72	32
December, 1921 ..	141	89	52
June, 1922 ..	243	127	116

"2. Ninety-five.

(Electrical Trades Group ...	1
Building Trades Group ...	25
Engineering Trades Group ...	24
Furniture Trades Group ...	13
Printing Trades Group ...	12
Leather Trades Group ...	6
Sheet Metal Working Trades Group ...	14
	95)

Sixty-three.

None.

"3. In one case a boy was employed in contravention of the award. In this instance the employer was not satisfied. The examination in which the boy failed was a simple paper in arithmetic.

"4. Yes, but in such cases a return must be filed with his employer also."

POSITION OF MANAGER OF "GOLDEN CASKET."

Mr. KERR asked the Home Secretary—

"1. Has the manager of the "Golden Casket" resigned his position, or has he been dismissed?"

"2. Does he know such manager or ex-manager's present whereabouts? Has he instituted any inquiries in this connection; and, if so, with what result?"

"3. Has he any knowledge of wrongful appropriation of moneys connected with the "Golden Casket"; if so, by whom was such wrongful appropriation made?"

"4. As a proportion of this money is paid into a Government Trust Fund and is utilised by the Government for various purposes, including an allocation into ordinary revenue account of the State, will he inform the House all about the alleged defalcations, if true?"

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. A. J. Jones, *Paddington*), in the absence of the Home Secretary (Hon. W. McCormack, *Cairns*), replied—

"1. The manager's services have been dispensed with.

"2. I was aware of his address up to the 17th August, since when I have not been concerned.

"3. No; and the report of the inspector of the Auditor-General's Department discloses that there has not been, and there is not, any wrongful appropriation of moneys connected with the 'Golden Casket.'

"See answer to No. 3."

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

APPLICATION OF CLOSURE TO MINES REGULATION BILL OF 1910.

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mirani*) asked the hon. member for Gregory—

"Is he aware that his statement in Committee on Friday last regarding the 'gagging' of the Mines Regulation Bill by a previous Government, and which he advanced as an excuse for the unprecedented use of the 'gag' by the present Government, is quite incorrect, and that, in the case he refers to (the Mines Regulation Bill), on the second reading, when the 'gag' was not applied, ten Labour members spoke, and that the Committee stage occupied two days, clauses 1 to 29 being fully discussed and the remaining clauses (30 to 71) being put through under an order of the House, the 'gag' not coming into operation at all?"

Mr. POLLOCK (*Gregory*) replied—

"The honourable member's question is, as usual, based on false premises. No member who showed a bonâ fide desire to intelligently discuss any measure has been 'gagged' by this Government. Those guilty of obstruction should, and, of course, have been 'gagged' for wasting the time of the House. The guillotine, which has never been used by this Government, is a greater restriction on discussion than the closure. A majority of the late Liberal party, including the honourable member for Mirani, voted to apply the guillotine to the Committee stages of the Mines Regulation Bill of 1910, with the result that

forty-one important clauses of that measure were passed, and neither amendment nor debate was permitted thereon. The honourable member for Mirani is recorded by 'Hansard' as having voted forty-five times on the evening of 28th September, 1910, to pass clauses without giving the Labour party the right to either amend or discuss them. For this reason he would be well advised to delegate the asking of such questions to some colleague not possessed of such a sticky political past."

(Government laughter.)

HOUSING ACCOMMODATION FOR EMPLOYEES AT STATE COALMINE, BOWEN COALFIELD.

Mr. COLLINS (*Bowen*) asked the Secretary for Mines—

"1. What steps are being taken to provide housing accommodation for the employees at the State coalmine, Bowen coalfield?"

"2. Has he taken into consideration the reservation of allotments for employees working in the State mine?"

The SECRETARY FOR MINES replied—

"1. The general superintendent of State coalmines has at present in hand the building of workmen's homes for employees of the State coalmine.

"2. Yes. A number of allotments at Collinsville, Bowen coalfield, have been reserved for the erection thereon of workmen's homes for State coalmine's employees."

MINERS' HOMESTEAD LEASES AT COLLINSVILLE, BOWEN COALFIELD.

Mr. COLLINS asked the Secretary for Mines—

"1. How many allotments were disposed of under the Miners' Homestead Perpetual Leases Act at the recent sale at Collinsville, Bowen coalfield?"

"2. Were the upset prices obtained?"

"3. What was the capital value realised?"

"4. What will be the annual rent?"

The SECRETARY FOR MINES replied—

"1. Allotments	...	...	84
Five-acre portions	...	...	9
			93

"2. Yes, in regard to eleven allotments and four portions, and more than upset price in regard to seventy-three allotments and five portions.

		£	s.	d.
"3. 84 allotments	...	7,112	0	0
9 (5-acre) portions	...	691	10	0
		£7,803	10	0

		£	s.	d.
"4. 84 allotments	...	213	7	2
9 (5-acre) portions	...	20	14	11

£234 2 1"

ROAD CONSTRUCTION ON SOLDIER SETTLEMENTS.

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*) asked the Premier—

"Will he consider the advisability of having estimates prepared for road construction on the various soldier settlements so that these settlements may have a full share of the expenditure of the

proposed £35,000 which has been allotted to Queensland by the Federal Government for the purposes of road construction?"

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

"Yes."

TABLING OF DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS.

Mr. PETRIE (*Toombul*) asked the Premier—

"When will the reports connected with the Home Secretary's and other departments that have not already been furnished be presented and laid on the table of the House?"

The PREMIER replied—

"As soon as printed."

REDUCTION OF LIABILITY OF CO-OPERATIVE WICKER FACTORY TO BLIND INSTITUTION.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE (*Oxley*) asked the Home Secretary—

"With reference to the amount of £350, owing in 1919 to the Blind Institution by the Co-operative Wicker Factory, responsibility for which was undertaken by the Federal Furnishing Trade Society, Queensland Branch, will he state what sums, if any, have been paid to date in reduction of that liability?"

The SECRETARY FOR MINES, in the absence of the Home Secretary, replied—

"£110."

GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE TO BUILDING TRADES GUILD.

Mr. EPLPHINSTONE asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

"1. Is he aware of the existence of a Building Trades Guild or some such body that has its origin in the Trades Hall and aims at undertaking constructional work on co-operative lines?"

"2. Has the Government given any financial assistance to this body; if so, when, to what amount, and on what terms of interest and repayment?"

"3. Is this body in the debt of any State enterprise; if so, which, and to what extent?"

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. J. Larcombe, *Acppel*), in the absence of the Secretary for Public Lands (Hon. J. H. Coyne, *Warrego*), replied—

"1. I am aware of the existence of a Building Trades Guild.

"2. Timber was supplied to the guild on credit.

"3. I refer the hon. member to the Minister in charge of State enterprises for a reply to this question."

AGENT-GENERAL IN LONDON—INTENTIONS OF MR. FIDELLY; TERMINATION OF MR. HUNTER'S APPOINTMENT.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE asked the Premier—

"1. Can he give the House any information in regard to the intentions of Mr. Fidelity in his capacity as Agent-General for Queensland?"

"2. What expenditure did the State incur in regard to his appointment in the way of travelling expenses and allowances?"

"3. In the event of Mr. Fihelly relinquishing his position, at whose expense will he return to Queensland?"

"4. Upon what terms and conditions was Mr. Hunter's appointment as Agent-General terminated?"

The PREMIER replied—

"1. His expressed intention was to do his best as Agent-General to advance the interests of Queensland.

"2. £1,063 9s. 7d.

"3. At State expense, if he holds office for the full period of his appointment.

"4. Salary for the whole of February, 1922, and expenses of him and family in returning to Queensland."

#### PROPOSED NEW RAILWAY.

PLAN, ETC., TABLE.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. J. Larcombe, *Keppel*) laid on the table—

Plan, section, and book of reference of the proposed extension of the Mount Morgan branch railway from Baralaba to Castle Creek;

Together with the report of the Commissioner for Railways thereon.

The Commissioner's report was ordered to be printed.

#### SUPPLY.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE—THIRD ALLOTTED DAY.

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

PREMIER AND CHIEF SECRETARY'S DEPARTMENT.  
MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES.

Question stated—That £37,525 be granted for "Miscellaneous Services."

Mr. SIZER (*Yundah*): Before the vote goes through, I would like to say a few words with regard to the Lieutenant-Governor, for whom an allowance of £950 is provided on this vote. I have spent a little time looking into the position of the Lieutenant-Governor. It certainly seems rather remarkable, in view of the attitude of the Government in recently ruthlessly reducing salaries in the public service, that provision is still made—I say unnecessarily—for £950 to be paid to a gentleman for no particular services whatever. It is recognised that during the absence of the Governor a Lieutenant-Governor must act in his stead. That only happens under extraordinary circumstances, such as during the period when there is a change of Governors or something like that. That has been a part of our system of government for a good many years. I have been looking up the records to see what the practice has been, and I find that the position of Lieutenant-Governor has usually been held by the Chief Justice of the State in an honorary capacity. The first to hold that high office, in his capacity as Chief Justice, was Sir S. W. Griffith, and he naturally carried out his functions very satisfactorily. Sir S. W. Griffith held office until he was appointed Chief Justice of the Commonwealth High Court, when he was succeeded by Sir Pope Cooper, who became Chief Justice of Queensland. That gentleman was appointed Lieutenant-Governor, and

I maintain that he carried out the duties of the office equally satisfactorily. The time came, however, when the political spleen of the Government was directed against Sir Pope Cooper, and they decided that by all means they should get rid of him and take away from him all power whatsoever. The Government first removed him from the position of Lieutenant-Governor, and afterwards, in venting their spleen, they removed him from the bench altogether.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope the hon. member will discuss the vote before the Committee.

Mr. SIZER: I am connecting my remarks with the Estimates by referring to previous occupants of the office. I was saying that the position had been filled very satisfactorily in the past by the Chief Justice. The office was also filled at different periods by the President of the Legislative Council. Seeing that the Legislative Council has been abolished, naturally the position of Lieutenant-Governor, which was filled by the President of the Council, died with it. We now come to this point: Seeing that an executive officer is necessary to act in place of the Governor at times, who should be appointed? The Government have decided that the ex-President of the Legislative Council should be appointed to that position, for which he is to receive £950 a year. I say that that is a most flagrant waste of money, and it is adding absolute insult to the public servants who have been compelled to accept a reduction in their salaries. At the same time, it shows to a great extent the hollow-ness of the Government's cry for economy, particularly when one of their own particular friends is benefited in this direction.

Mr. HARTLEY: It would be all right if it were given to Sir Pope Cooper. It would not be a flagrant waste of money then.

Mr. SIZER: The hon. member should be the last man in this House to talk about advocating a reduction of wages. He offered to resign his seat if the wages of public servants were reduced.

Mr. HARTLEY: I never advocated a reduction of wages.

Mr. SIZER: But you voted for a reduction of wages.

Mr. HARTLEY: Only for those getting over £300 a year.

Mr. SIZER: The hon. gentleman voted with the Government for the reduction of wages.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope the hon. gentleman will connect his remarks with the item mentioned in the Estimates.

Mr. SIZER: In Canada, since 1903 the position of Lieutenant-Governor or Deputy Governor of the various provinces has always been held by the Chief Justice. Prior to that, when there was a British garrison there, and before the country enjoyed complete self-government, the position was held by the senior officer of the military forces; but since the date mentioned the Chief Justice of the province has held the position. In South Africa ever since the Union the Chief Justice has held the position of Lieutenant-Governor, and it is also held by the Chief Justice in New Zealand, Victoria, New South Wales, Tasmania, and South Australia. In Western Australia the position of Deputy Governor is held by the ex-Chief Justice in an honorary capacity.

[*Mr. Sizer.*]

The only time when the Lieutenant-Governor is called upon to act is when the Governor happens to be outside the State. During the time he is so absent, the Lieutenant-Governor is entitled to half the Governor's salary. If he acts during the time that the Governor is in the State, it is in a purely honorary capacity, and he is not entitled to any salary. In the ordinary course of events a Governor is appointed for the term of five years. Probably three or four months may elapse between the termination of his appointment and the appointment of a new Governor. During that time the Lieutenant-Governor would act as Administrator of the Government, and he hitherto has been entitled to half the salary which the Governor receives. This provision goes outside that altogether, and says that the Acting Governor shall receive a permanent salary of £950 per annum. I very much doubt whether that is sound. Certainly it cannot be regarded other than as a gift or a dole to Mr. Lennon. The Constitution lays down exactly what a Lieutenant-Governor or Acting Governor shall receive—that is, half the Governor's salary during such time as he is administering the office. If this is not a flagrant waste of money, I do not know where one can be found. I do not know where it would be possible to find a more glaring case of providing a dole for a Government supporter, who, undoubtedly, has done good work for the Government. It seems rather humorous that whilst the Agent-General is under a special agreement, Mr. Lennon has no such agreement, and therefore was at the mercy of the Government when they decided to reduce salaries by 5 per cent. I would like to know whether Mr. Lennon agreed to the 5 per cent. reduction. I cannot see any ground for agreeing to this item. The Premier might inform us whether the Constitution makes provision for an Acting Governor, and whether the salary is not laid down. He might also tell us whether it is appropriate to grant a salary to a gentleman in this way. The Government cannot now object to the Chief Justice of Queensland acting as Deputy-Governor. What is to prevent the Chief Justice carrying out the duties of this office in an honorary capacity? If he is competent to fill the position of Chief Justice, surely he is competent to fill the position of Acting Governor. That would save the community at least £950 a year, and I do not think that any injustice would be done. The government of the State would be carried on just as effectively, and it would be some satisfaction to the public servants who have had to accept a reduction to know that the Government are attempting to economise and are not wasting the money in this way.

I would also like an explanation of the item of the Australian trade representative in the East. I understand that there is an arrangement with the Commonwealth Government in this connection. I would like to know if the Government are satisfied with the representation they are getting, and whether they think they are getting value for the £2,525, and whether it would not be better to reconsider the question entirely. We have read a lot of adverse criticism about the Australian trade representative in the East. It is necessary for Australia to be represented in the East, but I would like some explanation from the Premier as to whether the Government are satisfied with the value they are getting for the money

expended. I enter my objection to the item of £950 as allowance to the Lieutenant-Governor.

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): When speaking last night I took exception to the allowance of £950 to the Lieutenant-Governor, which we consider is altogether unnecessary. When the occasion arises for the appointment of a Lieutenant-Governor there is ample power to make that appointment under the dormant commission recently referred to. In view of the economy which has been practised on the public servants, we cannot see any justification for the expenditure of £950, and I beg therefore to move the omission of the item—

“Allowance to the Lieutenant-Governor, £950.”

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER (Hon. E. G. Theodore, *Chillagoe*): Hon. members opposite have made a very unnecessary personal attack upon the Lieutenant-Governor.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No.

The PREMIER: What other interpretation can be placed upon the action of the Opposition? They have not only assailed the occupant of the office, but they have actually moved the omission of this allowance made to him. The two or three hon. members who have spoken have referred in most disparaging terms to the present occupant of the office. It is not as though the suggestion by the hon. member for Nundah can be carried out. The position of Lieutenant-Governor is held by Mr. Lennon, and not by the Chief Justice. The appointment was made two and a-half years ago.

Mr. SIZER: The hon. gentleman can retire him if he likes.

The PREMIER: Not unless by the direction of the King.

Mr. SIZER: The hon. gentleman is one of the King's advisers. On whose recommendation was the Lieutenant-Governor appointed?

The PREMIER: I do not mind telling hon. members what ought to have been within their knowledge for the last two and a-half years. Mr. Lennon was appointed by a commission under the hand of the King himself, on the recommendation of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, after advice received from the then Governor of Queensland, the late Sir Hamilton Goold-Adams, who was acting upon the advice of his Ministerial adviser in Queensland.

Mr. SIZER: The hon. gentleman can reverse that process.

The PREMIER: At that time the term of office of the then Governor was expiring. I think he had three months' leave granted to him by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and I think it was in February, 1920, that he was due to leave Queensland. Before he left it became necessary to consider the appointment of a Lieutenant-Governor. I have myself made more than one reference to the fact that the Government did not desire to have any more Imperially appointed Governors, but that we wanted to carry out our policy of having locally appointed Governors; and, consistent with that policy, the Government recommended that Mr. Lennon should be appointed Lieutenant-Governor. If we could have had our policy carried out to its full effect, there would not have been any further appointment. On discussing this matter in

*Hon. E. G. Theodore.]*

England with the then Secretary of State for the Colonies, Lord Milner, he told me that he had no strong views himself, and did not think that his colleagues in England had any strong views upon the question, but, until the majority of the States had decided upon the policy of appointing local men as Governors or Lieutenant-Governors, he thought that it would prejudice the matter if he were to appoint other than an Imperial Governor; but, so soon as a majority of the States were in favour of an alteration of the existing system, the Imperial Government would fall in with that policy, and would agree to a local man being appointed.

[4 p.m.] Of course, as at present constituted, the other State Governments are not disposed to agree to that policy. I think Victoria had already made some representations practically in the same direction as my own representations; but since then they have met with some opposition and public criticism in that State. At present there is not a majority of the States in favour of the appointment of local Governors, and therefore Imperial men are still appointed as Governors to the various States. We had to accept that position without cavil, and Sir Mathew Nathan was appointed to the position of Governor in Queensland. He is a gentleman who is very well qualified to fill the position while it is necessary to have Imperially appointed Governors. Mr. Lennon was appointed Lieutenant-Governor under the King's commission, dated 1920. There is no time limit to that appointment; it is an appointment for life; and he continues to hold that appointment.

Mr. MORGAN: Why this large salary?

The PREMIER: The hon. member would sneer at anyone occupying that position who has been connected with the Labour party, or with the progress of the democratic policy of this State. The position is there, and the salary is paid so that the gentleman occupying the position may uphold the dignity of the office. It is conceivable that a gentleman could be appointed to that position from the people in this State who was wealthy enough to be able to spurn any suggestion of an allowance. Mr. Lennon, unfortunately, cannot do so, and it is only right, under the circumstances, that the Government should make some allowance appropriate to the position which Mr. Lennon is called upon to fulfil.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): The Premier has made one or two mistakes, and I do not think he has read the Lieutenant-Governor's Commission for some considerable time. I had the opportunity of reading it to-day. First of all, the date is not 1920, but 23rd November, 1919.

The PREMIER: Although the commission was signed in November, 1919, it did not come into effect until 1920.

Mr. KERR: That commission has nothing to do with any allowance or salary to the Lieutenant-Governor of this State. That commission simply makes provision for the office of Governor to be carried on in the event of the Governor suffering any disability or being absent from the State. I have been looking up the authorities with regard to the appointment of Lieutenant-Governors, and I find that Todd, in "Parliamentary Government in the Colonies," says—

"During the temporary absence of the

[Hon. E. G. Theodore.

Governor, the general practice is to empower the Chief Justice or senior judge to act as administrator."

Then Keith, another constitutional authority, says—

"In the absence of the Governor through incapacity, the administration is generally delegated to the Lieutenant-Governor if there is one, and, if not, to the Chief Justice of the colony."

The present commission appointing a Lieutenant-Governor makes no provision for any allowance, and some special action is necessary to appoint the late President of the Legislative Council as Lieutenant-Governor with a salary of £950 a year. If it is desired that a Deputy Governor should be appointed, there is sufficient authority already in existence for such an appointment. The Constitution Act lays down that the Lieutenant-Governor may receive half the Governor's salary while acting in that capacity. It is inconceivable, when drastic economy is being practised in the public service, that the Government should appoint a Lieutenant-Governor at £950 per annum. There is nothing personal in the criticism of this appointment, as has been suggested by the Premier. I have listened very carefully to the debate, and on no occasion have I heard the personal element come into the discussion. It is not the gentleman concerned that we are opposed to in any shape or form; it is the office itself.

The PREMIER: If it was some blue-blooded aristocrat you would agree to it.

Mr. KERR: That is not correct. The Premier has attempted to sidetrack the question altogether by bringing in the question of the appointment of a Governor. The appointment of a Governor in this State is provided for definitely. I have given a good deal of thought to this matter, and I have come to the conclusion that the payment of this salary is a waste of public money. The hon. member for Nundah called it a dole, and it certainly looks like a dole.

Mr. COLLINS: You did not protest against the amount spent in connection with the visit of the Prince of Wales.

Mr. KERR: No. If a salary is required for the Lieutenant-Governor, it is already provided for in the Constitution. This vote of £950 for the Lieutenant-Governor is placed among a number of miscellaneous items, possibly in the hope that it would be overlooked by the Opposition. It is such an important matter that the Opposition under no circumstances would permit such a vote to go through without criticism, more especially as public servants are suffering a reduction in their salaries. I intend to support the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition.

HON. W. H. BARNES (*Bulimba*): The Premier, as the previous speaker remarked, has really sidetracked the question. First of all, the hon. gentleman said it was a personal matter. I have listened very carefully to the debate, and I have not heard one single word said against the occupant of the office. Hon. members may hold different opinions on the subject of the gentleman's suitability for this appointment, but not a single word has been said against the occupant of the office. The Premier sidetracked the question, and I want to bring it back to its original position. At one period the President of the Legislative

Council occupied the position of Lieutenant-Governor, and drew a prescribed salary for it; but there is no Legislative Council to-day, and, apparently, there is a desire that the present Lieutenant-Governor—the ex-President of the Legislative Council—should receive some emolument. It is quite possible that the present occupant of the position may not do twenty-four hours' work as Administrator of the Government in the whole year; yet he will receive a salary of £950. The party opposite advocate this payment, but in the past they have been dead against anything like it. Is it fair that the public of Queensland should be asked to carry this burden of £950 when the Lieutenant-Governor may not use Government House other than as a visitor once in twelve months? I am not blaming the Lieutenant-Governor, who appears on these Estimates apparently because the Government have been anxious, as the result of doing away with another place, to make provision for him; and this position has been made for him in which he will do nothing and will get £950 a year. I am sure that you, Mr. Chairman, would look very cheerfully on a position of that kind, especially combined with some of the other positions you occupy at the present time. It would give standing to your position. We find this democratic Government, who have not been able to redeem the promise which was made by the Secretary for Mines to the electors of Paddington that there would not be any unemployment in Queensland, brazenly paying £950 to a gentleman to act as Lieutenant-Governor because they have no other place to put him in. I have a suggestion to make. There are rumours that the gentleman who is occupying the position of Agent-General in the old country is finding that his wings are clipped and his surroundings are not congenial. The Government might be able to appoint the gentleman who is down in this particular vote to the position of Agent-General.

MR. MORGAN: He may be too old.

HON. W. H. BARNES: The hon. member for Murilla forgets that, when it is a matter of political expediency, age is not considered. I am surprised at the hon. member for Murilla making such a suggestion in these democratic days. It seems to me that what I have suggested would be a good way out, under the circumstances. Looking at the matter from the Government point of view, what is going to be the effect outside this Chamber? Suppose, for instance, that the Secretary for Railways has to say to men who are being retrenched that £950 is being paid to someone who is doing nothing, what will those men say? I would not like to be in the shoes of hon. members opposite to feel how they pinch when the public realise they are going right beyond their principles. The time was when they used to argue that no one should receive a salary above a certain amount. If we look at the "Industrial Gazette," we find there are hundreds of men out of work, but the Government are going to give a gentleman £950 a year who will have nothing to do. I wonder if he will come in under the Bill which is going to be introduced to deal with unemployment. In these days of economy, when people are being "deflated" or having their salaries reduced in distinct breach of the Government's policy, we give £950 in connection with an office the work in which may not take one day in the year. We have no word

to say against the occupant of the office; we are standing for a principle. In these days consideration should be given to the man whom the Government sometimes term "the under dog." (Government laughter.) We are told that it is necessary in some cases to retire men at sixty-five years of age, and it seems to me that this case is a departure from the Government policy. I do not wonder at the Premier getting cross, because this is a distinct breach of the policy of the Labour party. It is another nail in the coffin of the party, just as the platform decided upon by the Brisbane Labour Convention which was held some months ago, in connection with which the Premier's advice was not taken; though the hon. gentleman swallowed the pill because it is necessary to keep in with hon. members opposite.

MR. MORGAN (*Murilla*): I am one of those who do not think this expenditure of £950 is necessary. The hon. member for Bowen has continually advocated the abolition of the position of Governor altogether, and I know that there is a number of hon. members on the opposite side who do not approve of the office of Governor at all. I remember when Federation was first being advocated one of the arguments used in favour of it was that we were going to do away with State Governors altogether, and that a Governor-General would be sufficient for all purposes, and that there would be a considerable saving of expenditure. The vote in connection with this particular office is becoming greater each year; but, notwithstanding that, we have this amount of £950 put on the Estimates. The hon. member for Bowen and other hon. members on the other side know that we are not going to receive value for the money. Had the gentleman concerned been appointed to some position in connection with State enterprises, he would have been able to devote his time and attention to the work, and we would have had nothing to complain about then, because we would receive value for the money paid. But the Lieutenant-Governor will draw this £950 a year and will, perhaps, not be called upon to give an hour's attention to the duties of the office in the whole twelve months.

I am not one of those, and the hon. member for Bowen is not one of those, who think that money should be paid away without receiving some return. It is certainly not good business to do that, and it looks to me as if this appointment has been made and this money placed on the Estimates as compensation for services rendered. We know the circumstances attaching to the appointment of Mr. Lennon as Lieutenant-Governor. We know that at one particular time he occupied the position of President of the Legislative Council; and, because he occupied that position, he was appointed Lieutenant-Governor, just the same as Sir Arthur Morgan, the previous President of the Legislative Council, was also appointed Lieutenant-Governor. We have no objection to that, although, generally speaking, I think that, if a Lieutenant-Governor is necessary, the duties should devolve upon the Chief Justice. In the Southern States the practice for years has been for the Chief Justice to hold the position. I am still of the opinion that it is necessary to have a Lieutenant-Governor, as the Governor may become ill, or he may leave the State for a short period, and it is necessary to have a man to perform

*Mr. Morgan.]*

the work during his absence. That being so, the duties should fall upon the shoulders of the Chief Justice of the State. The Chief Justice is already receiving a very handsome salary for the work he performs. No doubt, he performs very important work as a judge of the Supreme Court, but he could easily carry out the functions of the Lieutenant-Governor during the short periods that the Governor is absent from the seat of government. It will not be putting any extra burden on him, and it is already provided that, during the period that the Lieutenant-Governor acts for the Governor, he shall receive half of the salary allotted to the Governor for such short period. I cannot understand why that practice has been departed from, because there is no necessity to depart from it. The Premier and the Government, however, think differently. The Premier, by insinuation, inferred that, if the Lieutenant-Governor had been a wealthy man, we on this side would have offered no objection to his appointment at a salary of £950. We are not raising any objection to the fact that Mr. Lennon was appointed to the position. We are drawing attention to the fact that he is not earning the salary which appears on the Estimates, and he should have been appointed to some other position. If it is necessary to have a Lieutenant-Governor, it should go to the Chief Justice; but, personally, I would prefer to see Mr. Lennon retire from the position and transfer it to the Chief Justice. It should be recognised that whoever becomes Chief Justice should also be Lieutenant-Governor. We are in the position now that we are paying a man £950 without receiving one fraction of a penny in return for the expenditure of that money. How hon. members opposite can countenance a thing of that sort, knowing as they do that there has been a reduction in the salaries of all public servants receiving more than £500 per annum, I cannot understand. The present Government have been responsible for reducing the salaries of public servants who are on the bread line and who scarcely know how to meet their financial obligations. They scarcely know how to keep body and soul together; yet the Government, in a most callous manner, have reduced their salaries, and at the same time placed the very large sum of £950 on the Estimates to placate and compensate a gentleman who has been useful to them in the past.

Mr. BRENNAN: We saved money by abolishing the Legislative Council.

Mr. MORGAN: A certain amount of money was saved, but the hon. gentleman who occupied the position of President is now receiving practically the same salary as Lieutenant-Governor. When he was President of the Council, he was carrying out important functions, and he earned his salary. We have no objection to that, but since that Chamber was abolished the services of Mr. Lennon have been retained at practically the same salary, although we know that in no way does he render any service to the State. We are not getting value for the money spent. Personally, I do not care whether the Lieutenant-Governor is a rich man or a poor man. The Government of the day have no right to pay away money without getting full value for it. Here we have the Government paying away £950 a year. You can call it what you like. You can call it

[Mr. Morgan.

a dole or a pension if you like, but that money is voted to a gentleman who has been very useful to the Government in the past.

Mr. BRENNAN: Don't you think the money voted for the present Governor is wasted? What good is he to Queensland?

Mr. MORGAN: If hon. gentlemen opposite take that view that the £3,000 a year paid to the Governor is wasted, why do they increase that waste by paying £950 to the Lieutenant-Governor? We know that the present Governor is doing useful work in travelling throughout the length and breadth of the State and bringing brightness into many homes in the country.

Mr. BRENNAN: You forced him on us.

Mr. MORGAN: That is no justification for increasing the waste of money by giving Mr. Lennon £950 a year. We get full value for the amount we pay to the present Governor.

Mr. COLLINS: What does he do?

Mr. MORGAN: If hon. members opposite cannot reconcile their consciences to the fact that the present Governor is earning every penny of salary he receives, I fail to see how they can vote for this £950 to a gentleman who will not give one moment's attention to the position.

Mr. BRENNAN: On principle we must vote for it. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. KERR: What about the public servants who reached sixty-five years of age?

Mr. MORGAN: No doubt the hon. member for Toowoomba wishes to be loyal to a "pal" who has done good service in the past.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope the hon. gentleman will not refer to the Lieutenant-Governor in that way.

Mr. MORGAN: I am pointing out that the gentleman who occupies the position of Lieutenant-Governor has been very useful to the present Government, and they wish to compensate him for his usefulness. I am sure that, if Mr. Lennon did not desire the position of Lieutenant-Governor, it would be given to the Chief Justice. If there is ever a vacancy in the position, I am

[4.30 p.m.] sure that this Government will appoint the Chief Justice to the position, and he will be able to carry out the duties of the office in conjunction with his present duties. If the Government wish to compensate in any way those who have been useful to them in the past, it should not be done at the expense of the public; they should put their hands in their own pockets, or make the payment out of the large funds which they have at their disposal. It is humiliating, it is degrading, to be asked to vote a sum of £950 as compensation for one who has been useful to the Government.

Mr. SIZER (*Nundah*): I support the leader of the Opposition. I think that the Premier has altogether missed the point. The case is not affected by the individual who holds the position. We are dealing with the question of the salary of the Lieutenant-Governor, which is provided for by the Constitution. Section 5 of the Governor's Salary Act of 1872, which still stands, reads—

"An officer provisionally administering the Government of Queensland during the absence or incapacity of the Governor



or during a vacancy of the office shall receive one-half the salary of Governor, and, if he be the holder of any other office, one-half the salary of such office."

It is perfectly clear that provision is made for a Lieutenant-Governor, no matter who he may be, and provision also is made for his salary. This item on the Estimates is something in addition, and it raises a rather interesting point. Assume that this salary becomes an annual one of £950, and that the Lieutenant-Governor is not called upon to act during the year. Assume that the following year he is called upon to act. Section 5 of the Governor's Salary Act of 1872 comes into operation, and he would receive one-half the Governor's salary during the time he was acting, plus the £950 per year granted by this House as a kind of compensation. That means that we are playing fast and loose with our Constitution. Surely, we ought to know whether we are going to proceed in accordance with the provisions of our Constitution, or whether it is to be made permissible to look to the Government of the day to provide us with a sum on the Estimates when we leave this Chamber, should we have been particularly useful servants of the Government. I would like the Premier to tell us whether he proposes to amend the Governor's Salary Act of 1872 to provide that the gentleman who temporarily administers the Government of the State shall receive a permanent salary of £950. Unless an alteration is made, the Lieutenant-Governor will be entitled to £950 per annum, plus half the Governor's salary during the time that he is acting as Deputy Governor. I think such a position is unsound, and it should not be tolerated by this House. Whether the Chief Justice, Mr. Lennon, or the Premier himself held the office, that fact would not be altered. If the Premier is so anxious to economise, it would not take very long to advise His Excellency that, in the opinion of the Government, it is advisable to revoke the present commission and issue a commission to the Chief Justice. I have no doubt that the Governor and His Majesty would accept that advice and issue a commission to the Chief Justice. The Premier's argument is all moonshine and subterfuge.

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): I wish to support the amendment. I think it is absolutely necessary that attention should be drawn to what I consider is a misuse of public funds.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. TAYLOR: We have not been told by the Premier that there is any necessity for such an appointment. From the time responsible government was granted to the people of Queensland there has never been the slightest necessity for the making of such an appointment. Whenever the Governor has happened to be out of the State, or in some other way has been prevented from carrying out his duties, previous Governments have been able to carry on without a permanent appointment such as this.

At 4.37 p.m.,

Mr. F. A. COOPER (*Bremer*), one of the panel of Temporary Chairmen, relieved the Chairman in the chair.

Mr. TAYLOR: The Government are the custodians of the public funds, and they have a right to expend them in an economical way—in a way which will not prevent the activities of the State being carried on satisfactorily.

We know quite well what has led up to this appointment. The Legislative Council was abolished, and the Government thought that some provision should be made for Mr. Lennon, who was President of the Council at the time. It is just as well for the Government to own up to it. As President of the Council, Mr. Lennon, for a short period, occupied the position of Lieutenant-Governor; and, when the Council was abolished, the Government thought that some other position should be found for him. Is that a principle to which we should subscribe? If the Legislative Council had continued in existence, Mr. Lennon would still have occupied the position of Lieutenant-Governor. There is ample provision for a Lieutenant-Governor to act when occasion arises, without creating a permanent position for any gentleman. Had this appointment been made by a Country party Government or a Nationalist party Government—had it been made by any Government other than a Labour Government, hon. members opposite would have condemned it throughout the State; and we would have deserved that condemnation. It is contrary to the principles of hon. members opposite that such an appointment should be made. In the face of that, we are asked to sanction a vote which is quite contrary to the principles of democratic government. I hope that, when a vote is taken on the amendment, the item will be deleted. There has been nothing personal in the remarks made by hon. members on this side, but we have been discussing and disputing a principle which we think should not operate. The Government should not have created the position which has called for the discussion which has taken place this afternoon.

Mr. BRENNAN (*Toowoomba*): The leader of the National party said that we were discussing and disputing a principle, and that is why I have risen in my place. We have in Queensland a Governor who has been inflicted upon us by the Imperial authorities against the wishes of the Government in power in Queensland at the time. We have nothing personal against that gentleman. He is a gentleman of high standing, of good education, and very genial personality. But what right has Queensland to be imposed upon to the extent of £7,000 a year for this man? He comes here knowing nothing about our conditions, and we have to teach him all about them. As soon as he learns sufficient to have a grip of Queensland, he returns to England. Hon. members opposite say that we are not loyal if we do not have a Governor. The Imperial link with Australia is the Governor-General. We have too many Governors in Australia. We do not want an imported Governor in Queensland. If the leader of the National party or the leader of the Opposition would move to abolish the office of Governor, I would support it.

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH (to Mr. Corser): You'll lose your seat at the next election.

Mr. CORSER: The wish is father to the thought. We've heard your prophecies before.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. CORSER: Why don't you call on him?

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member for Burnett to withdraw that remark.

Mr. CORSER: The Minister interjected, and I answered him. I am not going to be a slave to anyone in this Committee.

Mr. Brennan.]

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is not in order in making such a remark to the Chair.

Mr. CORSER: The Minister made an interjection and I answered him. You call him to order.

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: You do what you are told.

Mr. CORSER: I will not do what you tell me.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member to withdraw the remark.

Mr. CORSER: I will not. You call on the Minister to withdraw.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member does not withdraw, I shall be forced to resort to the power provided under the Standing Orders. I ask the hon. member to withdraw the remark he made to the Chair.

Mr. CORSER: What remark do you disagree with?

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: I disagree with the remark "You call on him," as addressed to the Chair. I ask the hon. member to withdraw that remark.

After a pause,

Mr. CORSER: I will withdraw the remark.

Mr. BRENNAN: I think that on principle we as a party following the policy of the Labour platform should not have imported Governors here.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*): I do not think the Government are really in earnest in their desire for economy or to give full justice to the public service. It really appears from the remarks of the Premier that the position was filled before it was created. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that it was the desire of the Government to have a local Governor, and the position was really filled before the Imperial Government had been approached, and that, having made that appointment, they still had to keep Mr. Lennon in his position because the appointment had been made by the King on the advice of the Government. The Government could do the same with Mr. Lennon as they would do to an ordinary working man in the same position. If they had appointed an ordinary working man under a misapprehension, they would give him the "loot" at once, or would ask him to retire, as they should ask Mr. Lennon to retire, as his services are not required. According to the remarks of the Premier and the hon. member for Toowoomba, it appears that Mr. Lennon was not appointed because there was any need for his services, but because the Government desired a local Governor. Now that they have an Imperial Governor they are having two for spite. When we are retrenching and cutting down the salaries of the public servants, we should not have a man drawing a big salary for nothing, which really amounts to an old age pension. I intend to support the amendment.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*): The Premier would like to infer that we are making a personal attack upon the Lieutenant-Governor, but the amendment has been moved for reasons quite different from that. Personally, I have the greatest regard for Mr. Lennon. When he acted as Governor, he filled the position with credit to the State, and the duties which devolved upon his wife

and daughters were carried out with credit to themselves and to the State. There is nothing personal in this debate at all.

Mr. HARTLEY: Purely political.

Mr. CORSER: The position is a purely political one. Mr. Lennon was appointed to the position of Speaker in this Chamber, so that he could qualify for the position to which he knew he would eventually be appointed. He was not very much interested in his position as Speaker, because he knew that he was to be appointed to the Legislative Council to practically a life position. When the Government abolished the Legislative Council they abolished Mr. Lennon's position and salary, and they have now created his present billet to fulfil their political promises to him. The salary, instead of being paid by the State, should be paid out of some of the political funds secured by the Government from their "Liberty Fairs" and other such means of obtaining money. Hon. members on the other side object to the expenditure in connection with His Excellency the Governor, yet they have appointed an understudy. We have an understudy to the Agent-General at home, whose salary we do not know too much about, and we are supposed to have several more Ministers now than we had formerly.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: There is no increase in the salaries of Ministers.

Mr. CORSER: No, but there are more Ministers. I am not cavilling at the salaries paid to Ministers. I think every Minister earns the salary which he receives, but we object to this Committee being asked to provide a further £950 as salary for the Lieutenant-Governor, when it has not been necessary in the past. Reference has been made to the present Governor of Queensland. I may say that Sir Matthew Nathan is a man whom the whole of Queensland respects. The people of Queensland are quite satisfied to have a man of his ability and standing from the other side of the world. He is the representative of the King. Hon. members opposite might as well say that the King ought to be an Australian. It is not a burning question throughout the country as to who shall be His Majesty's representative here, so long as he is a man who is capable of filling the position with the dignity that the office demands. The present occupant of the position is doing that, and there should be no slurs cast on him.

Mr. COLLINS: What are you casting slurs on the Governor for?

Mr. CORSER: I am not casting slurs on the Governor. I am protesting against the slurs that have come from hon. members on the other side.

Mr. COLLINS: Who are they?

Mr. CORSER: The hon. member for Toowoomba for one, and I believe the hon. member for Bowen—

Mr. COLLINS: I rise to a point of order. I ask that the hon. member withdraw that remark. The hon. member for Bowen has not spoken on this vote.

Mr. CORSER: I have not stated that you did. I said the hon. member for Toowoomba reflected on the Governor, and I was proceeding to say that I believe the hon. member for Bowen desires an Australian to hold the office of Governor. I am quite satisfied with the present occupant of the position,

[*Mr. Brennan.*]

and I believe the people of Queensland are satisfied. The Imperial authorities have been pleased to appoint Sir Matthew Nathan, and we should make no complaint until we have cause. I oppose the amendment, not on personal lines as suggested by the Premier, but because of the political touch suggested in the appointment.

Question—That the item "Allowance to the Lieutenant-Governor, £950" (*Mr. Tomlin's amendment*)—be omitted—put; and the Committee divided—

In division,

The PREMIER: I declare that, in addition to voting in my own right, I vote for the "Noes" as proxy for Messrs. Coyne, Gilday, and McCormack.

AYES, 33.

Mr. Appel	Mr. King
" Barnes, G. P.	" Logan
" Barnes, W. H.	" Macgregor
" Bebbington	" Maxwell
" Bell	" Morgan
" Cattermull	" Nott
" Clayton	" Peterson
" Corser	" Petrie
" 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. Fletcher and Mr. Fry.

NOES, 36.

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

Tellers: Mr. Foley and Mr. Forde.

Resolved in the negative.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): I would like to say a few words with respect to the experiments being carried out in connection with the destruction of prickly-pear. I would ask the Premier if he can give us [5 p.m.] any information as to the work which is being performed by those who are engaged in the experiments being made with insects and other pests which have been propagated for the purpose of destroying prickly-pear. I think the people outside should be kept fully informed of what is happening. Although the Prickly-pear Board has been in existence for some considerable time, we have seen very little in the Press as to the work which is being carried out by the board. I do not object to the money which is being spent in this direction; in fact, if it was necessary, I would be in favour of voting £10,000 in order to discover some means of eradicating prickly-pear. I am satisfied, after the long experience I have had, that poisons will not bring about the eradication of prickly-pear in Queensland.

Mr. HARTLEY: Hear, hear! It is time you woke up to that.

Mr. MORGAN: I have said that for a long time. We know that there are many good poisons on the market to-day, but, if the hon. member will read the speech which I delivered two or three years ago, he will find that I said then that poisons would not bring about the eradication of the prickly-pear, even if it was supplied to the people free. I also stated that, if spraying would destroy the pear, we could not bring about its destruction by that means, owing to the cost of getting the water and the low value of the lands which are infested with prickly-pear. The board are working in the right direction; but I would ask whether the people are to get full information on the matter, or whether it is to be disclosed only to a few. In my electorate there have recently been set aside 40,000 acres which are to be opened in a day or two, and I am told by the Lands Department that the land is going to be allotted to two gentlemen for a first period of twenty years and a second period of thirty years, or fifty years altogether. I am informed that one of these gentlemen is Mr. O'Sullivan, a son of Mr. Justice O'Sullivan, and the other gentleman is a son of Mr. Henderson, the Government Analyst. I am told that this land has been set aside for these gentlemen, and that they are going to destroy the pear by means of insects. I would like to know whether Mr. Henderson, the Government Analyst, who is dealing with the insects, has discovered that they are destructive, and having inside knowledge, this land has been allotted to Mr. O'Sullivan and Mr. Henderson, who are getting in ahead of anybody else.

The PREMIER: I think I can answer that.

Mr. MORGAN: I should be glad of an answer. I do not suggest that there is anything wrong in regard to this matter, but the people in my electorate who hold this land under occupation license have received a notification of the termination of the license. They have written to me and asked why their license is being terminated. I have made investigation in the Lands Department, and I find that this land, which adjoins the railway on each side, is good land, the furthest point being not more than 3 or 9 miles from the railway. A suspicion has arisen because this land has not been opened to general competition, but has been reserved for the two gentlemen I have named. Has Mr. Henderson, the Government Analyst, discovered that these pests are effective, and, his son having got this inside information, these two gentlemen are going to make a large amount of money out of this lease, which, I understand, is for a period of fifty years? If that is so, it is quite wrong. I think that, when information with regard to these pests is being disclosed, we should all be placed on the same footing. No one has any right to make use of inside information in order to secure a large area of country. The same objection would apply to a similar thing being done in connection with the construction of a railway line. It would not be right for the Secretary for Railways, who knew that a railway was going to be built, to give inside information to anyone which would enable him to get a lot of country before the railway was built.

Mr. COLLINS: That used to be done in the old Tory days.

Mr. MORGAN: Even if it was done in the old Tory time, it is a wrong principle.

Mr. Morgan.]

I am not sticking up for any Government who do things of that description. I hope that the Premier will be able to assure us that there is nothing in the fact that one of these gentlemen happens to be a son of the Government Analyst. I want to see the pear destroyed, and to see people take up land and destroy it, and, if these two gentlemen bring about the destruction of prickly-pear, they will be public benefactors.

The PREMIER (Hon. E. G. Theodore, *Chillagoe*): The experiments which are being carried out in connection with the prickly-pear pest are in accordance with the agreement which the Government made with the Commonwealth Government some time ago. I think this is the third year that this appropriation has been made, and the agreement extends for five years. The amount appropriated is £2,000 a year. The Commonwealth Prickly-pear Board are carrying out certain experiments in regard to the eradication of pear. I do not know if they have discovered any remedy yet, or have come to any definite conclusion in regard to the eradication of the prickly-pear by insect pests or by some bacteriological processes, but I know that they are inquiring very exhaustively into these matters. The hon. member asked if it is possible for anyone to get inside information on this point, and to make use of that information to the exclusion of everyone else. I do not think it is possible.

I have heard that Mr. Henderson and Mr. O'Sullivan took up certain areas of land so that they would be able to apply certain theories which they have in regard to eradication of pear. They are acting under the directional advice of Mr. J. B. Henderson, Government Analyst, who is at present enjoying three months' leave, and is assisting his son in this undertaking. Mr. Henderson has not got access to any information which is received from the Prickly-pear Board; but, if he is able to discover anything that will help us to get rid of the pear, it will be of advantage to the State. Mr. Henderson has a strong scientific bent and a strong inclination to engage in research. If these gentlemen are able to discover any process which will destroy the pear, and place our prickly-pear lands upon a purely commercial basis, then I am sure we wish them good luck in their enterprise. (Hear, hear!) I can assure the Committee that Mr. Henderson has not got access to any information from the Prickly-pear Board, nor do I think he would use it if he had, because he is a thoroughly honourable man. If members of the Committee are interested in the work of the Board, I can tell them that Dr. Harvey Johnston will be very too pleased to see any members and show them through the various experimental stations and explain what he is doing in his endeavours to discover some means for destroying the pear. He will also show them what results he has achieved up to the present time. I may say I went through the stations myself. Professor Harvey Johnston is acting in conjunction with the Commonwealth Bureau of Science and Industry. He has every hope that in future his experiments will lead to the discovery of some means of eradicating the pear by means of insect pests. He is going ahead step by step; and although, naturally, his experiments must meet with many disappointments and hundreds of failures, still he thinks that his experiments are now

[Mr. Morgan.

developing on promising lines, and that he is now on the eve of important discoveries. I do not know that I can say more than that. I have already announced that, with a view to dealing more comprehensively with the prickly-pear question, the Government intend appointing a Board to make a general survey of the prickly-pear infested lands of the State. They will thoroughly study the question from a practical point of view, and will leave the scientific part of it to the Commonwealth Prickly-pear Board. The Board which we shall appoint will go into the question of advising the Government as to what practical steps can be taken to eradicate the pear, or to stop the pest from spreading further. I think that this is work which might be entered into with great confidence by the Government.

Mr. VOWLES: We have been asking you to do that for the last seven years.

The PREMIER: Then you must have been asking for it with a still, small voice. Every time the Government originate any policy of this kind, the leader of the Opposition claims credit for it. I do not mind him claiming credit for anything that he has always advocated, but I am sorry that he has not assisted the Government in this way in the past. I can say that the Government have gone ahead unaided and unassisted, with the determination to take practical steps to put the question under the control of someone who can survey the position and give definite and authoritative advice to the Government.

Mr. BRENNAN (*Toowoomba*): It is rather interesting to hear the leader of the Opposition say that he has been asking the Government to do this for the last seven years. The prickly-pear was brought to Queensland first by the Nationalists and by friends of hon. members opposite, who used to "sack" the groom for not watering it. They exchanged a leaf here and there amongst their friends, and said it was a choice cactus plant. For forty years the friends of hon. members opposite did nothing to stop the spread of the pest, although they could have handled it in three weeks, and now they come along and say that they have been asking for something to be done for the last seven years.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: That is not the only evil that is allowed to grow in Queensland.

Mr. BRENNAN: No; the hon. member is allowed to grow. (Laughter.) Dr. Harvey Johnston has published many reports in the papers, and has also issued a number of publications dealing with prickly-pear, and the Premier has made statements regarding his experiments. We know very well that Dr. Harvey Johnston has discovered that the Monacantha pear can be destroyed by the cochineal insect.

Mr. MORGAN: It was not Dr. Johnston who discovered that. It was Mr. Temple Clerk.

Mr. BRENNAN: We know that Dr. Harvey Johnston is trying to discover an insect that will destroy the other varieties of pear which are so prevalent in Queensland. We know that the hon. member for Burnett has been experimenting with the cochineal insect, and that he has exchanged insects with the hon. member for Murilla, both of whom have been trying to destroy the pear with insects. They know all that is going on in connection with this matter, yet they come to this Committee and pretend

to believe that there is some discovery being made, and that someone is working under the cushion. There are 30,000,000 acres of land under pear in Queensland, and it is open to anyone to take up prickly-pear land at the present time. The hon. member for Murilla can do it, or he can allow his son to take up prickly-pear land, and, if he is bona fide in his wish to get rid of the pear, he can move in that direction. There is nothing to prevent any member of this House from taking up pear land, if he wishes to do so. The Government have nothing to do with Mr. Henderon taking up land. That is a matter for himself. Anyone can take up prickly-pear land, and can get insects to destroy the pear while he is asleep.

Mr. BEBBINGTON (*Drayton*): What the leader of the Opposition said is quite true. Ever since he has been in this House he has asked the Government to do something in connection with the prickly-pear pest. I have always held this opinion, and will not alter it, that you can go from Rockhampton across the Central Railway right through the Dawson River country and right to the New South Wales border without getting out of prickly-pear.

Mr. HARTLEY: That is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: It is quite correct. It is covered with pear, more or less.

Mr. HARTLEY: There are hundreds of square miles free of pear.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: All the better if it is, but I know it is covered with scattered pear. I have seen it myself all the way to Taroom.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: What variety?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: There are half a dozen varieties. We need not trouble about the varieties, so long as it is pear. All pear is a pest. There is a variety called the tree pear, which does not spread.

Mr. HARTLEY: You mistook cabbages for pears.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: The hon. gentleman does not know the difference between cabbage and prickly-pear. (Laughter.) When the Denham Government were in office we used to advise them to do something to get rid of the pear. I advised them to give settlers the clean land in front of the pear and make it worth their while to clear the pear-covered lands. The pear has ruined many of our best settlers, and that is why they clear out and come down to the cities to live. It is no use talking about giving a leasehold on prickly-pear country. A man would be a lunatic to take up a leasehold and clear the prickly-pear. Why should he go to the expense of clearing the land for the Government? If he were given the freehold and he cleared it of pear, he would be rewarded for his labour. I do not know what recommendation can come from this Committee. The only thing to do is to give the settlers freehold land on the cleared land in front of the pear, and let them clear the pear. That is the only way to get rid of it. We have asked the Department of Public Lands for many years to do something to get rid of the pear. Speaking to a Land Commissioner at Taroom, I said, "Give the people clean land in front of the pear, and they will form a barrier against the pest." He said, "We cannot give people clean land." I said, "You have the choice

between giving it to the people and letting the pear take it." The Government would not give the people the freehold of the clean land, and the consequence has been that the pear has taken possession of millions of acres since.

Mr. HARTLEY (*Fitroy*): The advice which the hon. member for Drayton has tendered is very much on the same lines as the advice to burn down your house because there happens to be a fire in the kitchen. (Laughter.) The hon. member says that we should give away all the clean land in front of the pear to prevent the spread of the pear.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: The pear has taken it.

Mr. HARTLEY: Anybody who knows anything about the spread of the pear knows that it is greatest on unoccupied lands.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: On Crown lands.

Mr. HARTLEY: It does not matter whether they are Crown lands or anything else; when the land is not being utilised continually, as is the case in places remote from settlement, particularly the scrub lands along the rivers where there is very little traffic either by cattle or settlers—that is where the pear gets a hold and flourishes. By and by floods bring the pear down the various creeks and rivers. I do not think it would be an exaggeration to say that on some occasions pear from up near Taroom has travelled right down the Fitzroy and Dawson Rivers, and probably lodged on the beaches along the coast from Emu Park to St. Lawrence. I have seen pear growing on the isolated rocky islands along the coast where there has been very little vegetation of other sorts. I think the real solution of the pear problem is, first, settlement on the land which is heavily infested.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Who is going to be fool enough to go there?

Mr. HARTLEY: If it were made worth a man's while to go to hell, he would go, if he could get back. (Laughter.) If you make it worth a man's while to go on pear-infested country, he will go there, if you give him the land on a long lease, with assistance to enable him to clear it. On every occasion when I have spoken about prickly-pear I have advocated—

Mr. COSTELLO: The Government did not take any notice of you.

Mr. HARTLEY: No more than they do of the hon. member. They are quite safe in not taking notice of me at certain times. One of these times they will find, perhaps, that they are unsafe—and that will be a different matter. (Laughter.) The next step in regard to the eradication of pear is to find a commercial use for it.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: That has been sought for a long while.

Mr. HARTLEY: I do not know that the Commonwealth Bureau of Science and Industry and all the other pottifogging bodies have worked on practical lines—it has been pure theory. Mr. Daniel Jones, who lately left Queensland, at one time experimented with pear by turning the residue into a board. He produced a board which was practically equal to beaver-boards or any of the three-ply articles which are manufactured at the present time.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: At what cost?

*Mr. Hartley.*

Mr. HARTLEY: That does not matter. There would be no cost, if it were a waste product.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Who is going to buy it if it is made at a prohibitive cost?

Mr. HARTLEY: I will try to knock this into the hon. member's head. (Laughter.) If a man has a couple of hundred acres of land on a free lease for fifty or sixty years, with Government assistance to clear it, all the pear which comes off it is so much to the good. He can turn it into a by-product and sell it. Is not that profit to him?

Mr. BEBBINGTON: But he cannot.

Mr. HARTLEY: Mr. Jones, on a small scale, made it into a saleable product. Whether it was made on a profitable, commercial basis, I am not prepared to say. If the pear had been a by-product and the board had been produced from it, it would have been profitable. That is one line of investigation on which this Commonwealth Prickly-pear Board might work. Encouragement might also be given to mechanics to invent a machine that will deal with the pear actively and definitely. Mr. Morrissey, for a number of years, has been experimenting with a machine and has brought it to a very fair stage of perfection. He has had to do it all on his own account, and has put his own labour and his own money into it. I think that the Government could well take this matter up. I ask the Premier now to make a recommendation to the Prickly-pear Board to investigate Mr. Morrissey's machine. His address is "Toowoomba"; I daresay a more definite address could be obtained if the Board required it. I am satisfied that some mechanical contrivance could be invented which would deal with at least 70 per cent. of the pear. Not only does that machine eradicate the pear—it takes it up as it goes forward, something in the way of a combination roller and plough—but, when it has taken it from the ground, it grinds it into a material something like the fine sawdust that comes from a sawmill. In that form it could easily be packed and sent to a factory where, in my opinion, it could be converted into hard blocks of a durable consistency, or into boards something like the three-ply of which I have spoken. It would then be profitable as a by-product from the clearing of the pear.

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): I trust that the Prickly-pear Board will take into consideration what the hon. member for Fitzroy has said. I had something to do with the registering of the patent for this machine. It is suitable for the clearing of pear on open country; but if there is any timber, it is absolutely hopeless. I presume that the product would be something in the form of fodder.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Ninety-five per cent. of the pear is water.

Mr. VOWLES: In drought time pear has been used with good effect as fodder for stock.

I wish to draw attention to page 133 of "Hansard," vol. cxx., in reference to the interjection which I made to the Premier to show that I have been asking for the last seven years that the Government should do something practical so far as the prickly-pear is concerned. Every year I have pointed to the fact that there was not in the Governor's Speech anything to indicate that the Govern-

ment had any policy with respect to the pear. This is what I said in 1915—

"I would like to have seen some reference in the Governor's Speech to what I consider is, next to the war, the most important problem that Queensland has to tackle—that is, the subject of prickly-pear. There is no reference to it at all, and, surely, it cannot be through ignorance. Members on the Government side, particularly the Minister for Lands, must know what prickly-pear means to Queensland. He must know that during the last two years, while the people have been standing by watching for the results of the experiments at Dulacca, they were 'hoping against hope' that some method might be devised whereby prickly-pear could be tackled economically. In the meantime that prickly-pear has been growing and growing and growing. Thousands and thousands of acres of estates have been taken charge of by it in that time. With that knowledge, and the knowledge—I say advisedly—that the Roberts experiments have not come up to expectation—

"The Secretary for Agriculture: Has it grown more than usual since the 22nd May?"

"Mr. VOWLES: I am not saying that. We were all standing by, marking time, as it were, waiting the developments of those experiments, and I think we are all satisfied that the developments are not going to be practical.

"Mr. Kirwan: Is that so?"

"Mr. VOWLES: That is my opinion, and it is the opinion of many other persons who have an experience of that particular pest, and it is time that the Government got a move on."

When the Government were in Opposition they said what they would do. They have now been in power seven years, and it is only this year that they propose to do something practical.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: This is the only Government which has done anything practical.

Mr. VOWLES: In the dying days of this Government they are going to appoint a Board to make investigations. We are told that over 1,000,000 acres of land per year are lost through prickly-pear, which [5.30 p.m.] has meant that during the Government's term of office 7,000,000 acres of land have been lost. It is the opinion of people out back that, if the Government desire to increase the value of the land, they must make the conditions more attractive and more acceptable to tenants. I have had twenty-three years' experience in the back country, and I consider that the only way to save the land from pear is to establish a buffer area. The Government should give the land away, if necessary, otherwise it will be lost. They should give the land in front of the prickly-pear area to tenants at a cheap rate, and make it worth the while of the tenants to keep it free from pear, and give them the freehold of every acre they clear. If the Government are going to continue the policy of granting prickly-pear areas under the perpetual lease system or occupation license, they are only placing a premium upon prickly-pear growing. I think the Commission will inform the Government that they should first attend to the land laws.

[Mr. Hartley.

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mirani*): I desire to refer to the item in connection with the erection of new sugar mills. I understand that it is the intention of the Government to erect a mill in the country between the Johnstone and the Herbert Rivers, somewhere about Maria Creek. I have seen that country, and there is no doubt that there is scope there for at least one mill, if not more. We know that Australia requires about 5,000 tons more sugar each year. An up-to-date mill is capable of manufacturing from 10,000 to 15,000 tons of sugar, and from that we must conclude that a sugar mill should be erected in Queensland every three years. I believe that it is a good thing to erect additional sugar mills, because it will be the means of further increasing settlement, in the same way as has been accomplished by the erection of the Babinda and South Johnstone mills, which were initiated by the previous Government and to which the recent increase in our Northern population is largely owing. I am quite in accord with the proposed erection of new mills; but I question whether it is necessary to spend £1,000 upon the appointment of a special Royal Commission.

The PREMIER: The question that the Commission will inquire into will be the location of the mills.

Mr. SWAYNE: It seems to me that the present staff dealing with the sugar industry is quite competent to advise the Government on that matter. Mr. Short, who is in charge of the Government Central Mills at the present time, is quite competent to advise from the millers' point of view, and Mr. Easterby, who is attached to the Department of Agriculture and Stock, is quite competent to advise from a grower's point of view. With regard to advice in connection with machinery, etc., the Sugar Bureau has its consulting engineers—Messrs. Petree and Oakes. The present staff should be as competent as any Commission that can be appointed, and they would probably do the work quicker and cheaper. If the Commission is appointed, it will not only mean additional expense, but it will mean delay. Various people will be called to give evidence, but that evidence will be largely discounted because of their personal interests in the matter. If Mr. Short and Mr. Easterby were instructed to select a site for a mill, they would come to just as wise a conclusion as any commission.

The PREMIER: Surely the hon. gentleman would want the Commission to take evidence from the residents in the different localities?

Mr. SWAYNE: I do not know that it is necessary. The gentlemen I have mentioned could make inquiries on the spot, and come to a decision quicker and cheaper than by the taking of evidence. There is always a lot of redundant and irrelevant evidence. Taking evidence may mean a delay of a year, and time is the essence of the contract to the settlers there. The mills would be erected quicker and more effectively if the matter were left entirely in the hands of the gentlemen I have mentioned.

Mr. COLLINS (*Bowen*): I am not quite in accord with the hon. member for Mirani, although I quite agree with him in connection with the increased amount of sugar required by Australia's increasing population. I hope that the Commission which is to be appointed will give due regard to the Inkerman Estate.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear!

Mr. COLLINS: The sum of £400,000 is to be spent on the Inkerman irrigation scheme, and, if it is going to be a success, there must be increased sugar production there. The Inkerman Mill, which is the second or third largest in Queensland, and which is owned by Messrs. John Drysdale and Company, will not be able to cope with the increased production in that area. Had it not been for the drought conditions which existed in the early part of the year, it would have been necessary to take from 40,000 to 50,000 tons of sugar-cane to Proserpine to be crushed. There is room for increased production in and around Proserpine, and even on the Don River at Bowen. In a very short time the Proserpine Mill will be fully supplied from the Bowen end and also from in and around Proserpine. There are areas between Bowen and Home Hill suitable for sugar-cane growing. One little centre called Gumlu is already turning out a considerable amount of cane, and we shall require more crushing power in and around Inkerman; and I hope the Commission will not overlook that district when they are taking evidence.

At 5.40 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

Mr. GREEN (*Townsville*): There are several items in connection with this vote which particularly affect North Queensland, and I should like to say a few words in connection with them.

The first is the subsidy for a steamer service between Brisbane and the Gulf ports. I feel quite sure that the Committee will agree that the Government are adopting the right attitude in seeing that those who are endeavouring to develop our rich Northern lands and the country behind the Gulf ports are given sea communication with Brisbane. I would also like to point out that the people who are developing that portion of the State will not be properly safeguarded until they are given direct railway communication with one of the Eastern coastal ports. It is certainly the duty of any Government to try and link up that portion of the State with the East by rail. It would not be a great or difficult task to link up the Gulf ports with the Cairns railway system; and if that were done, it would considerably help in the development of that portion of Queensland. I am not speaking from any party standpoint; but the Premier will agree with me that, if Forsyth and Croydon were linked up and direct communication given to Gulf ports, an immense benefit would result.

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

Mr. GREEN: This subsidy is intended to give relief to the Gulf ports.

The PREMIER: A line would only have to be built from Forsyth, the present terminus of the Cairns railway, to Croydon.

Mr. GREEN: If that connection were made, those living in the Gulf districts would not be affected by the industrial troubles that we have from time to time in connection with shipping, and, moreover, they would be brought into much quicker contact with the capital and chief cities of Queensland, and would derive great benefit in that respect.

The second item in the vote to which I wish to refer is the £3,000 for advertising the State. I am pleased to see that the Government, by increasing the vote, have

*Mr. Green.]*

recognised the necessity of advertising the State to a greater extent than in the past. I am one of those who believe that you cannot advertise too much, and in the past we have not spent sufficient in advertising our beautiful scenery and the potentialities of this great State. I only wish that some of the other items were cut out and a larger expenditure provided for in this connection. Various portions of the world are advertised more freely in the Southern States than is Queensland. We have scenery, both coastal and inland, in the Northern portion of Queensland that is unsurpassed in any part of the world, yet, at the present time, parties tour the East for change and to view the scenery of Java and Japan, which is not equal to the scenery which we have in Northern Queensland. (Hear, hear!) I have had the privilege of visiting the East, and on my way back I met people who had gone from South Australia, and when they saw the coastal scenery of Queensland they remarked, "Why don't you advertise more in the South and let the people there know the beautiful scenery you have to show them in North Queensland?" If the Government were to advertise more in the South it would be advantageous to the State, and would attract tourists of the right kind—tourists who would not only be impressed with our beautiful scenery but also with the vastness and possibilities of this great State, and who would assist us to develop our resources. We might use the advertisements as a means of attracting immigrants. I do not mind where the immigrants come from so long as they are of the right type and nationality, and will thus enable us to develop and fill up the vast empty spaces of Queensland, and North Queensland in particular.

I would also like to make some reference to the Royal Commission to inquire into the question of erecting further sugar-mills. The Premier recently visited certain portions of the State, and, as he mentioned yesterday, deputations waited on him in different centres and asked for the erection of sugar-mills; and it appears to me—I do not like to be suspicious—that this item is simply put down as a means of sidetracking the whole question. I hope I am not right in that conclusion.

The PREMIER: Why do you say so?

Mr. GREEN: We had a Royal Commission appointed in 1910, which visited the whole of the Northern portion of this State and reported upon the most suitable localities for the erection of sugar-mills. That Commission made an exhaustive report, and that report is still available.

The PREMIER: Surely the hon. member knows that there was another Royal Commission in 1916, and it is time we had another inquiry, because there have been further developments since that date.

Mr. GREEN: Does the hon. gentleman not recognise that a great many men have settled in the Liverpool and Maria Creek areas, on the distinct promise that a central mill was to be erected there?

The PREMIER: They settled in the Liverpool Creek area on the understanding that a mill would be erected there; and there is a mill there—the South Johnstone mill.

Mr. GREEN: People settled on Maria Creek on the understanding that a central

mill would be erected in that area for the crushing of their cane.

The PREMIER: Yes. The Maria Creek canegrowers are sending their cane this season to the South Johnstone mill.

Mr. GREEN: The Maria Creek settlers were promised that a mill would be erected at Banyan.

The PREMIER: That is so; and no doubt, if a mill is erected at Banyan their cane will go to that mill; but their cane is not left standing at the present time.

Mr. GREEN: I understand that some of the settlers there are being driven off the land because the promise that was made to them has not been fulfilled. In regard to this area, the report of the Royal Commission of 1910 states—

"Settlers—particularly energetic, resolute class of men, who, by their dominant perseverance in past years, have given practical proof of ability to effectively avail themselves of any future encouragement offered them by rendering their holdings productive."

Those are the settlers who are being driven off the land because the promise made to them has not been fulfilled. We have been told that the Government are going to spend £2,000,000 to open up the Burnett lands, ostensibly for the purpose of settling immigrants. At the present time the Government are completing the North Coast Railway, and there is plenty of land available along that line for settlement; and if a sum of £500,000 was spent on two additional sugar-mills, it would settle a large number of families and assist those already settled in those districts.

The PREMIER: Give me a chance, and I will explain that.

Mr. GREEN: If you read through the reports of the Royal Commissions you will find it stated that there are plenty of Crown lands available adjacent to these sites. The railway is being constructed through the district, and I think that it is going to be one of the best payable railways in Queensland when completed. It goes through some of the finest country in North Queensland, if not in Queensland as a whole. If, with a portion of that money, the Government would at once erect a mill there, it would materially assist in opening up that district and in settling immigrants of the right type; it would assist in maintaining a White Australia, and would enable us to defend North Queensland in future years, if it became necessary to do so.

The PREMIER (Hon. E. G. Theodore, *Chillagoe*): The hon. member for Townsville is wrong in assuming that there is anything cut and dried in connection with the proposed new sugar-mills.

Mr. GREEN: I have not assumed that, but I thought there was some delay.

The PREMIER: No, there is no delay. The Government are naturally anxious to get on with the business, but it would be grossly unfair for them to make an arbitrary decision as to the site of a mill or mills. Consider what is involved. I suppose that there are at least half a dozen districts which could show good reasons for the erection of mills in their localities, and at least a dozen other districts or more which think they have equally good claims. In my opinion, some of these districts have very poor claims, but there are half a dozen districts which have, probably, strong claims. It would be easy for

[Mr. Green.]



the Government to curry favour by arbitrarily deciding what locality should have a mill, but that would be unfair to the other districts, and for that reason the Government have decided to appoint an impartial Commission, consisting of the gentlemen I mentioned last night—Mr. Harris, as chairman, and Messrs. Salisbury and Easterby. They will not be influenced by the Government. I do not suppose that those gentlemen would tolerate any interference or restriction in the matter. They are being given a free hand to make investigations in the various districts, and decide the order in which the mills should be built. A Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into the matter in 1910, and it made certain recommendations, and another Commission was subsequently appointed in 1916, and made recommendations; but the conditions are changing every year. The Commission in 1916 recommended that the next sites chosen should be the Tully River, Banyan, and Freshwater Creek, and it also made various other recommendations, but the circumstances have since changed. As a matter of fact, the Freshwater Creek lands are now being utilised.

Mr. GREEN: Freshwater Creek was recommended before others in 1911.

The PREMIER: That may be, but it does not come within the scope of the inquiry. Those lands are under cane, and existing mills are taking the cane. That is why it is necessary to have a fresh inquiry. It may not cost the £1,000 put down on the Estimates, but we want the inquiry to be comprehensive enough for all the people who think they have a right to a mill to put their claims before the Commission, and the Government will consider these claims. The hon. member for Mirani said that Mr. Easterby and Mr. Short could give an authoritative opinion as to the site of the new mills, but that would not be satisfactory, unless they allowed people to put their evidence before them, so that the people in the various districts would be cognisant of the evidence. For that reason I think it is more satisfactory to have a Royal Commission. The Government have no preference with regard to any particular district, and, whatever the recommendations of the Commission are, the Government will adopt them.

Mr. G. P. BARNES (*Warwick*): In this vote for "Miscellaneous Services" there are many items of practical value, not the least important of which is the matter of prickly-pear. Although it is late in the day, I am sure the country will be delighted to know that a degree of success is likely to attend the efforts which are being made for the eradication of the pest. I rose particularly to endorse the attitude of the leader of the Opposition and other hon. members regarding the necessity for the creation of buffer areas for the protection of the State against the spread of prickly-pear. I have advocated this method for many years, and I think everyone is seized with the importance of coping with the pest. Occupancy of the land is the only thing which is of any use, and it would have been far better if the lands adjacent to prickly-pear areas had long ago been given away to the people, instead of having them, as they are doing to-day, developing still further the growth of pear. It is the unoccupied land that is telling the tale against us. If the Government would abandon their idea with regard to leasehold tenure and would give the people the freehold of the land infested with

prickly-pear, a real service would be rendered to the community. A great deal has been said about the 40,000 acres of land which is likely to be taken up by a certain syndicate, who, it is evident, are in possession of information which will lead to successful dealing with the pear. In this connection I want to make a suggestion. There are a great number of local authorities which are deeply interested in the prickly-pear question. In my own district tens of thousands of pounds have been expended in connection with the eradication of pear by various shire councils. Why should the councils not be entrusted with some cochineal insects, in order to make experiments? I would put in a special plea for my own district.

Mr. HARTLEY: You would want someone to look after the cochineal insects for a bit, as well as the pear.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: It might be easier to yard them up than to yard the hon. member. I believe efforts have been made in that direction.

Mr. HARTLEY: You people have found out that you could not yard me up.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Unfortunately, although the hon. member has been yarded up, he indicated this afternoon that he might kick over the traces any moment. I hope the Premier will take cognisance of the recalcitrant member. If other people are willing to take up land on the same terms as the 40,000 acres referred to have been taken up, we should by all means let them do so.

This vote bristles with many items of importance. Take, for instance, the first item with regard to a steamer service for the North. If we would encourage settlement, we must make the conditions of the people there as good as possible, and give them proper transit facilities. I do not think the Committee has been informed as to what is being done regarding the vote of £3,000 for advertising the State.

The PREMIER: I mentioned previously that it is to be expended for the purpose of attracting tourists to North Queensland, and for issuing pamphlets.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I would like to know how the amount is likely to be expended, because I think that £3,000 is altogether too insignificant to be of any real service in advertising the State. That sum

[7 p.m.] will go nowhere, and I would like the Premier to indicate the manner in which this money is to be expended. We can then form some idea of the value of the vote. Anyone who is at all connected with the cost of advertising must be well aware that very little can be accomplished in advertising with an expenditure of only £3,000. If the money is voted just to be given away in certain directions, the Opposition will stoutly oppose it. We only want information regarding it, so that we can judge if the money is to be spent in the right direction. Another item which deserves consideration by the Committee is the amount put down for the expenses of the Australian Trade Representative in the East. I understand there are real good trade prospects in the Eastern ports, especially in connection with meat, and we might find markets there for our surplus meat.

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: Where did you say we could get a market for our surplus meat?

*Mr. G. P. Barnes.]*

Mr. G. P. BARNES: In the East we have a market at our doors. In other directions we can also get markets, and I am surprised that the opportunity to investigate those markets more fully has not been availed of by the Government. The amount voted is infinitesimal, and I hope some information will be forthcoming to indicate the lines upon which the representative is to work.

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: There has been an Eastern Trade Representative appointed by the Commonwealth, and the cost is shared by the States.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Can we have a preliminary report as to what success has attended his efforts?

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: He has not been there long enough. He has sent in a report indicating the amount of imports to the various countries in the East, and the very small proportion supplied from Australia.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I suppose that he has indicated the quantities that may be received from Australia at those ports.

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: If you call at my office, I will let you have a look at the letter.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I shall be very glad to do so. The finding of markets for our surplus products is a matter of infinite importance. Satisfactory development can only be brought about by production and export.

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: I will bring the letter to the House to-morrow morning.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: It will be very interesting. If the information were made available to business men, they could do certain missionary work and further the cause which the Government have had in view in placing this amount upon the Estimates.

Mr. CLAYTON (*Wide Bay*): I notice that the vote for advertising the State has been increased by £1,000. I do not think that any hon. member would object if it had been increased considerably more. Anybody who attended the Maryborough show or the Brisbane Exhibition must have felt proud at the very fine exhibits made by the primary producers from different parts of the State. I refer more particularly to those in the Wide Bay and Burnett district, who showed that the primary producers were capable of producing articles which were a credit to the State. The Pialba district, which was successful in the "B" grade district exhibit, had a very fine display of its potentialities. If we could get one exhibit from the various district exhibits which were entered at either of those shows, it would be one of the finest mediums for advertising the State at the British Empire Exhibition, the preliminary expenses of which are to be £3,000. I do not think we shall object if the Government in their wisdom see fit to expend more than has been placed on the Estimates.

The appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the necessity for additional sugar-mills is a move in the right direction. I think that that Commission should give serious consideration to the question of increasing the supplies of cane to the existing mills.

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: There is no need to have a Commission to do that.

[*Mr. G. P. Barnes.*]

Mr. CLAYTON: The Government have spent a good deal of money in connection with the central mills. If they were to expend money in affording facilities for extra cane supplies to those mills, they would be doing something for the betterment of Queensland. There are many instances of central mills being insufficiently supplied.

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): I would like to have information given regarding the amounts paid to persons for publicity work, which has been referred to in questions which have been asked in this House, including the amount paid to Mr. Randolph Bedford for his publicity work. When asking for this information yesterday, I read the questions bearing on the matter and paragraphs which had appeared in the papers.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The Premier has already replied.

Mr. VOWLES: The Premier has not replied. When he was asked questions in this House, he said that the information would be given at the proper time, when the Estimates were under discussion. I have asked the Premier to give the information, and he has not done so. I ask for that information again.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): It is an extraordinary position for the Committee to be in—that we have to wait until the Premier chooses to come along and answer very important questions. The hon. member for Warwick has raised some very important matters, and not a member on the front Government bench has given him a reply.

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: I gave the information while he was speaking.

Mr. KERR: The Premier's place is on the front bench. In connection with the investigation of the proposed unification of railway gauges, last year £1,000 was appropriated. I would like to know from the Premier whether that amount has been utilised in any investigation in regard to that matter. I would like to know what is the attitude of this Government on that question.

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: It has been stated over and over again.

Mr. KERR: It has not. If the hon. gentleman will read the minutes of the last Premier's Conference, he will find that the Premier was very lukewarm on that matter. This important question of having a uniform railway gauge between the capitals of Australia should receive more consideration than it is receiving.

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that New South Wales and Victoria are stumbling blocks in connection with the matter.

Mr. KERR: I admit that Victoria has not yet agreed, but New South Wales has given its sanction to the matter. A statement has already been published definitely defining the attitude of the New South Wales Government.

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: Only last week.

Mr. KERR: The hon. gentleman said that New South Wales was the stumbling block. This question has occupied a good deal of the time of the Prime Minister, State Ministers, and railway experts.

Mr. COLLINS: Is the hon. gentleman stonewalling the Estimates?

Mr. KERR: No; we are asking questions, and there is no Minister here to answer them. In 1897 a resolution was moved at a conference of Railway Commissioners, reading—

“The Commissioners, in view of the contemplated federation of the Australian Colonies and the desirability of providing the utmost facilities for intercommunication, are impressed with the necessity of having, as soon as possible, a uniform gauge.”

Conferences have been held at different times which have advocated the establishment of a uniform gauge, but nothing definite seems to have been done until May, 1920, when the Premiers of the different States met the Prime Minister in conference. The agreement arrived at was that the capital cities would be connected up. It was agreed at that conference to allocate the cost to the different States, to obtain the approval of the different States, and that railway experts should meet and submit reports. One of the railway experts came from America, one from England, and one was in Australia.

The bell indicated that the hon. member's time had expired.

Mr. KERR: I have not been speaking fifteen minutes.

The CHAIRMAN: This is the hon. gentleman's third speech.

Mr. KERR: That is not right. I have not spoken before on the vote for “Miscellaneous Services.” I have spoken on the general vote. This is the first time that I have spoken on this particular vote.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman spoke at three minutes past four.

Mr. KERR: The railway experts met, and submitted plans to the Premiers' Conference, when an agreement was reached, so far as Western Australia and Queensland were concerned. The Premier of Queensland intimated in a quiet way that Queensland would fall in with some scheme, but he did not intimate what the scheme was. The Prime Minister of Australia, who always advocates the right thing for the good of Australia, has always advocated a uniform gauge, not only between the capital cities, but in other parts. The Government should make every effort to bring this question to a head as quickly as possible. I believe it is estimated that it will take £21,600,000 to link up the different capitals. We know that it is proposed to connect the lines between New South Wales and Queensland, through the Northern Rivers district first. Queensland's quota in connection with the construction of a wider gauge system is £2,535,868, and the work that is required to be done will only cost £1,848,000. That would look as if we were spending a large amount of money and not getting sufficient work for it. That would be a narrow view to take, more especially when you look at New South Wales, which has agreed to go into this scheme, and see that their quota is £7,094,000, and the cost of the work that is going to be done in that State is £1,657,000. It must not be forgotten that the Commonwealth Government are going to bear one-fifth of the cost of the whole scheme, which is estimated to cost £21,000,000. Of course, the Queensland taxpayer will have to meet his share of that one-fifth. A table was prepared by the experts in connection with the question of spreading the expenditure over a number

of years. With the proposal that has been made I cannot agree. I do not think that we should spread the money that is to be expended in Queensland over a period of five or six years, because that would mean that we would have certain work lying idle for that period on which we would be paying interest and getting no return. Owing to the very short line necessary in Queensland to connect with New South Wales, it would be much better if the whole work were done as quickly as possible. The attitude taken up by Sir James Mitchell, the Premier of Western Australia, on this question is very interesting. Mr. Hughes asked this question—

“Then I understand Sir James Mitchell is in favour, broadly speaking, of connecting the capitals?”

“Sir James Mitchell: Yes, I am.”

“Sir Henry Barwell: Are you, Sir James, in favour of the whole of the scheme which involves an estimated expenditure of £21,000,000?”

“Sir James Mitchell: Yes, certainly.”

Mr. Lawson, the Premier of Victoria, thought the time was not opportune, and said he would submit the whole proceedings of the conference to the State Railway Commissioner. He was, under those circumstances, not prepared to commit himself. Sir Henry Barwell, Premier of South Australia, adopted a similar attitude. It remains for the Queensland Premier, if he is sincere in this matter, to join with Sir James Mitchell of Western Australia and the Prime Minister of Australia. Mr. Dooley of New South Wales was not present at the conference.

The bell indicated that the hon. member's time had expired.

Mr. COLLINS (*Bowen*): Speaking earlier in the evening in regard to the necessity for erecting further sugar-mills, I missed a very important point. I pointed out to the Committee how desirable it was that a sugar-mill should be erected on the Inkerman Estate. The point I want to make is this: We have a very large power-house there which is to be used in connection with the irrigation scheme, and I have no doubt that, with a little alteration in so far as electrical power goes, it would be possible to get the power from this large power-house to work a sugar-mill in the event of one being erected. As members of the Opposition seem so anxious to debate this vote, I think we might as well debate it too. With the irrigation scheme in full swing, there must be a big increase in the production of sugar-cane at Inkerman. If it had not been for the drought conditions which existed earlier in the year, the present Inkerman mill would not have been able to cope with the cane grown on the Inkerman Estate, and we would have had to send 50,000 tons to the Prosperpine mill to be crushed. I know of no better place in Queensland that the Commission could visit and take evidence, and I hope that they will go fully into the question of erecting an additional sugar-mill on the Inkerman Estate.

Mr. PEASE (*Herbert*): I would like to say a few words in regard to the vote for advertising the State. We have heard hon. members opposite speaking on this question. If ever there was a time in the history of Queensland when the State needed defending, it is the present, and that is on account of the propaganda of the Opposition. We have

*Mr. Pease.]*

the hon. member for Oxley going into the streets and decrying Queensland.

Mr. J. JONES: Decrying the Government.

Mr. PEASE: On passing the office of the hon. member for Oxley this morning, I was surprised to find that there was a branch of the Charity Organisation Society next door. We have, on the one hand, a member of this Chamber going into the streets and decrying the State, and on the other hand the Charity Organisation Society finds it necessary to open up here, no doubt on account of the propaganda of hon. members opposite. I noticed further that one of the windows in the office of the hon. member for Oxley was cracked, no doubt owing to the indignation felt at the hard things the hon. member has been saying to the detriment of Queensland.

Mr. FLETCHER: That is very weak.

Mr. PEASE: I am going to give you something a bit stronger. I wish to connect up the Country party with this slandering of Queensland. I have here the annual report of a branch of the Country party, in which it is stated—

“Publicity.—During the year the organisation continued to supply the newspapers with three articles weekly on matters of a political nature.”

I also came into possession of an article of this nature, which was not only disseminated through Queensland but also went to the other side of the world. When speaking on the State enterprises I gave an illustration of the sort of political propaganda the Country party particularly were responsible for sending over to the other side of the world, and which was published in the “London” magazine. I read the article, and I am satisfied that every hon. member was astonished at it. I have here another article of the same political nature, which is all in accordance with the propaganda which is going to destroy Queensland. I know that business people at the other end of the world are astonished to find that Queensland is such a good State for business people. I have here an article which appeared in the London “Morning Post.” I am quite sure that every hon. member will be astonished at the political propaganda which the Opposition are responsible for, and which they are going out into the streets to proclaim. If you analyse their propaganda, you will see that it all tends to the discredit of Queensland. This is the sort of stuff that is machined out. In the London “Morning Post” of 22nd January there is an article headed—

“LABOUR IN THE SADDLE.

“QUEENSLAND’S EXPERIENCE.

“From a Special Correspondent.”

It points out that Queensland is the home of the wildest communist enterprises.

It will be remembered how the hon. member for Oxley dwelt on the term “Communist.” I wonder if he wrote that article. The article said—

“Now ‘Extreme Labour’ has seized the political power in Queensland, and is using that power with gross disregard for political decency and constitutional usage.”

I am quite satisfied that I have heard

[Mr. Pease.

some of those terms used by the hon. member for Oxley—

“There is a serious and growing deficit in spite of increased taxation, and, upon the Auditor-General’s report being presented, the Labour Government adjourned Parliament in order to stifle discussion.”

I would like to ask hon. members if they can prove that this House was ever adjourned in order to stifle discussion when the Auditor-General’s report was brought down.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: It was done last session.

Mr. PEASE: The article goes on—

“The number of employees on the State railways has been increased by 33½ per cent.”

I have heard the leader of the Opposition say there were three men doing two men’s work, and we have now the statement which I have just quoted. The article further says—

“A sum of £60,000 has been spent by the Government in support of strikers who were on strike in defiance of the arbitration laws.”

That is the sort of thing that business men in London are served with at their breakfast tables in regard to Queensland. Is it any wonder that we on this side find it necessary to show how false and ridiculous these statements are? The article goes on—

“The financial policy of Labour in Queensland is to loot the property of owners by confiscatory taxation, and to divide the loot among the Labour unions. In doing so they have created a grave situation for Queensland, according to the impartial report of the Auditor-General.”

We have men in Queensland who machine this stuff out and send it to London, to be disseminated amongst the people there, to lead them to believe that the statements are based on the Auditor-General’s report. The matter was brought before the Agent-General, and he dealt with it, and issued a statement to the effect that the article was not only misleading, but calculated to do grave injury to Queensland. Hon. members will realise the injury which has been done. I will give a case in illustration. The principal of one of the largest firms in Brisbane told me this session that he had been to London to do business, and, while there, he called on a firm he had done business with for years and years. This London firm have been supplying certain [7.30 p.m.] goods to the Queensland firm on long term bills. The last time the Queensland merchant went home they said to him, “We are sorry, but we must have cash against the documents for all these articles.” The Queensland gentleman asked why they wanted the cash, seeing they had been dealing with the London firm for years, and credit was established. The London man said, “Queensland is on the brink of a revolution. It is worse than the States of South America, and that is why we want the cash down.” That is the conversation as it was absolutely given to me. These are the political articles of the Country party. If any hon. member analyses this statement, he will find in it the same words that are used by members of the Opposition. There is the word “communism.” The hon. member for Oxley is everlastingly using that word.

When the Agent-General drew attention to the article, especially to the portion relating to the Auditor-General, the editor of the paper put in a footnote which stated—

"This article is from our correspondent in Queensland, who states that it was based on the Queensland Auditor-General's report."

I ask hon. members opposite to show me in the Auditor-General's report where £60,000 was spent by this Government in support of the finances of the strikers, to encourage them to defy the arbitration laws. I also ask the Country party to show me where the Government looted the property owners by confiscatory taxation, in order to divide it up amongst the Labour unions of Queensland. This sort of stuff is connected with the Country party, as it appears in their own report. It says in the report of the Country party, which I have read—

"We are sending out three newspaper articles every week."

I have a North Queensland paper here which contains one of the articles of the Country party. I will not weary the Committee by reading it, but the article is similar to that which I have just read from the London "Morning Post." I ask the hon. member for Bulimba, if he were in business on the other side of the world and he read that article in that reputable newspaper, would he not think that it was correct? Would he not think that it was based on the Auditor-General's report? No wonder that London business people say to Queensland merchants, "We want cash against the documents. We cannot give you credit." I had a letter from a business man in Melbourne not long ago in which he said that he was astounded to find how Queensland was defamed in Melbourne. That defamation is coming from the members of the Country party. I ask the leader of the Opposition, will he stand up to that article? Will he say that the Government spent £60,000 in supplying funds to strikers to strike in defiance of the arbitration law? Will he say that we divided the money of the property owners among the Labour unions of Queensland? Does the leader of the Opposition say that his party are not responsible for the circulation of those statements?

Mr. VOWLES: I do say so.

Mr. PEASE: Why, your own annual report proves it. I have your own report here, which proves that this statement came from your party.

Mr. VOWLES: Rot!

Mr. PEASE: Why, your own members are going about the streets of Brisbane now carrying on the same propaganda. We have the hon. member for Oxley using exactly the same words as appear in this article. The people want to realise that the Country party are trying to defame the Government and are damaging the credit of Queensland. Ask the people of Queensland what they think of it? Does the hon. member for Oxley think that that is the sort of thing to put through the newspapers in London? The funds behind hon. members opposite are the funds that are paid for that sort of dope.

Mr. VOWLES: Nonsense!

Mr. PEASE: We know members of the Country party are defaming the Government in the streets of Brisbane. Fortunately they

cannot get an audience to listen to them. I ask the leader of the Opposition to call off the organisations supporting him and stop them from sending such disgraceful articles to the Press in England.

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): The hon. member for Herbert has accused the Country party of writing these articles. Let me tell that hon. member that these articles are probably inspired by himself. (Laughter.) No one ever seems to see these articles but the hon. member. He says the hon. member for Oxley or some other member of the Country party is responsible for sending that article, but I deny it emphatically.

Mr. PEASE: The same thing is in the report of your own organisation.

Mr. VOWLES: It is all very well for the hon. member to make those charges, but they are without any foundation. If I did not get up and deny them, they would go on record as having been made by some responsible individual, which we took for granted. The hon. member says that the hon. member for Oxley must have written the article because the word "Communist" appears in it. If you read the report of the Labour Conference which took place in Brisbane last October, you will find that, when a certain proposition was put before the meeting, the Premier himself said, "This is communism pure and simple." This communistic cry is based on the words then used by the Premier.

Mr. COLLINS: Do you say that this is a communistic Government?

Mr. VOWLES: We have often been asked what is the meaning of a "Communist." A communist is a man who believes in the equal division of unequal earnings. The communist wants to put in his penny and take the other fellow's shilling. (Laughter.) The hon. member for Bowen used to be a socialist, and that was his idea of socialism; but now he has come round to communism. We do not want to have a dissertation on communism to-night, but, so far as the remarks made by the hon. member for Herbert are concerned, I dissociate my party altogether from them.

Mr. PEASE: You cannot dissociate your party from them, because they are in your own official report.

Mr. VOWLES: The hon. member should be called upon to substantiate the statements he has made. He has made certain remarks about the Country party, but I deny them absolutely.

Mr. PEASE (*Herbert*): The leader of the Opposition is quite wrong in what he says.

Mr. VOWLES: I am right.

Mr. PEASE: The hon. gentleman has asked me to prove what I say, and I am going to do it. I have here a copy of the "North Queensland Herald," printed in Townsville, which reprinted this article from the "London Post," dated London, 22nd January.

Mr. FLETCHER: That has nothing to do with the Country party.

Mr. PEASE: I have the report of the Country party which states that they are supplying three newspaper articles weekly on matters of a political nature.

Mr. FLETCHER: What has that to do with it?

*Mr. Pease.]*

Mr. PEASE: That is one of the articles sent to the paper in London. It was reprinted in the columns of the Townsville paper.

Mr. FLETCHER: Are you going to connect us up with it?

Mr. PEASE: I am going to connect the Country party up with it, and I will connect the hon. member for Port Curtis some time this session with the attempts to bribe the Premier. I am quite prepared to substantiate every word that I have said to-night.

Mr. VOWLES: Did you say, "With the attempts to bribe the Premier"?

Mr. PEASE: Yes, to get the Premier to go over there.

Mr. VOWLES: We would not bribe you.

Mr. PEASE: You would not get me. I am quite prepared to substantiate every statement I have made to-night.

Mr. FLETCHER (*Port Curtis*): Is the hon. member for Herbert in order in saying that I attempted to bribe the Premier?

The CHAIRMAN: I did not understand the hon. member for Herbert to say that.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Yes, he said it all right.

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member for Herbert said that the hon. member for Port Curtis attempted to bribe the Premier, he is out of order.

Mr. PEASE (*Herbert*): I withdraw the statement that the hon. member attempted to bribe the Premier; but I have here the hon. member's photo, taken with the gentleman who approached the Premier. (Loud Opposition laughter.)

HON. W. H. BARNES (*Bulimba*): The hon. member for Herbert has failed to bring before this Committee anything definite in connection with the charges which he has made with regard to the parties who are sitting on this side of the Chamber. There are sitting on this side members who do not belong to the Country party; but I am perfectly certain that anyone who knows the members of the Country party would not for one moment suggest that letters would be written by them to the old country such as that which has been read by the hon. member for Herbert. The hon. member jumped to the conclusion that they had been so written because—he said—certain statements had been made in this Chamber which seemed to correspond with the type of letter that was written to the old country. Is it just for an hon. member to assume, on the evidence of a newspaper paragraph, that that letter was written by any member of the House? The hon. member has a particularly weak case. Have not some of the advertisements, gained by the State as the result of what this Government have done, been quite sufficient to damage the country, and damage the Government irretrievably?

Mr. BRENNAN: In what way?

HON. W. H. BARNES: What has been the policy of the Government but extreme repudiation? (Interruption.) Has the influence of that not been felt in the old country? The hon. member for Herbert asked for my opinion, as a business man, in connection with a certain matter. My view is that trading is very much better carried out on a cash basis than with long-dated bills. Disaster to Queensland in years gone by has resulted from the fact that frequently long-dated bills have been given,

[*Mr. Pease.*

and trading encouraged along those lines. I do not know the business man to whom the hon. member referred.

Mr. PEASE: I will introduce you to him to-morrow.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I make no reference to him personally; but, leaving that gentleman out of the question altogether, is it not conceivable that a man who may have been in a good position has drifted into a bad financial position; and consequently where terms previously had been given they have now been withdrawn? That is happening every day in the week. There were statements in the paragraph which the hon. member read that were altogether wrong. Things have been happening in Queensland. Take "Liberty Fair." Where has some of the money from that gone?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have allowed a fair amount of latitude, but I cannot allow the hon. member to drift altogether. I hope the hon. member will connect his remarks with the vote.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I admit that you have allowed a very great deal of liberty, Mr. Kirwan.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think I have allowed the hon. member a very great deal of latitude, too.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am not doubting that. I want to reply to what the hon. member for Herbert has referred to; but, if you say that I am out of order, I will not persist. Some of the "Liberty Fair" money has gone in a certain direction. The hon. member made one statement with regard to the North. Is it not a fact that the Government stayed their hand when the police were sent to do their duty in the North? Is that a mis-statement?

In connection with advertising, it has been said that the Government, dominated by outside influences, have advertised the State in that particular direction. Did not the Premier himself, when he sought to prevent the adoption of a certain policy in Brisbane recently, say that they were getting out of hand? Is it not a fact that since then the controlling influences have prevailed upon the Premier himself in that particular regard?

Mr. PAYNE: You supported the Government that carried this so-called "Repudiation Bill" to the second reading stage, and the big squatters made you pull out.

HON. W. H. BARNES: Has the Premier made up his mind as to who are to be the members of the Commission to be appointed to inquire into the necessity for additional sugar-mills? I believe that the Government are acting rightly in appointing a Commission. I do not often agree with the Government, but I admit that the change in the nature of our industries makes it necessary to have inquiry before additional sugar-mills are erected in any particular part of the State. Can the Premier say who are to be the members of the Commission?

The PREMIER: You are asking for information that I have already given twice—last night and again to-day.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I very much regret that I did not catch it. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell me whether there are to be three members?

The PREMIER: Yes.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am much obliged to the hon. gentleman. It is very refreshing to know that at last this Government, who have been in office for seven years, are moving in connection with the great sugar industry. It is the first time that they have attempted to do anything. They have sat down and taken the credit that belonged to previous Governments. Hon. members on this side are out to do their best to develop the State, and anything which tends in that direction will have their support. I hope that the Government will not allow themselves to be controlled in this matter by outside bodies, but will be guided by the judgment and wisdom of this Committee.

Mr. BRENNAN (*Toowoomba*): I trust that some of the money for advertising the State will be spent in advertising the Darling Downs. I hope that the Intelligence and Tourist Bureau will have some new photographs taken. A greater amount should be spent in advertising this State in order to counteract the effect of newspapers which have defamed Queensland since Labour came into power. When one goes to Melbourne they hear that Queensland is in a state of revolt, and that the Bolsheviks are in charge. It is a great shame that hon. members opposite do not use their influence with journalists outside to see that proper literature is contained in the different publications, in order to lift Queensland to the standard to which she is entitled. We have the greatest possibilities for advancement and progress in this State.

Mr. FORDE (*Rockhampton*): Hon. members opposite are stonewalling this vote, and are making some ridiculous statements with a view to misrepresenting this Government and this State. The hon. member for Bulimba stated that the Government took seven years to wake up to the necessity of doing something for the sugar industry. When that hon. member was in power he refused to introduce legislation to establish cane prices boards. Probably we can forgive him as a bitter party politician for not giving this Government credit which is due for the establishment of those boards. The cane farmers of Queensland were clamouring for the boards for many years, but it was only when this Government came into power that they were established, with the result that the growers now have representation on the boards, and they have some say in what they shall receive for their cane. As a result of the Labour Government's legislation, the canegrowers have benefited to the extent of £2,000,000. The sugar industry has made wonderful progress since the establishment of the cane prices boards, as will be seen when I say that the value of the sugar crop for the last seven years has been—

	£
1915 ... ..	1,500,000
1916 ... ..	2,089,000
1917 ... ..	4,335,000
1918 ... ..	2,735,000
1919 ... ..	2,342,000
1920 ... ..	3,430,000
1921 ... ..	9,500,000

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope the hon. gentleman will connect his remarks on the sugar question with the appointment of a Royal Commission.

Mr. FORDE: I want to point out that the industry is of such importance that the

Government are wise in appointing a Commission to decide on the location of additional sugar-mills. In 1916 the canegrowers only received £1 6s. 5d. per ton on an average for their cane; in 1921 the Deolbi mill paid £2 8s. 7d., and the Millaquin mill paid £2 7s. 2d.; and the average price for cane for the 1920 season was £2 11s. Realising the importance of this industry, the Government should deal with it in the most cautious and generous way.

Mr. CATTERMULL: Quote the prices for sugar in 1915 and 1921.

Mr. FORDE: I am making my speech in my own way. I am giving figures which the hon. member does not like. He is trying to defend the hon. member for Bulimba. The sugar-growers in the Childers district are watching him.

Mr. CATTERMULL: They are watching the hon. member very closely.

Mr. FORDE: They have a very favourable eye on me, and they tell me they are going to make me the member for Capricornia. I am not going to be led aside by a would-be Labour member of the Legislative Council, whom we would not have. This State has been maligned and misrepresented by agents of hon. members opposite in the London papers, and it is well that we should spend more money in advertising this State. As an Australian, I have always regarded this country as the finest in the world. We should tell the people on the other side of the world what wonderful opportunities are offered here to the right class of people who are prepared to come and make their homes here. In order to refute some of the propaganda by hon. members opposite that Queensland is being ruined under a Labour Government, it is well to turn to the figures of the Commonwealth Statistician in connection with exports from the Commonwealth for the year 1921-22. The exports for that year amounted to £127,949,000, and for the previous year they amounted to £131,925,000, showing a decrease of £3,976,000. In Queensland the figures show an increase in exports of £2,401,435 for one year. We find that the decrease occurred in the Tory-governed States of Victoria and South Australia, and Western Australia. It is well that these figures should be published for the benefit of the people in England and America, so that the right class of people will come to this country. We are told by hon. members opposite that people will not come to Queensland because there is a Labour Government in power, and because there is a Bolshevik Government here. According to the quarterly returns issued by the Commonwealth Statistician, we find that the excess of immigration over emigration for 1921 was—

Queensland ... ..	4,584
South Australia ... ..	4,434
Victoria ... ..	3,375
Tasmania ... ..	2,008
New South Wales ... ..	1,546
Western Australia ... ..	27

Those figures show that the people are flocking to Queensland from other States because they know that under this sympathetic Government they have a better chance of getting a fairer deal than in any other State in Australia. Propaganda of this kind should go out to the people in other parts of the world. The Advertising Branch might also

*Mr. Forde.]*

tell the people of America and England, despite the criticism of hon. members opposite, that taxation under this Government is most equitable, and that people are not being driven off the land and out of industry, as is stated. "The Producers' Review," the official organ of the Queensland Farmers' Union and the United Canegrowers' Association, states—

"The Queensland tax is more equitable and places the burden upon those who are able to bear it."

"The Producers' Review" further states—

"The Queensland and Victorian income tax assessments on large earnings are an interesting comparison when the taxpayer of average means realises that the State revenue has to be obtained from somewhere."

Here are a few comparisons which are set out in "The Producers' Review" of 10th October, 1921. It shows that on a net income of £10,000 the tax in Queensland is £1,680, while the Victorian tax is only £570, while with the small man earning £4 per week the tax is 5s. in Queensland and £3 1s. 7d. in Tasmania. It is well that the

[8 p.m.] Government should advertise the equitable taxation system adopted in Queensland, because we have hon. members opposite who, by their agents outside, send special articles home to the London papers, saying that this Government's taxation is not equitable and that it tends to keep people out of the country.

Another item in the vote is £2,525 for the Australian Trade Representative in the East. I am glad to know that the Queensland Government have assisted in the appointment of a Trade Commissioner in the East, because I think it will open up tremendous possibilities for Queensland. There is a good market

there for our meat, and, just as the dairying industry and rural industries generally require assistance at the present time by the establishment of advisory boards and publicity experts, so our secondary industries require assistance too. In this connection there are great possibilities for Australia in the way of opening up trade with Java and the East generally. It must be borne in mind that the little island of Java, which is only half the area of Victoria, carries a population of over 30,000,000 people, while the East Indies, of which Java is the main distributing centre, have a population of nearly 49,000,000 people. Those people are not supplied with much of what they require by Australia, particularly by Queensland, and the Trade Commissioner in the East might assist us in opening up markets there. Although the bulk of the population in that island consist of the dark-skinned natives, there being only 250,000 whites on the island, there has been an increase in the earning power of the natives in recent years, and consequently their purchasing power has improved. They demand a better class of clothing and better food, just as the workers of Australia when their wages were increased, demanded better clothes and better food; and the primary producers reaped the benefit because they got a better market for their produce. Java and all those other places in the East demand the very best quality, and the Trade Commissioner might keep his eyes on these matters and advise Queensland and the other States of Australia as to the standards they must maintain. Not only should we encourage primary industries but secondary industries as well, so that we might capture these markets. Just consider the wonderful opportunities at present untouched. Take the following figures:—

Country.	Population.	Total Imports.	Australian Trade. 1919-1920.	
			Imports.	Exports.
		£	£	£
China .. .. .	420,000,000	550,000,000	301,826	543,365
South Africa .. .. .	5,000,000	50,750,000	660,653	3,044,351
Strait Settlements .. .. .	720,000	90,000,000	1,363,905	6,216,398
Dutch East Indies .. .. .	47,000,000	40,000,000	6,405,452	2,619,995
Japan .. .. .	80,000,000	270,000,000	4,282,000	7,229,501
India .. .. .	315,000,000	150,000,000	4,597,682	2,454,935
Canada .. .. .	8,000,000	248,025,000	2,640,385	312,452
United States, America .. .. .	107,500,000	1,055,879,642	23,768,030	11,120,037

I have just quoted these figures to show the Committee the imports to these Eastern countries. Take a country like China, with imports amounting to £550,000,000! What an opportunity there is for Australia to get a market for her goods! The trade up to the present time has been neglected, and I am glad that this Government have had something to do with the appointment of a Trade Commissioner in the East. We should make Australia, and particularly Queensland, a great manufacturing country, so that we can supply the people in the East with their requirements. We know that the wearing apparel of the people in China is chiefly cotton. What a wonderful opportunity there is in Queensland for the establishment of secondary industries, particularly the manufacturing of cotton into the finished article! We should be able in a few years to supply China with millions of pounds worth of

cotton goods. As a representative of Central Queensland, one of the greatest cotton districts of Australia, I strongly urge the Government to do everything possible to encourage trade with the East, and get some of that cotton trade, because if we can grow the raw cotton, we ought to be able to manufacture it into the finished article.

We ought also to do a bigger trade with the East in connection with woollen goods, and the Trade Commissioner might be able to assist in that direction. We find that before the last drought Australia had 95,000,000 sheep; Russia had 72,000,000; United States, 48,000,000; and the Argentine, 43,000,000. Two sheep in Australia will produce the value of wool that can be produced by three sheep in Russia, showing that we can produce the right quality of sheep, and we ought to go in to a greater extent for the manufacture of finished woollen goods, so that we might

[Mr. Forde.]



be able to develop an export trade in these goods. What do we find? Mr. Stirling Taylor, Director of the Commonwealth Bureau of Science and Industry, writing on 6th February, 1920, said—

“Although there may be difficulties there is no real obstacle in the way of the greater part of the Australian clip being treated, namely, turned into woollen goods, in Australia.”

I want to see our raw wool turned into finished woollen goods, and our raw cotton manufactured into the finished article, and I want the Trade Commissioner in the East to assist us in getting markets.

In my opinion the British Empire Exhibition Mission will do a great deal towards helping Australia. I see there is a vote providing for a preliminary expenditure of, approximately, £3,000 for the British Empire Exhibition Mission, and the Premier has announced his willingness to assist that mission. The hon. member for Bulimba was present at the dinner in the Belle Vue Hotel given by Major Belcher, who in his speech complimented the Premier of Queensland on his great wisdom and on the foresight he has shown in handling the affairs of the country. The Premier has promised to assist to the extent required, and the Commonwealth Government have recently announced their intention to participate in the Exhibition. What can the Exhibition do for Australia? It can make still better known the merits of Australian agricultural and dairying produce, which every year can be valued at nearly £200,000,000. These men can do wonderful advertising for this country. They will, through that British Empire Exhibition enable Australia to increase her exports of wool, cotton, beef, mutton, lamb, wheat, oats, maize, hay, and other articles. At the present time there is a good trade carried on between Australia and the United Kingdom. Mark the increase which has taken place since 1913, two years before this Government came into power. In 1913 the statistics of trade from Australia to the United Kingdom showed an amount of £33,065,250; in 1920 the amount was £112,709,445. The trade from the United Kingdom to Australia in 1913 showed £37,829,482, and in 1920 it was £68,267,648. Mark the jump from £37,000,000 to £63,000,000 in 1920! From Australia to the United Kingdom it increased from £38,280,462 to £112,709,445, after five years of Labour government. To hear hon. members opposite speak, one would think that we had discouraged trade with the United Kingdom. That is just a part of the small, petty, biassed propaganda which they have tried to disseminate amongst the people of Queensland. The British Empire Exhibition will enable Australians to get into touch with corporations and firms in Great Britain who are anxious to supply their requirements and buy their exports. That Exhibition will be attended by probably upwards of 10,000,000 people from all parts of the British Empire. I learn that cheap steamer fares will be given to Australians to visit the Exhibition, and also to the people of Canada, New Zealand, and other parts of the British Dominions. It will be an unique opportunity for the people to see what the British Empire can produce. That Exhibition will tend to advertise the opportunities that Australia offers to suitable immigrants—to people who are prepared to come here and invest their money in cotton-growing and also in the establishment of secondary industries in

Queensland. I know that Major Belcher, the manager of the mission, after I had arranged for him to be shown over the cotton lands in Central Queensland, said, “If I were ten years younger, I would come to Central Queensland and go in for cotton-growing.” He was very enthusiastic in regard to the wonderful opportunities offering in Queensland for men with a limited capital of about £1,000. Such a man as Major Belcher will be a real live wire in England in helping to advertise Queensland. I am glad to know that a good sum of money will be spent in connection with the British Empire Exhibition. I hope that the Government will continue their wise, statesmanlike attitude on these big questions, which will go towards making Queensland the most prosperous State in the Commonwealth.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Question put and passed.

#### HOME SECRETARY'S DEPARTMENT.

##### CHIEF OFFICE.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. A. J. Jones, *Paddington*): I beg to move—

“That £6,115 be granted for the ‘Chief Office, Home Department.’”

I regret the circumstances which make it necessary for me to move this vote to-night, namely, the illness of my colleague, the Home Secretary. While I do not apologise for acting for him nor do I desire to shirk any responsibility, I think his absence is regrettable, because it is well known to hon. members on both sides of the Chamber that Mr. McCormack has a thorough grasp of his department, and administers it fearlessly, firmly, and sympathetically. (Hear, hear!) Hon. members will observe that there is a net increase in the vote of only £27. Owing to the increased administrative and departmental work caused by the attitude taken up by the department, an Assistant Under Secretary has been appointed, and I think that is an innovation which will be beneficial to the department and also to the State. The department controls a good many different votes which will all need to be discussed, and I content myself now with moving the vote.

Mr. VOWLES (*Darby*): This is a department which controls very important branches such as “Relief of Aborigines,” “Charitable Institutions,” “Health,” “Outdoor Relief,” “State Children,” and “Miscellaneous Services.”

A good deal of attention has recently been directed to a matter which is controlled by the department—that is, the “Golden Casket.” Exception has been taken by some people to taking this money away from a multitude of workers in order to create a few capitalists. It struck me at the time that this statement must have appealed to the hon. member for Bowen. The question as to whether we should continue to carry on this system of gambling is one which the Committee should consider, more particularly as reference has been made in the public Press and this House during the last few days to certain rumours which are abroad in respect to the carrying on of this system. We were told this afternoon in reply to a question that the manager had been dismissed. It is a most remarkable thing that a man should be dismissed if there are no irregularities.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: He was not dismissed for that reason at all.

*Mr. Vowles.]*

Mr. VOWLES: We are told that there has been a complete audit, and that everything is in order. I am very pleased to hear that for the sake of the individual, because there have been some very nasty rumours about town. If those rumours are not correct, the truth should be made known.

Mr. GLEDSON: Let us know what they are.

Mr. VOWLES: In the first place there was a rumour that money had been stolen—I do not say it is correct. In answer to a question to-day we were told, first of all, that the manager's services have been dispensed with, and then we were told that there were no irregularities.

Mr. GLEDSON: Who told you that money was stolen?

Mr. VOWLES: Everyone in the street knows that that is the rumour. There is £135,000 lying to the credit of various accounts in connection with the "Golden Casket" funds at the present time. We are told that the "Golden Casket" is carried on in the name of charity, and the funds are supposed to be devoted to the hospitals.

If it is going to be carried on, [8.30 p.m.] then it is only fair to the hospitals who are undertaking certain expenditure in many cases in anticipation of receiving a part of these moneys to know exactly where they stand. We should let the hospitals know whether these moneys will be available. It is looked forward to in the country as a sort of gift, and the people there know that it is not going to last for all time. The hospital committees are taking advantage of the increased donations or contributions to their funds to improve their hospitals and plant. In my own town of Dalby they are bringing the plant up to date, and they have got an X-ray apparatus and other improvements in connection with the hospital. They regard this money as extraordinary revenue, and, so far as the upkeep of the hospitals is concerned, they are not increasing their annual expenditure at all. They know that it cannot be continued for all time, and the time may possibly be not far distant when they will have to consider other methods for raising ways and means.

Mr. COLLINS: What method do you suggest for getting the money?

Mr. VOWLES: There is a large section of the community that does not pay anything towards the upkeep of hospitals. There should be a hospital tax. That is what I favour.

Mr. COLLINS: On land values?

Mr. VOWLES: No. We have a good system in connection with the Dalby Hospital, where certain workers subscribe to the hospital out of their wages. The railway workers subscribe as a body, also the flour-mill workers, sawmill workers, and others. They all voluntarily contribute 1d. in the £1 out of their wages throughout the whole year. Last year we got £120 from the railway workers in the Dalby district, and on that we got the Government subsidy. You cannot say that the workers in our district do not contribute towards the funds of the hospital. It is not altogether the Brisbane workers who do not contribute to the Brisbane hospital, but the Brisbane capitalists, who do not contribute their fair share so far as the Brisbane General Hospital is concerned.

Mr. PHASE: Hear, hear! We all agree with you there.

[Mr. Vowles.

Mr. VOWLES: The country hospitals all pay their way and have credit balances, while the Brisbane General Hospital receives about £50,000 every year from the Government. Of course, they claim that they are entitled to that as a base hospital.

Mr. BRENNAN: A lot of country patients go there.

Mr. VOWLES: Every hospital is in the same position. We find that, as a hospital is improved, and when you get up-to-date appliances, and an up-to-date doctor and a nursing staff, you get more patients, as they always go to a good hospital. Notwithstanding the fact that the Dalby Hospital has to cater for outside districts, we are able to carry on with voluntary contributions and the Government subsidy and have a credit balance.

Mr. BRENNAN: Would you consent to a tax on the same lines as the New Zealand Act?

Mr. VOWLES: It is not a matter of what I would consent to. I will deal with the matter fearlessly when the time comes. It is an anomaly that the city of Brisbane should not be able to maintain the General Hospital here.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Brisbane certainly takes up enough collections.

Mr. VOWLES: But they do not do their collecting in a systematic way, like we do in the country. There are wealthy men in Brisbane who can afford to support the hospital. Look at a wealthy suburb like Toowong! If the people there were told that they must collect £2,000 or £3,000 a year towards the hospital, they would collect it. In my district voluntary donations are made by different sections, and we have all our money collected on a system. That can be done on a larger scale in Brisbane.

Mr. GLEDSON: You opposed the Hospitals Bill which was introduced here three years ago.

Mr. VOWLES: The money to be raised under that Bill was on land values, and was to be levied like a land tax. Every individual in the community should be asked to contribute towards the hospital according to his salary. He should pay so much in the £1.

The PREMIER: You advocate a tax on wages?

Mr. VOWLES: It should include all incomes—wages and everything else—whatever the income may be. If the workers in the Dalby district can do it on a voluntary scale, then the people in other districts should be compelled to do it.

Mr. GLEDSON: Hundreds here would escape scot free because they are not earning wages or salaries.

The CHAIRMAN: It has just occurred to me that a discussion on hospitals is likely to be initiated on this vote. I think the discussion should take place on the vote for hospitals. I have no objection to the leader of the Opposition discussing the "Golden Casket" on the vote for the Chief Office, but I do not think it would be wise for any hon. member to go outside the "Golden Casket." If we have a general discussion on hospitals now, then, when we reach the vote for hospitals, the whole thing will be gone over again. I suggest, therefore, that hon. members should refrain from discussing hospitals until we reach that vote.

Mr. VOWLES: One matter I would like to suggest to the Premier is this: Judging by the progress we are making, we have very little chance of getting to the Trust and Loan Fund Estimates. I hope the Premier will consider the question of discussing the whole of the administration of the departments on the first vote, including the discussion of the Trust and Loan Fund Estimates for each particular department.

The PREMIER: If the hon. gentleman is agreeable to make an arrangement to discuss everything on the first vote, and not to discuss the individual votes afterwards, I am quite agreeable.

Mr. VOWLES: Including the Trust and Loan Funds?

The PREMIER: It would be distinctly out of order to discuss the Trust and Loan Fund on the Revenue Estimates.

Mr. VOWLES: The hon. gentleman knows we are anxious to discuss the Trust and Loan Fund Estimates.

The PREMIER: The hon. gentleman has the matter in his own hands. He can hurry on till he gets to those Estimates.

Mr. VOWLES: I do not think that I have it in my own hands, judging by the stonewalling which has been going on on the other side.

Mr. PEASE: You started it.

Mr. VOWLES: If you look at the Estimates, you will find every department has Trust and Loan Funds under its administration. These are matters that we are particularly anxious to get to, because that is where the big sums of money are involved. We are only dealing with the little departmental matters now, and I venture to say we will never get to the important ones.

The PREMIER: It is entirely in your own hands.

Mr. VOWLES: We will never get there. We have had this sort of statement made by the Premier on other occasions, and we know very well that, when we get to a certain department towards the end of the seventeen days allowed for Supply, the stonewall will start and we will only get about five minutes on them.

The PREMIER: You have spent three days on my department, and that came first.

Mr. VOWLES: Look how the hon. member for Rockhampton has taken up the time.

Mr. PEASE: Your score is nearly "100 not out" in "Hansard." (Laughter.)

Mr. VOWLES: I am going to get the "century," because there is all to-morrow not touched.

Mr. FORDE: There is this difference between your speeches and mine: Mine have something in them, but yours have nothing in them.

Mr. VOWLES: I could not call anything a speech that is read out, and the hon. member's speeches are always read out. With regard to the "Golden Casket," last year the Auditor-General reported that there was a shortage of £480. I am glad the Minister is going to give us some detailed information on this question.

Mr. BRENNAN: How many "Golden Caskets" does it include?

Mr. VOWLES: It does not matter how many it includes. It shows that the system of bookkeeping must be bad. There must

be something wrong when there is a shortage of £480 and the Auditor-General cannot find it. If £480 can disappear, there is no reason why £4,800 should not disappear. There are 103,000 subscribers, and the same amount is collected on every occasion, so the balance should be practically the same. You know what the expenses are, and you should have a balance half an hour after the "Casket" is drawn. We know nothing about these things because we have not got the Auditor-General's report, and we are not going to get it.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: You can have the audit inspector's report on it.

Mr. VOWLES: I think we should have it, because the position is anomalous.

[8.30 p.m.]

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. A. J. Jones, *Paddington*): I am particularly pleased that the leader of the Opposition has introduced this matter thus early. The hon. member for Enoggera yesterday asked a question which I answered very fully to-day. Prior to that question being answered, full details were obtained regarding the distribution of the funds derived from the "Golden Casket" Art Union. The hon. member for Oxley, speaking last night in South Brisbane, is reported to have said—

"People took tickets in the 'Golden Casket' because they desired to get something for nothing—something easily accomplished without effort. They satisfied their conscience, or endeavoured to do so, by the fact that the proceeds of the 'Casket' were utilised for the maintenance of hospitals. The Labour Government had received £1,255,000 from the forty-five 'caskets' which had been conducted under its direction. It was possible that some disclosures would shortly be made which would be a very unhappy sequel."

I am sorry that the hon. member is not in his place to-night. I invite him to make his "disclosures" as early as he possibly can. Hon. members opposite based their questions on very idle rumour, or they have very suspicious minds. In the first place, the Labour Government did not receive £1,255,000. Replying to a question asked by the hon. member for East Toowoomba (Mr. T. R. Roberts), I stated that the total amount of money received for the sale of tickets in "Caskets" Nos. 7 to 52 was £1,255,000; the amount distributed to hospitals was £308,407, as well as £10,000 in connection with the Mount Mulligan disaster, and £100 to some little institution in the electorate of the hon. member for Murilla. The management expenses were £71,236, and the amount at credit in the Commonwealth Savings Bank was £145,863. I want to pay a tribute to the "Golden Casket" committee, for the valuable services they have rendered to the department and for the manner in which they have conducted the "Casket" right through. I am aware, Mr. Kirwan, that you are a member of the committee, otherwise I would probably eulogise it to a greater extent. The hon. member for Oxley certainly endeavoured to mislead the people of Queensland when he stated that the Labour Government had received £1,255,000. He knew what the position was, because he had the answer to the question on the day on which he made that speech.

*Hon. A. J. Jones.]*

The leader of the Opposition made some reference to the manager of the "Golden Casket." I answered certain questions relating to that subject to-day, and an hon. member opposite has given notice of another question for to-morrow. My answer to the question was based on the audit inspector's report. Now the hon. member asks for this report to be laid on the table. Is it inferred that I have not given correct information?

Mr. VOWLES: I did not ask for it to be laid on the table of the House. I asked why the man's services were dispensed with.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hon. member for Enoggera has given notice of a question. Neither the Government nor the "Golden Casket" committee have anything to hide.

Mr. T. R. ROBERTS: The hon. member is asking for the date of the audit.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The manager of the "Golden Casket," Mr. Lucas, approached me on 14th August, and made application for three months' leave. He brought with him a doctor's certificate, which stated that he required three months' absolute rest.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: He was after a proxy. (Laughter.)

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: That interjection, in my opinion, indicates a vacant mind.

Mr. J. H. C. ROBERTS: Is your opinion on a vacant mind worth having?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: If the hon. member wants information, I am quite willing to give it to him; if he does not, I am quite content to sit down. The "Golden Casket" committee were the proper authority to grant the manager leave of absence. As it was not possible to get the committee together, we granted him one week's sick leave, and submitted the application to the "Golden Casket" committee. The manager went back to the office, drew three months' salary in advance, and on the following morning left for Sydney. There had been an audit inspection within a week of that time, but an auditor was immediately put on to inspect the books. Mr. Lucas's services have been dispensed with for the reason that he went away without getting leave, and stayed away over the week, and because he had improperly drawn three months' salary—a sum of £175. The Auditor-General says—

"Mr. Lucas has improperly drawn £175, equivalent to three months' salary, presumably in respect of leave which has not been granted."

I would like to quote from the audit inspector's report.

Mr. BRENNAN: Was any leave due to him?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I think it is only fair to say that, had the manager waited, and had he not ignored the instruction of the committee, he probably would have been due for nearly three months' sick leave. The audit inspector's report is dated 21st August, 1922, and says—

"I beg to submit, as requested, a special report on the 'Golden Casket' office. In company with my assistant

[Hon. A. J. Jones.

(Mr. Buckle), cash was checked at this office on 11th instant, and specially checked on 17th idem. On the first occasion the collection cash was 4s. 1d. short, and on 17th the shortage was 17s. 4d., to which must be added 5s. 8d., errors found in daily cash sheets subsequent to taking of cash, bringing the total to 25s. Of this amount the cost of one ticket—5s. 3d.—is to be collected from one of the girls for over-issue to a subscriber, should the latter not remit for the extra ticket sent. The balance of 7s. 9d. is unaccounted for.

"Petty cash showed a surplus of 1s. 1d. against the book balance.

"Counter prize money was correct.

"Counter cashiers in each case showed small deficits, probably errors in change—No. 1, 10s.; No. 2, 10d.; No. 3, 6d.

"All bank adjustments have been made up to date, but reveal nothing extraordinary.

"Attached herewith is a voucher for £175 in favour of Mr. Lucas, the manager, for salary for three months' leave, but no date is shown in respect of the leave."

The audit inspector's report is dated 17th August. Mr. Lucas applied for leave on 14th August, and left for Sydney the following day, and has not yet returned. There is nothing wrong with the "Golden Casket" funds at all.

Mr. VOWLES: It seems that the manager has been pretty harshly treated.

The PREMIER: By the Opposition making innuendoes.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: While I hold no brief for the manager of the "Golden Casket," I think it is only fair to say that his services were dispensed with for disobeying instructions and refusing to remain in Brisbane. He left without leave from the committee, which is a thing no Government would tolerate on the part of any public servant. I am very sorry indeed that the hon. member for Oxley is not here to-night. The statement he made last night certainly deserves contradiction. Hon. members opposite are trying to create suspicion in the minds of the contributing public so that the "Golden Casket" will not be as successful in the future as it has been in the past. Since the Government have had control of this institution, nothing has been wrong with it. Prior to the Government taking control, the committee ran six "Caskets," and there was nothing wrong with any of them. The proceeds have been devoted to a very good cause—the interests of the sick and the needy of this State. Hon. members opposite may call it gambling, but other countries gamble in the same direction. Hon. members opposite always look to Great Britain for precedence. The following advertisement appeared in one of the London periodicals on 28th June, 1922:—

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

"Proceeds to be divided between St. Thomas's Hospital, the British Red Cross Society, Infant and Child welfare.

£10,000 MUST BE WON IN THE  
GENUINE SPORTING BALLOT.

Numbered Tickets, 5/.	Numbered Tickets, 5/.
1st Prize ... ..	£2,500
2nd Prize ... ..	1,000
2 Prizes of ... ..	500
4 Prizes of ... ..	250
10 Prizes of ... ..	100
15 Prizes of ... ..	50

"And hundreds of other money prizes, ranging from £25 to £5.

"Prize money guaranteed and ballot organised for the Red Cross Society by

DOUGLAS STUART.

"THE BIGGEST MONEY PRIZE EVENT SINCE THE CALCUTTA SWEEPSTAKE."

Mr. MOORE: It was a godsend to the hon. gentleman to find that advertisement. It has been quoted about eight times already.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I desire to get the advertisement into "Hansard," so that the people of Queensland may know that the British Government allow institutions similar to the "Golden Casket" to be run in aid of hospitals in that country. The hon. member for Enoggera has asked me to lay the audit inspector's report on the table. I have quoted that portion of the report dealing with the manager, Mr. Lucas, and I hope, in fairness to the manager and in fairness to the department and the contributing public, that we shall not hear any more about any shortage in the "Golden Casket" funds.

Mr. KING (*Logan*): I want to congratulate the Government on the creation of the position of Assistant Under Secretary in the department. I recognise that the department is a very big one, with very wide ramifications indeed. Under the jurisdiction of one Under Secretary, I almost think that he had too much to do; but notwithstanding that fact, he has carried out his work remarkably well. I congratulate the Government on the creation of the position of Assistant Under Secretary, and I congratulate them still more upon their selection. Mr. Chuter is a man who has been with the department for a number of years, and has been connected very closely with local government and health matters, and in his position as Assistant Under Secretary he will have greater control and will come into closer contact with those particular sections than he has in the past. As a local government man, I think Mr. Chuter's appointment has met with general approval throughout the State. He is successful in local government work; he is always courteous and affable, and is extremely capable. Mr. Chuter has a very high conception of and a very keen regard for local government work, and I think in the execution of his duty he will try to teach local government men that they will have to soar above the making of an ordinary culvert and the making of a drain. I look forward with a great deal of pleasure to closer association with him in my official position as secretary and legal adviser of the Local Authorities' Association. Since I have been in that position, I and all local government men throughout Queensland have received the very greatest assistance and help from Mr. Chuter in his position of Chief Clerk and Assistant Under Secretary. I rise to voice the appreciation of the general

public and myself in particular at the creation of this particular office and the appointment of Mr. Chuter.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*): I would like to ask the Minister in charge of the Home Secretary's Estimates whether there is at the present time a sum of £130,000 yet undistributed from the "Golden Casket" funds.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: A sum of £145,000.

Mr. CORSER: Is it the intention of the Government to distribute that sum amongst existing hospitals? I have a reason for asking the question, and I want to know whether these funds are to be distributed in the same quarters as past distributions.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The amount will be distributed in the same way as previously to existing and new hospitals. As a matter of fact, we propose to introduce legislation which may mean the establishment of new hospitals.

Mr. CORSER: I think we have drawn something from the Minister which, up to the present time, the Government have tried to conceal. I understand the Government, in the fore-hadged legislation referred to by the Minister, propose to do something for the assistance of country women.

The CHAIRMAN: Possibly the hon. member did not hear my previous ruling that we are now dealing with the Chief Office. I have already intimated to hon. members that it will be in order to discuss the administration of the "Golden Casket" on this vote, but not the administration of the fund. The hon. member may deal with that matter under the vote for hospitals.

Mr. CORSER: I understand that on the vote for the Chief Office we can deal with the policy of the Home Department.

The CHAIRMAN: I would remind the hon. member that that has not been agreed upon, although a suggestion was made that we should discuss all the departmental votes on the Chief Office.

Mr. CORSER: The Government propose to introduce legislation to provide for something which does not exist at the present time—legislation for the establishment of maternity hospitals. That is a very good policy for the Government to introduce. It has been advocated by country members for some time that the Government should extend their administration of hospitals to permit of the establishment of maternity hospitals in country districts. From the information I have drawn from the Minister in charge of the vote, the sum of £140,000 in connection with the "Golden Casket" is not to be distributed solely amongst existing hospitals, but is to be used also for the establishment of this new policy. The existing hospitals are to be denied this assistance, which they claim they should get.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Do you believe in the "Golden Casket"?

Mr. CORSER: You have not heard me say anything against it. I believe in the subsidies that our hospitals are getting, and, no doubt, a number of people purchase "Casket" tickets in order to assist the hospitals. But we find the Government are now going in for another policy.

The CHAIRMAN: I am not going to permit a general discussion on the administration of the hospitals on this vote. If the

*Mr. Corser.*]

hon. member wishes to say anything about the administration of the "Golden Casket" office, he can do so on this vote.

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): I am sorry I cannot agree with the Minister with regard to the very great benefit that the "Golden Casket" is conferring upon the community. Personally, I think it is a menace to the community, and it is a very great pity that the Government are associated with it in any shape or form.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: How would you raise the £300,000 for the hospitals?

Mr. TAYLOR: Surely we have sufficient initiative to raise the necessary money to maintain our hospitals. We did it for fifty or sixty years without "Golden Caskets" and we can do it again. The people are prepared to do it again. It is all very well for Ministers to talk about being in favour of the "Golden Casket," but there are several members on their own side who do not agree with the "Golden Casket." The Home Secretary himself said that it was a deplorable thing that money had to be raised in that way to maintain the hospitals of this State. Hon. members opposite have got up in this Chamber and spoken about members on this side running down the State, but you have only to take up certain papers to see how this State is held up from one end of Australia to the other as the great gambling State of the Commonwealth.

Mr. DUNSTAN: The Tory Press.

Mr. TAYLOR: If we had no "Golden Casket," the Tory Press could not make those charges. The sooner the "Golden Caskets" are cut out from the national life of this State the better it will be for the State. Horse racing, "Golden Caskets," and gambling of every description are demoralising the whole community, and I am surprised that the Minister has attempted to uphold the "Golden Casket." I did not think he would uphold it.

Mr. FORDE: Do you think the Commonwealth National Government are right in taxing the "Golden Casket" distributions?

Mr. TAYLOR: If I had anything to do with the taxing of the "Golden Casket" I would tax it out of existence.

I would like to refer to the remarks of the Minister in connection with the questions asked by the hon. member for Enoggera. The hon. member for Enoggera was quite right in asking those questions. All over the city, rightly or wrongly, there were rumours circulating with regard to what had happened in connection with the "Golden Casket," and by asking those questions we have now got the information. I am very pleased to hear that there have not been the defalcations which have been stated. It has been stated that the shortage ranges from £17,000 down to £7,000, and all that kind of thing. The hon. member is entitled to ask questions and get the information when he hears rumours of that nature.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: When he got the answer he did not accept my statement, but asked for an audit.

Mr. TAYLOR: The hon. member asked for a statement to be put on the table, but that does not imply that the Minister is not playing the game. We all know that an auditor may make certain references as to

the way in which a thing is conducted. The Minister is asked a certain question, and he answers it in the way it is asked, but an auditor in submitting a report would probably say that the accounts are not sufficiently checked, or that there has been no proper supervision, and we are entitled to know everything that the auditors have to say in connection with public accounts. There was no reflection on the Minister in any shape or form by the questions which were asked by the hon. member for Enoggera to-day. I am very pleased to know that the auditors have reported favourably on this concern, but I certainly think, when the Minister answered the questions to-day, that the hon. member of Enoggera was quite within his right in wanting to know when the audit was taken, who had suggested the audit, and whether there were any special reasons or circumstances in connection with the "Golden Casket" that prompted those audits, and he was entitled to get the fullest possible information from the Minister.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: In the audit inspector's report it is stated that the manager was leaving, after I had advised him not to go.

Mr. TAYLOR: We did not know that before, and we are entitled to have that information.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*): I wish to say a few words with regard to the "Golden Casket."

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Do you believe in the "Golden Casket"?

Mr. MOORE: I do not believe in it, and have never taken a ticket in it.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: You would take the first prize if you won it.

Mr. MOORE: I would not take the first prize. As I have never taken a ticket, I could not win the first prize. The Minister went to a great deal of trouble in trying to find some other country which is [9 p.m.] doing the same thing. He picked out a bookmaker in England who is permitted to run a sort of "Golden Casket"—a bookmaker who encourages people to gamble.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I have taken a ticket in the "Golden Casket," but I have never been at Ascot. You go to race meetings.

Mr. MOORE: Why does the Minister want to make excuses by going to some other country to find out whether they are doing the same thing there? The Home Secretary himself, when deputations have waited upon him, has said that it was not an economical way of collecting money—that it was an easy way, but not a good or desirable way of collecting money. If the Minister defends his position by saying that the Government cannot get money in any other way and are prepared to see the people degraded rather than that the hospitals should suffer, let him say so, instead of getting up and making excuses.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: How is it that the country hospitals have never sent the money back?

Mr. MOORE: A lot of the country hospitals which have received money did not know that it came from the "Golden Casket" funds. (Government dissent.) The sum of £92,000 was given to the hospitals, which it was thought had come out of the

[Mr. Taylor.

funds of the Home Department, and not out of the "Golden Casket" funds.

Mr. COLLINS: They know in my electorate, because they have wired to me about it.

Mr. MOORE: If the Government give them an opportunity to secure funds in such an easy way, I suppose they will take them, but that does not excuse the Government. If the Government do not think that it is a good thing for the State that this gambling should go on, they should adopt some other means of raising money.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: You only want to stop one side of it—you should stop horse-racing.

Mr. MOORE: A motion to prohibit proprietary racing has been passed by this House, and there is a suspicion as to why that has not been carried out; but I am not talking about proprietary racing now, but the "Golden Casket," which is not a right way to collect money, when you see the enormous amount paid in by the people and the comparatively small amount received by the hospitals.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: It gives a lot of employment.

Mr. MOORE: It gives employment to a few people, but not in a fitting way. I do not think it gives a lot of employment, compared with the great amount of money put into it, and it certainly causes unemployment. I strongly object to the principle, and I do not think the hospitals should be financed in this way.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The hospitals in your electorate take a good part of the fund.

Mr. MOORE: I do not think they do. I have none in my electorate. The people in my electorate subscribe more than those in any other country district.

Mr. BRENNAN: That is all right—those are the workers.

Mr. MOORE: The hon. member is starting to squib, as soon as I point out to him that he is wrong. He says that people do not subscribe, and, when I show that they do, he says that they are the workers. The hon. member thinks he may lose a few votes. I object to the "Golden Casket" altogether, as I do not think it is a fitting way to finance the hospitals, and the sooner the Government give it up and finance the hospitals in another way the better it will be for the State.

Mr. BRENNAN (*Toowoomba*): Show us how to finance the hospitals if we close down the "Golden Casket." There are other ways of raising money, the same as in New Zealand for instance, under a Hospital Act; but hon. members opposite do not want anything which puts a tax on those who are best able to bear it. They want further to reduce the workers' wages and make the workers support the hospitals. The Toowoomba hospital is a refuge for the whole of the electorate of the hon. member for Aubigny. He says that his electorate subscribes proportionately to the number who go into that hospital.

Mr. MOORE: It does.

Mr. BRENNAN: I say it does not. The workers in the coal mines do subscribe, as the workers of Toowoomba do. It would be well to compare the amount which the workers of Toowoomba subscribe to the hospital with the amount which comes from outsiders who are not industrialists. In Toowoomba we used to raise £1,000 a year for the hospital. A lot of social "snobs" used to go round and collect money, but to-day those individuals will not collect

money because they are not on the committee. They will have nothing to do with the institution because it is not a social club. We must have the "Golden Casket" in order to keep the hospitals going.

Mr. COLLINS (*Bowen*): I cannot understand the hypocrisy of the Opposition with regard to gambling. The leader of the National party said that I was opposed to the "Golden Casket," and I want to define my position. While I am opposed to gambling in connection with the "Golden Casket," I am opposed to gambling all round; but we have gambling in society at present, and not only with regard to the "Golden Casket," the funds from which go to support the hospitals. We have gambling on our racecourses and in connection with our foodstuffs. We have gambling in connection with the lives of the people. What about Gallipoli, which was nothing else but a huge gamble? We were told that by the leading authorities in connection with the war. Hon. members opposite should get away from this cant and hypocrisy with regard to gambling. Society is a huge gamble from top to bottom. I do not believe in the "Golden Casket" myself, but I am a good soldier of this party, and I am not going over to the other side of the House because of it. Perhaps if I see a more progressive party—men with brains who are capable of running the State—I might consider my position. (Opposition laughter.) But, in my opinion, the Opposition are not competent to run the State, and as they are the backbone of the gambling system of society, I am going to remain where I am.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. COLLINS: I get wires from my electorate from time to time asking when "Golden Casket" money will be forwarded to them. They cannot wait until it is due, but are anxious to receive it at once. Can hon. members opposite outline any other scheme whereby our hospitals may be supported? Can the hon. member for Windsor suggest any scheme whereby the General Hospital in Brisbane may be supported? Brisbane is the principal offender in regard to the support of the hospitals. We manage to support two in my electorate, and we are now building a third one which the people there will support. The proper method to support hospitals would be by imposing a tax on land values. Does the hon. gentleman believe in that? Hon. members opposite do not outline any scheme at all for supporting the hospitals. When we were in opposition some years ago we always had brains enough, when we criticised the Government, to outline what we would do in the event of our getting into power. Ask the leader of the Opposition or the leader of the Nationalist party, in the event of their getting into power, what they propose to do to raise the £300,000 now raised by the "Golden Casket" for the support of our hospitals. How are they going to raise that money? Do they propose a land tax or a higher tax on the large incomes? They are silent! No answer! All they can do is to criticise.

Mr. MOORE: We already pay a land tax to support the infectious diseases hospital.

Mr. VOWLES: I told you how the workers contribute towards the support of the Dalby hospital.

Mr. COLLINS: A better system would be to have a hospital tax based on land values.

Mr. VOWLES: No.

*Mr. Collins.]*

Mr. COLLINS: Hon. members opposite are not in favour of that. I hope that this party will evolve a scheme later on for the support of the hospitals, and I know hon. members opposite will oppose it. We might propose to put it on the land values or make the incomes above £1,500 pay for the support of the hospitals. If we propose that, we shall meet with opposition from hon. members on the other side.

Mr. KING: The land already carries a tax for infectious diseases.

Mr. COLLINS: Well, what would be wrong with making it carry a tax for the hospitals?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope the hon. member is not going to discuss the question of financing the hospitals. I have already intimated that I am not going to permit it to be discussed on this vote. Hon. members can discuss the administration of the "Golden Casket," but they cannot discuss the question of financing the hospitals until they get to the hospitals vote.

Mr. COLLINS: I was connecting my remarks with the "Golden Casket" by asking where members opposite would raise the £300,000 to support the hospitals. I say, away with all this cant and hypocrisy! If we believe in abolishing gambling, let us do away with gambling altogether.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): With regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Bowen as to what we should do in regard to the "Golden Casket" providing funds for the upkeep of the hospital, I can tell him that we can find a means of raising the money for the hospital. We cannot dissociate the management altogether when we remember the replies given by the Minister to the questions that were asked to-day in regard to the "Golden Casket." I can tell the hon. member for Bowen that, when another Government is in office, within two months there will be no "Golden Caskets" run for hospitals. The necessary money to carry on the hospitals will be received.

Mr. COLLINS: How?

Mr. TAYLOR: I am not going to tell the hon. member. We have a statement made that £1,255,000 has been raised by the "Golden Casket," and that only £308,000 has gone to the hospitals.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: Do you want it all to go to the hospitals?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: What about the prizes?

Mr. TAYLOR: We will raise that £308,000, but it will not cost £1,000,000 to raise it.

Mr. DUNSTAN: You did not raise it before.

Mr. TAYLOR: It is all very well to talk about gambling. Hon. members know it is a bad thing for the community, and the hon. member for Bowen knows it just as well as anybody else. The sooner that this gambling is cut out of the national life of Queensland the better it will be for Queensland, the better for the hospitals, and the better for the whole community.

Mr. BRENNAN (*Toowoomba*): The hon. member who has just resumed his seat referred to the "Golden Casket," and said that it ought to be cut out. The leader of the Opposition said that the workers in his electorate subscribed to the hospital. Who are the people who use the hospitals? The people who use the hospitals are those who subscribe to the "Golden Casket." They are the

workers. All that money comes out of the pockets of the workers. Ninety per cent. of the patients in the hospitals are workers. The reason that they have to go into the hospitals is because they are broken down as the result of their work in various industries, where they are creating wealth for the capitalist. Hon. members opposite are not satisfied with the workers going into the hospitals, but they want them to pay their own way while they are there.

Question put and passed.

#### RELIEF OF ABORIGINALS.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES moved—  
"That £42,058 be granted for the 'Relief of Aborigines.'"

I might point out that there is a decrease of £5,420 in the vote as compared with the amount appropriated last year. There is also a decrease of about £3,000 in "Contingencies."

Mr. MORGAN (*Murillø*): I notice that the figures are not correct in connection with this vote; I do not know whether it is intentional or whether it is a mistake on the part of the Government Printer or the department. If the Minister will look up the Estimates for last year, he will see the different numbers of native workers who were provided for as compared with the numbers stated in this vote. For instance, take the Barambah Settlement. It states in the Estimates that we have before us that there were twenty native workers last year and fifteen are provided for this year. If we look up last year's Estimates, we shall see that there were thirty-six native workers provided for last year. In the case of the Palm Island Settlement, it states in connection with the Estimates for this year that there are five native assistants this year and there were four last year. If we look up last year's Estimates, we shall find that the native assistants last year at Palm Island totalled fifteen. Then, at the Taroom Settlement, we find in the Estimates before us that five native assistants are provided for this year as compared with five last year; but on looking up last year's Estimates, we see that sixteen native assistants were provided for. Those figures are most misleading and are not correct in any particular, and I want to know why it is so. There is also a discrepancy in the number of persons connected with the department. In the Estimates before us it says that there were seventy-one persons provided for in 1921-22; but, if we look at last year's Estimates, we shall see that for 1921-22 108 persons were provided for.

I wish to say a few words in connection with the Taroom settlement in my electorate. I would like to know whether that settlement is self-supporting, or how it stands. I recommended last year that certain things should be done in order to make the settlement self-supporting, so that it would not be a burden upon the State and would give better conditions to the inmates. I would like to see the people in the settlement get better foodstuffs. Although meat is very cheap at present—ridiculously so, unfortunately—the natives do not get a fair meat ration. Has there been any improvement recently owing to the fact that cattle can be obtained at a very low price? The natives deserve a greater quantity of meat than has been allotted to them during the past year. Again, is it the intention of the Government to go in for cotton growing on

[*Mr. Collins.*]



the settlement? The land there is suitable for its culture.

Mr. BRENNAN: That is a good idea.

Mr. MORGAN: There is no reason why 100 acres should not be planted.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: They would not want a "gininery." (Laughter.)

Mr. MORGAN: It depends on what sort of "gininery" the hon. gentleman means. There would be no scarcity of labour, because the older people would be able to spend part of their time picking cotton, thus enabling them to earn something and make their conditions better than they are at present. In that locality the wallaby, the kangaroo, and the opossum are disappearing rapidly, and the natives want some other way of existing. I hope that the Minister will give serious consideration to the suggestion.

Mr. PETRIE (*Toombul*): I am sorry that we have not the report of the Protector of Aborigines. Possibly it might have explained away some of the discrepancies referred to by the hon. member for Murilla.

I see that the vote has been reduced by £5,420. I do not know whether that is a result of a small number of aborigines, or whether it is due to cutting down the expenditure and not allowing them what they should get. I notice that the item, "Blankets, clothing, drapery," has been cut down from £8,000 to £6,460; also the item, "Maintenance and Incidentals," at Barambah, shows a very big decrease of over £3,000.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: These estimates are not based on last year's appropriation, but on the actual expenditure.

Mr. PETRIE: The Chief Protector has done good work so far as our aborigines are concerned. I have nothing to say against him or any of his officers. He is a humane man, and deserves every credit for the way in which he administers the department. The aborigines are a very sensitive race. They like to travel about, but now they are confined to the settlements—which is a very good thing. We had an instance showing what good socialists they are. A young black-fellow—I think on Mr. Donald Gunn's station—decided that he would make himself more comfortable by building a hut somewhere near a tree. He had not the hut up very long before his friends came along and slept in it while he had to camp under the tree. The suggestion has been thrown out that our blacks in the past have not had the protection which they had in recent years. We have taken their country from them. If, years ago, they had been better treated, there would not have been attributed to them a lot of crimes which were due to neglect and bad management. The suggestion of the hon. member for Murilla regarding cotton growing is a good one, and I hope that some notice will be taken of it by the Minister.

I have been instructed by my medical adviser not to speak often. There seemingly was no necessity for the advice, because we have not had the opportunity of speaking frequently on account of having the "gag" put on us. I am an old member, and I sit back so as to give the young members a chance. I think they should have the opportunity of speaking before those who have been in the House a long time.

Some Ministers seem to think that it is not necessary for hon. members to have the

departmental reports when discussing the Estimates. It is very necessary, because they are the only means we have of gaining information. I asked a question yesterday regarding a lot of the reports. In connection with the Home Department, very few, if any, of the reports have been tabled. I hope that this reduction in the vote does not mean that the Government are going to make the poor blackfellow suffer by giving him less food or blankets than should be allowed him. They are passing out; we have no blacks in the metropolitan area now, whereas years ago there was quite a number of them, and they were not looked after or cared for.

Mr. EDWARDS (*Nanango*): I am rather pleased that the hon. member for Murilla has brought up the question of cultivation on the different aboriginal settlements. Speaking on this question last session, I was given a definite promise by the Home Secretary that he would visit Barambah and go into the question of whether cultivation could not be increased. I understand that there is a large area of country there which could be brought under cotton, now that there is a great demand for its cultivation in Queensland. Other crops also could be taken up. If I remember rightly, the report last year stated the amount of produce which was grown at the settlement. I

[9.30 p.m.] think we should see that cultivation is extended. I notice that there is a considerable reduction in the item for "Maintenance and Incidentals, Barambah." It is hoped that the conditions of the natives are not going to be interfered with. We should increase the degree of comfort for the natives.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Last year money was spent on buildings, and as much money will be spent on buildings this year.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am pleased to hear that. I would like to ask the Minister in charge of the Estimates if it will be possible for a Minister to visit Barambah during the coming year?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I will go myself if the hon. gentleman will promise not to criticise me for travelling.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am never guilty of such a thing. I hope the natives' welfare will be well looked after.

Mr. BULCOCK (*Barcoo*): It is rather interesting for one keenly interested in the welfare of our natives to hear the criticisms emanating from hon. members opposite. The hon. member for Nanango said that the natives' standard should be increased, as compared with what is disclosed by the Estimates last year. I have in mind some little time ago certain individuals approaching the Premier asking him to consent to the reduction in the standard enjoyed by the aborigines. Certain men employed in the pastoral industry had been reduced in wages, and it was asked that a proportional decrease be extended to the natives also. That would suggest that there was, and is, a tendency in certain areas to exploit native labour.

Mr. MORGAN: They are employed on the State stations.

Mr. BULCOCK: Not to a very great extent. If the award conditions are observed, it will be all right. I am not cavilling at their conditions, provided they

*Mr. Bulcock.]*

are given humane and compassionate treatment. I object to the exploitation of natives by a certain class of pastoralists. I believe that has led in a great measure to the rapid disappearance of the aboriginals. The aboriginal is a link with the past, and past memories. In districts where they were well known a few years ago they have almost disappeared. Whether they have been concentrated in the settlements I do not know. It is certainly due to the fact that the older hands, who did not take kindly to settlement, owing to the conditions of livelihood imposed upon them by the employing classes in the bush, have decreased rapidly, because the standard was not equal to the task imposed upon them. I have long considered that the time is ripe when they should be withdrawn from the general class of labour that they are performing at the present time. I do not stand for the farming-out of the unfortunate young aboriginals to stations who exploit their labour. While there is a keen competitive demand for the aboriginal labourer, who is a very useful adjunct to cattle stations, more especially where the boundaries are not very well defined, and in dry times and mustering times experience goes to show that it is only the young aboriginal who is wanted. As soon as he passes his maximum sphere of usefulness to the pastoralist, he is returned to a settlement, and becomes a charge on the State. I do not think that the aboriginal should be exploited of the best he can give in his younger years, to be passed back to the settlement when he has passed that period of maximum efficiency. The "cut" that was proposed to be inflicted upon the aboriginals amounted to about 10s. a week. On the advent of this Government more satisfactory conditions were introduced than had existed in the past. The natives were a guileless, simple race, without any knowledge of combination or knowledge of anything save the fact that a certain task could be given to them, and the race provided an easy field for exploitation. It is necessary to afford some protection for them, and native settlements were established. Certain industrial conditions were formulated, which the employers said the aboriginals would not appreciate. There was no effort or tendency on the part of the employing classes to give the natives a decent "go," and it was necessary for the State to give them a decent "go." I do not think that the settlements are fulfilling a sufficient degree of usefulness. I think that as many natives as may be required should be allocated to the islands along the coast. They could be segregated entirely, and be removed from exploitation at the hands of the employing classes. If the natives were segregated, and allowed to cultivate the land on the islands, I am of the opinion that, with the cultivation of cotton, coffee, etc., they would become self-supporting, more especially if the influences of the white people were removed. I know that in many instances the protector and his zealous staff of officials have a good deal of difficulty in combating the insidious associations to which the inmates of these settlements are subjected.

The public do not appreciate the work that the protector and his staff are performing at the present time. If we do not take some steps to do something for the aboriginals and inculcate in them a proper sense of citizenship, we shall be wanting in our duty. At the present time, in spite of all the legisla-

[Mr. Bulcock.

tion we have on this subject, in spite of the zealous work of the protector, I do sincerely believe that the aboriginal, on account of his want of knowledge of many things, is being exploited. There is not very much possibility of protecting him from that exploitation in certain directions so long as he does not know the value of money. It seems impossible to teach the aboriginal the value of money, and, therefore, he must be protected from himself. The nobler plan would be to segregate him and allow him to produce wealth and consume it rather than follow the present system, whereby he is asked to work for a certain amount of money which he never sees. It is allocated to the general fund, and perhaps he never obtains the use of it. The aboriginals have a lot to be thankful for so far as this Government are concerned. If anybody who knew the conditions prevailing a few years ago contrasted those conditions with the conditions prevailing to-day, he could not fail but recognise that great progress has been made, and one would be wanting in a sense of fairness if he did not appreciate what had been done industrially and socially for the aboriginals by this Government. It is impossible to protect the aboriginals so long as they are surrounded by the ordinary influences of civilisation, and they should be allowed to form settlements in their own manner, isolated from the influences of the white race. If that were done, the results would show that it was justified. Some time ago in this Chamber I raised the question of the ready accessibility of drugs to aboriginal labour in the State. I had in my mind at the time an incident that occurred on one cattle station in North Queensland which employed a good many aboriginals. An individual came on to this run armed with a considerable amount of chlorodyne which he retailed to the natives at a price a good deal higher than its value. The aboriginals used this chlorodyne for drug purposes, consuming as much as half a bottle at a time. It is necessary to protect them against themselves, and I am pleased that the Chief Protector did recognise the validity of the claim that I and other hon. members advanced on that occasion and took steps to tighten up the regulations, so that to-day it is practically impossible for people to exploit the aboriginal so far as selling him supplies at an extortionate rate is concerned. If it were not for the action of the Government in protecting the aboriginal, and in standing between him and the ruthless exploitation by a certain section of the pastoralists, it is just to assume that there would be no restrictions in regard to the employing of aboriginals, which would undoubtedly result to their detriment.

Mr. WEIR (*Maryborough*): I am sorry to say that I cannot altogether agree with what the hon. member for Toombul has said. Just before this House met this session I had the opportunity of paying a visit to the Barambah Settlement, and I cannot say that the Chief Protector has been doing all that the Government expect he should do. I do not know the Chief Protector, and therefore I am perfectly free to express an opinion. I say that Barambah at the present time is not a standing monument to this Government or to the Chief Protector, and the sooner the Chief Protector realises that he cannot carry out an unbiassed inspection unless he goes there without sending a notice ahead of him

the better. Under the present conditions he will never get results. It stands to reason that, if those in charge of a settlement know that the Protector is coming to see them, they will have a clean up. When I viewed Barambah the other day the conditions were totally different from what they were before I got there. Without being unduly severe on the Chief Protector, I think they ought to produce still better results. I am sure that if he realises the responsibilities of his position—which he does—he will not resent fair criticism in this House. There is still a lot to be done at Barambah. He knows that, if he knows his work. But there is one thing that appeals to me more than any other. It is this: Every morning in the year some 200 able-bodied men leave Barambah headquarters to go to work, and they do not produce enough vegetables to feed themselves. There are no fowls on the settlement unless they are the private property of the storekeeper. There are some eight pigs in the district, and only sufficient cows to produce the milk required for the people who are sick. I tell you candidly that they are not producing the results that a settlement like that ought to produce. I could tell the Chief Protector what is wrong, but it is his duty to find out. I hope he will get busy on Barambah and make some improvement. There is a lot of room for improvement. I have just learned that relatively there is the same number of blacks at Palm Island. There are 700 at one place and 600 at the other. If that is so, the results at Palm Island are infinitely superior to the results at Barambah. I cannot see why they should be, because the land at Barambah is suitable for many things, while the land at Palm Island is also suitable for many things. If Palm Island can put up such a good showing there after a few years, then Barambah stands twice condemned.

I want particularly to direct the attention of this House to the treatment meted out to the black girls in these settlements. It is a scandalous thing to think that under any Government it is possible for these girls to be the prey of the human element outside who live on the black girls if they can. It is the fact that these girls living on the settlement are mostly pure girls, for the black girls' standard of honour is very high, but once they leave the settlements numbers of these girls come back bearing a half-caste illegitimate child. This country is responsible for that. We have taken the country from these people and their parents, and if we allow that sort of thing to go on, we are morally responsible, and we have a right to stop it. Unfortunately, the child is subject to all the evils of both races. It was my misfortune to have to spend last Monday in the Supreme Court at Maryborough and see that poor, unfortunate black boy who was tried for murder. I sat in the court and listened to the evidence brought out, and one witness on oath stated that this boy was treated exactly the same as any white boy was treated. He also said that the standard of intelligence of the black boy was equal to the standard of intelligence of a white boy. Anybody who knows anything about blacks knows that that is not possible. I sat there and compared him with my own boy of about equal age—thirteen and a-half years—and I could not for the life of me conceive how it was humanly possible for that boy to be as responsible as my child, considering that my lad had been subject to parental control and had the influence of his parents all his life,

while this unfortunate little black was "chucked" out into the world. I am not offering any criticism on the poor, unfortunate soul who was the victim of that murder. I should be a double-dyed coward if I were not game to condemn a system which produces a murderer in the shape of a black boy thirteen and a-half years of age. The evidence was directed to show that this boy had received the same opportunities and treatment as a white boy; but when the witness was asked more pressing questions, he said, "Yes, he did get some of his meals outside—he had two on the tankstand and one in the kitchen." Does not that sort of treatment develop the baser instincts of the child? We know that there is ingrained in a black boy the baser side of the human makeup. The instinct of the black boy from boyhood is to kill something, even if it is only a bird. They will kill for food. If he had used the whip on the woman when he was protecting himself the result would have been different; but he used the wrong weapon—he used an axe. We are morally responsible for that boy through the irresponsible system which we have in force. I am not directing my remarks to the Chief Protector; I am concerned with the district protector. I believe—although I may be wrong—that the present system compels the police to keep in touch with a boy like this when he is hired out. The police in that district neglected their responsibility when they did not see that the boy was properly housed and fed, and therefore they are morally responsible for the fact that that boy is a murderer. How can we produce anything but murderers under this system? If we put one of our own boys in the same position and he had to have his meals on the tankstand like a dog, would he not develop like a dog? There is a certain aspect of the case which is sub judice, and which I therefore cannot touch—that is, the question of whether he will be handed over to the Protector of State Children or not. The fact remains that we could have preserved that lad if he had been properly looked after by the people who are paid to protect him. I thought it was my duty to state the experience I passed through on Monday last. It was another illustration to me of what we might expect from our boys if they were trained under the same system. I trust that the Chief Protector is taking notice of my remarks, and that he will take them in the spirit in which they are given, and as coming from one who desires to see the best thing done to these boys and to the girls by the community.

Question put and passed.

#### CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS AND GRANTS.

THE SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. A. J. Jones, *Paddington*): I beg to move—

"That £90,340 be granted for 'Charitable Institutions and Grants.'"

I would point out that there is a decrease on the appropriation for last year of £3,449.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): I would like to mention that, when coming down to the House to-day, I saw for the first time in my experience in Queensland a poor, unfortunate individual sitting in front of the Town Hall on a stool and holding two boxes of matches in his hand, with a placard in front of him bearing the word "Invalid." I have always told people from the South who come here that that is a thing we know nothing of in the streets of Brisbane, and that it is not

*Mr. Morgan.]*

necessary for our blind or disabled people to appeal for assistance in that way. I think that something should be done for this unfortunate individual. The Government should make some inquiry into the matter, and see that the man is not allowed to remain in that position. There is no necessity for a man to display his infirmity in the main street of the city and sell matches in order to obtain the necessaries of life.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: There is more of that in the Southern States.

Mr. MORGAN: This is the first time I have seen such a case during the fourteen years I have been coming to Brisbane, and I hope that it will not occur again. It is not creditable to the State that a person should be compelled to sit in the street like this individual.

Mr. FORDE (*Rockhampton*): I agree with the hon. member who has just resumed his seat. It is not nice to see people in that condition about the streets. I was very much impressed by a visit which I made to the Blind, Deaf and Dumb Institution lately to see how kindly the inmates there are treated. I took a visitor from England to see the institution, and the superintendent went to a great deal of trouble to explain everything that was being done. There are sixty-seven children and ninety-seven adults in the institution, and they are all made very comfortable. Many of them are blind—some partially blind, some totally blind—others deaf and dumb; but they are all quite happy carrying on useful occupations. It was a revelation to see how expert they were at the various trades in which they were engaged. I was pleased to learn from the superintendent that they got a revenue from the institution amounting to £17,211 per annum. Of course, the expenditure is £20,432, but through the sale of articles manufactured by the inmates of the institution the revenue amounted to, approximately, £17,211 annually. I do not think that such an institution is expected to pay. It must be very pleasing to the department and to the Minister to know that good work is being done in teaching the blind to read by the Braille system, and that the deaf and dumb are being educated as well as it is possible to educate them. Others are taught various trades, and so occupy their minds.

I might also refer to another institution which I visited six or eight months ago in company with the Home Secretary. I refer to the Westwood Sanatorium, which was established by the Labour Government in Central Queensland at a cost of £26,000 for the purpose of caring for the miners from Mount Morgan and other places who are stricken with that fell disease—miners' phthisis. It is an excellent institution for these unfortunate people, who get the best nursing care and the best skilled medical attention. It is a credit to the Government. I understand that in June, 1922, there were forty-five patients, as against thirty-two twelve months ago, and the number was increasing. I would like to see the institution more fully occupied, and hope the department will send a greater number of patients there, because there are hundreds in need of its care.

Mr. STOPFORD: I hope that there will be no more miners who find it necessary to go there.

Mr. FORDE: That is all right. We would all like it if no more miners suffered from miners' phthisis, but we would not like to

[*Mr. Morgan.*]

see those who suffer from the disease left uncared for. It would be a good thing if we could wipe the disease out altogether, but, unfortunately, while men work in mines and under the conditions they do at present, there will always be patients suffering from miners' phthisis. It is, therefore, a credit to the Government that we have such an institution as the Westwood Sanatorium, where the men get proper nursing care and proper medical attention. That institution is looked after by a very efficient staff, and the Home Secretary was much impressed with the good work done by the matron, sisters, and nursing staff, and with the care taken of the patients by the medical superintendent, who visits the institution every week and takes a very great personal interest in his patients. It is a credit to the Government that that institution was established. Before the Government took notice of these things, miners suffering from this disease were allowed to die without proper medical attention. Several of the men recovered their health after being in the institution from eighteen months to two years. Several were completely cured in that time, and some in less time than that. One man who visited half a dozen sanatoria in other parts of the world could not get cured until he visited the Westwood Sanatorium, and was completely cured and enabled to follow his occupation on a station in the west of Queensland. One thing that struck me whilst I was at Westwood Sanatorium was the 580 acres of land which surround the institution. It is infested with prickly-pear. I asked the Home Secretary to make a special effort to have the prickly-pear cleared, or to make some arrangement with the surrounding settlers to get a lease of the land on condition that they clear the pear. I see that provision is made on the Estimates for an expenditure of £500 for the purpose of clearing prickly-pear. I understand that a few years ago £700 was spent in clearing pear round the institution. The pear has grown, until now it is as bad as, if not worse than, it was at that time. The department might consider the advisability of cutting up the 580 acres into small areas and giving some of the people in the district, or some of the ex-patients, leases for the purpose of growing cotton. The land is suitable for that purpose. If a lease for a period of years were given to some of the people, I have no doubt that they would plant a cotton crop. If they planted 30 acres of cotton and got £600 or £800, would it not be better for the Government? Those men would be producing something, they would be bringing money to Central Queensland, and the land would be better utilised. At present it does not serve any more useful purpose than the browsing of a few head of cattle. Some man who is supplying milk to the institution has an arrangement whereby his cattle are allowed to run on the land. It does not seem to be anyone's duty to clear the land of pear.

There is in this vote a grant of £600 to the Rockhampton Benevolent Asylum. I am very pleased that, as a result of representations made on many occasions by the hon. member for Fitzroy and myself, the Home Secretary granted an additional £100 towards the upkeep of that institution. It is doing good work, containing, approximately, eighty patients. It is controlled by an enthusiastic committee of ladies, who give up a lot of their time to care for the poorer people in the community—many of whom are fit

subjects for Dunwich, but prefer to be looked after in their own town. A number of them are natives of Rockhampton, and do not want to leave Rockhampton; and I am pleased that there is such an institution in which they may be housed and have some degree of home life meted out to them. The hon. member for Fitzroy and I would like the Home Secretary to increase that grant still further, if he can. We recognise that the Government have been generous towards benevolent institutions. One has only to look at the records to find that the Government have treated such institutions much more generously than the previous Government did. I have a comparative table of expenditure on benevolent institutions—including hospitals for the insane, "Relief of Aborigines," and so on, and I find that in the last three years of the Denham Government the expenditure was—

	£
1912-13 ... ..	330,057
1913-14 ... ..	367,517
1914-15 ... ..	410,124

making a total of £1,107,998. Taking three years under the present Government up to the year 1920-21, the expenditure has been—

	£
1918-19 ... ..	670,018
1919-20 ... ..	784,570
1920-21 ... ..	923,796

making a total of £2,738,384, as against £1,107,998 in the last three years of the Denham Government's regime. That shows that this Government has always been more generous in its treatment of benevolent institutions than the previous Government. The annual expenditure for charitable purposes by the present Administration is 74 per cent. in excess of the average expenditure of the last three years of the previous Administration. The Government is a humanitarian one, caring for the sick and needy in the community. It is the sympathetic ear of the Home Secretary which listens when we go to him with requests on behalf of those people. It is with a view to impressing upon the Government the necessity for continuing their generosity towards the poor and helpless in the community that I offer these few words of advice.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. A. J. Jones, *Paddington*): The hon. member for Rockhampton has referred to the prickly-pear near the Westwood Sanatorium. On one occasion that reserve was perfectly clear of pear. Once land is cleared of pear another crop must be substituted, or close attention given to it to keep it clear. Unfortunately, that land has become somewhat pear infested again. No doubt, if it was placed under cotton cultivation, the position would be much better. I would like to inform the hon. member for Murilla that the Chief Protector of Aborigines has informed me that steps have been taken in connection with cotton cultivation at Barambah and Taroom. The prosperity and the greatness of a country is gauged by the number of inmates in such institutions as Dunwich, the Blind, Deaf and Dumb Institution, and the Westwood institution, etc. The number of inmates in these institutions has decreased rather than increased when compared with the present population. The hon. member for Rockhampton has culogised the Government and its Home Secretary for the consideration the Minister has shown for institutions in the

Central districts. I am sorry that the Home Secretary is not here to receive those congratulations and commendations. The Home Secretary is a man who has the courage of his convictions, who can be firm, and stand right because it is right; but no hon. gentleman in this House has a bigger or warmer heart when it comes to administering for the sick and needy who have to enter these institutions.

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): I was rather interested to see that the hon. member for Rockhampton took a kindly interest in the affairs of the Normanby electorate. I understand that the Westwood Sanatorium is situated in that electorate.

Mr. FORDE: I take a keen interest in the whole of Queensland.

Mr. BEBBINGTON: Why does not the hon. member stick to his own electorate?

Mr. VOWLES: The hon. member for Rockhampton has suggested what should be done in regard to pear land surrounding the sanatorium. One would imagine that nothing has been done at all. The Estimates will show that last year £500 was allocated for that purpose, and this year £500 is allocated for the same purpose. I do not know what is the idea of the hon. member's suggestion when the department has already taken steps to deal with the matter.

Mr. FORDE: The place is infested with pear, and I want it cleared so that it can be put to a useful purpose.

Mr. VOWLES: Leave that to the hon. member for Normanby. (Interruption.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope hon. members will obey my call to order and allow the leader of the Opposition to continue his speech.

Mr. VOWLES: The one thing that hon. members object to is outside members coming to their electorates and then telling them how things should be done. The hon. member for Normanby is here to speak for himself on that matter. Because the hon. member for Rockhampton makes a casual visit to a public institution, he poses as an authority and directs the Government as to what they should do. I would like to point out that there seems to be a disparity in the payments to the different nurses for similar work in different districts. If you take the Jubilee Sanatorium at Dalby, you will find that the sister there receives £110 and the nurses £78. If you go to Westwood the sister receives £130 and the nurses receive £85. Then if you take the Dunwich Benevolent Asylum, you will find the nurses receive £135, and so on. The comparison is all against the remuneration paid to those looking after the sanatorium in my electorate, and I think I have a grievance there.

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: They are all under awards. The Arbitration Court creates different districts.

Mr. VOWLES: Then the basis is wrong. Then, again, there are twenty-three on the staff at the Jubilee Sanatorium and there are only seventeen at Westwood. I understand that, according to the proportion of patients, they are up to their full complement at Dalby.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The length of service fixes the salary.

Mr. VOWLES: Last year £3,400 was voted for the Jubilee Sanatorium, and this year only £2,400 is asked for for a staff of twenty-three, while at Westwood £3,250 is required for a staff of seventeen.

*Mr. Vowles.]*

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The answer to that is that the estimate is based, not so much on the appropriation last year, as on the actual expenditure.

Mr. VOWLES: Why should it be necessary to vote £3,250 for the maintenance of a staff of seventeen and only £2,400 for a staff of twenty-three at Dalby? The figures seem to be wrong.

Mr. HARTLEY: The work is extending at Westwood.

Mr. VOWLES: That is the information I am asking for.

Mr. STOPFORD: Westwood Sanatorium is taking a lot of patients who would otherwise have gone to Dalby.

Mr. VOWLES: I know that is so. That is what it was established for, and it was built in the vicinity of the place where the patients come from. If there are not so many patients at Dalby, where a staff of twenty-three is required, as there are at Westwood, where there is a staff of seventeen, then the thing seems out of proportion. I am only seeking information.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. A. J. Jones, *Paddington*): The expenditure at the Jubilee Sanatorium for the year 1919-20 was £3,658 9s. 9d., and for last year it was £2,355 12s. 9d. There was a decrease of £1,274 17s., due to the difference in the prices of butter, cheese, groceries, and other commodities. As I have said, this year's estimate is not based on the amount appropriated last year, but on the amount actually expended.

Mr. VOWLES: But does not the same thing apply to Westwood?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: There was an increase last year at Westwood on the expenditure of the previous year. It is all due to the cost of the articles purchased.

Mr. VOWLES: But if it is falling in Dalby, it should be falling in Westwood.

Mr. PETERSON (*Normanby*): I have no objection to the hon. member for Rockhampton taking an interest in the institution in my electorate, and the electors of Central Queensland have a right to be thankful to other Central members for the interest they have taken.

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: It is a State institution.

Mr. PETERSON: There are electors from all parts of Queensland in that institution, and every hon. member should take an interest, not only in that institution, but in all other institutions. As far as the insinuations that I have not looked after the interests of the sanatorium are concerned, I refer hon. members to the secretary of the institution in confirmation of the fact that I was recently forwarded a testimonial expressing thanks for the interest I had taken on behalf of the inmates of the institution—a memento which I shall always cherish. The hon. member for Rockhampton himself knows that no part of my electorate has been neglected since I have been in this House. It is time something was done with regard to the pear on the sanatorium reserve. I have already moved in the direction of asking the Home Secretary to divide the area into sections, leaving the institution with a small piece of ground, and letting the other part under prickly-pear clearing tenure. The sum of £500 was voted last year for the clearing of the pear on

[Mr. Vowles.

that land, but I do not believe that a penny of that amount has been spent. I hope that the Minister will realise the menace which the pear is becoming at the Westwood Sanatorium.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: We cleared it once.

Mr. PETERSON: Yes; you gave it to a person rent free on condition that he kept it clear. It would cost £1,000 to clear the reserve to-day. Would it not be better to reserve a small area for the institution, and give the use of the other portion to someone who will agree to keep it clear of pear? I would like to know whether the sum of £500 put on the Estimates last year has been spent, or whether it has been merely carried forward to this year. If it is not spent soon, it will cost ten times more than that to clear the pear.

Mr. HARTLEY (*Fitzroy*): I would like to add a word of praise to the matron and nursing staff at the Westwood Sanatorium for the way that institution has been conducted, and I am glad to see the attention paid to sufferers from miners' phthisis in the vicinity of the sanatorium, and also in other parts of the State.

There is one item which seems to give much concern and that is the amount of prickly-pear on the reserve at the sanatorium. The pear there is not so bad. It should be attended to, and the best way to attend to it is to have a man put on to clear it now and again. I do not agree with the suggestion that the odd man should do it. You are trying to get the engine-driver to look after the boiler, look after the laundry department, and clear the pear in his spare time; but that will not leave him much spare time to look after the engine. You will have to have a man for that work. I hope the Minister will not be led into any cranky ideas about the distribution of the cochineal insect. We had the hon. member for Warwick this afternoon advocating that the Commonwealth Bureau Department of Science and Industry which is trying to eradicate the pear should make exchanges of the cochineal insect throughout the district. I hope the Home Secretary will not make a mistake like that in the Central District.

Mr. VOWLES: Why?

Mr. HARTLEY: Because you cannot brand or earmark a cochineal insect. (Laughter.) They can easily get through a barbed-wire fence, and they can also get through netting, and once they get away look at the trouble the department will have to get them back and identify them. (Laughter.) They would get amongst the pear in the Gogango Range, where the pear is so thick that you cannot hear a dog bark. If he does bark, he chokes because it goes back down his throat. In places where the cochineal insect is bred they collect them by scraping them from the leaves on which they live. Now, just fancy what a job that would be if these "chaps" got away among the fastnesses of the prickly-pear patches of the Gogango Ranges. Imagine the job of the departmental musters sent to yard them up. The pear there is large, with leaves about a foot in diameter, and thorns anything from 4 to 5 inches long and half an inch apart. Fancy trying to muster off these nimble little "chaps" at the rate of 5,000 to the inch from a leaf like that! I think the Minister will appreciate the unwisdom of letting loose these insects in the way that has been suggested.

At 10.30 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN said: Under the provisions of Standing Order No. 307, I will now leave the chair and make my report to the House.

The House resumed.

The CHAIRMAN reported progress.

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

#### MORNING SITTINGS.

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

"That during the remainder of this session, unless otherwise ordered, the House will meet for the despatch of business at 10.30 o'clock a.m. on each sitting day at present appointed, and that on any of those days Supply (including any Resolution thereof for the ensuing year) may be taken both from 11 o'clock a.m. to 4.30 o'clock p.m., and from 4.30 o'clock p.m. to 10.30 o'clock p.m.; each of those periods shall be accounted allotted days under the provisions of Standing Order No. 307, and all other provisions of that Standing Order shall apply: Provided that at 4.30 o'clock p.m. the proceedings shall be interrupted for the purpose only of dealing with formal business, for asking and answering questions, and for giving notices of motion."

The idea is to allow the double days for Supply. This is the third day's consideration of Supply, and we have fourteen more days for the consideration of Estimates and the reception of the Resolutions. There is still a large volume business to go through this session. A number of Bills were outlined in the Governor's Speech at the commencement of the session.

Mr. MORGAN: You are going to drop a lot of them.

The PREMIER: It is not the intention of the Government to drop any of those measures. There is quite a formidable list of Bills on the business-paper, and I ask hon. members to agree to this motion to enable us to get through the business which we think we should get through this session.

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): In the early part of the session, when we decided to sit on Fridays, I applied to the Premier to meet on that day at 2 o'clock, and finish at 6 o'clock, to enable hon. members to catch their trains and get to their homes. We were told that it would cause great inconvenience—that it would not suit Ministers—they would not be able to attend to their ordinary functions in their offices if that concession—which was acceptable to both sides—were granted to hon. members. Notwithstanding that they are short-handed, for some reason of their own the Government have decided that for the future we are to sit every morning so long as the Estimates are being discussed. Why this indecent haste? Does the hon. gentleman realise that, under this proposal, we are going to be deprived of two days? Half-past 10 o'clock is to be the formal hour of meeting; but we shall actually meet at 11 o'clock. We shall sit from 11 till 1 and from 2 till half-past 4—that will be regarded as one day—a total of four and a-half hours instead of six hours, as at present.

The PREMIER: It is the same for members on this side.

Mr. VOWLES: That is not the point. When we started the session our Standing

Orders were revised to deal with the altered conditions. The debate on the Address in Reply was limited to four days. Under the old Standing Orders every hon. member had the right to speak for sixty minutes on the Address in Reply. We were deprived of that right, and it will be seen from "Hansard" that the Premier told us, "You will have the opportunity of speaking when the Financial Statement comes forward. Every man will have the right to express his opinion." When the Financial Statement came forward some of us were deprived of the right of speaking.

The PREMIER: You wasted a day on the want of confidence motion.

Mr. VOWLES: It is not a question of what we wasted. An offer was made in this House and accepted by us.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is not dealing with the motion.

Mr. VOWLES: I am giving reasons why we should not sit—because we are being deprived of our proper time.

The PREMIER: You will have further opportunity on the Resolutions.

Mr. VOWLES: There are already sufficient matters outstanding to take up the whole of the time allotted to Resolutions.

Mr. PEASE: The Premier gave you information, and you did not like it.

Mr. VOWLES: All we want is the truth. If every Minister would give the same amount of information as is given by the Secretary for Mines, there would be less trouble in this House. That Minister gives us all the details on every occasion—and he is the only Minister who does so. He is too honest; he does not understand his surroundings. When we were deprived of our right of speech on the Financial Statement we were told that the opportunity would arise when the Estimates were being discussed. That would be all right if the time allotted were spread over the whole of the Estimates. But those who know the game from past experience know that there are many Estimates which are worthy of discussion, and which we desire to discuss, which will never come before the Committee. It will be the policy of the Government to stonewall, to put up speakers as they have done in the past, in order that those departments in respect of which we want information shall not be reviewed. In the face of that, can we consent to two days being taken from hon. members who, in some instances, have not in this Parliament had an opportunity of expressing their opinions on certain subjects? It is unreasonable for the Premier to ask it. The hon. gentleman has told us that all the legislation which has been forecast is going to be placed on the statute-book. The whole of the sessional programme can be placed on the statute-book gradually. It can be done after half-past 10. There is no need to rush the Estimates through like this. The Premier is anxious to get this House off his hands. Probably, after the caucus meeting this morning there will be a rush for electorates. We will find that a surprise will be sprung upon the country.

The PREMIER: Who tells the hon. gentleman these caucus secrets?

Mr. VOWLES: We have not got any dictaphone or secret stenographers, but the information leaks out just the same. Judging by the levity with which the Premier

*Mr. Vowles.]*

receives our objection to these proposals, one would think that the Opposition had no rights at all, and that we had simply to consent to whatever suited the Government's programme. That is not the spirit in which an Opposition takes that sort of thing. We are going to stand up for our rights. If the Premier is determined to see this matter through, then we can only oppose the motion as far as we are permitted. I would not be doing my duty to this Opposition, and future Oppositions, if I did not stand up and protest. No person was more earnest in his endeavours to preserve the rights of the Opposition than the Premier and his predecessor when they were in opposition. They spoke at great length, and made quotations to show what had been done on former occasions. The hon. gentleman always took the stand that the Opposition could not consent to an arrangement of this kind, because it would be setting a precedent to future Oppositions and parliamentarians. I am not going to take this matter lying down. I intend to divide the House on the question, in order to have placed on the records our objection to the Premier's desire.

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): We sat an extra day every week at the commencement of the session in order that the business might be facilitated and carried through. We have been in session eight weeks, and now an attempt is being made to foist on the Opposition a curtailment of their rights. A similar motion was moved on 14th October last year, and various excuses were given at the time. Last year we were told that it was because the Opposition would not grant a "pair." That cannot be urged on this occasion, because hon. members have the right to vote by proxy. It was also stated that there was a Premier's Conference in Melbourne. I think I am right in saying that there is to be a Premier's Conference at the end of September or the beginning of October.

The PREMIER: I have not heard of it.

Mr. TAYLOR: It is rather remarkable that all the Premier's Conferences are arranged in Melbourne about the time of the Melbourne Cup.

The PREMIER: Those conferences are called by the Nationalist Prime Minister.

Mr. TAYLOR: I hope that the Premier will derive some benefit from his attendance at those conferences. Last year private members' day was cut out, as it has been this year. The Financial Statement was "gagged" last year in the same manner as it was "gagged" this year.

The PREMIER: The leader of the Opposition must have been wrong when he said this year that it was unprecedented to "gag" the Financial Statement?

Mr. TAYLOR: He made a mistake. The Financial Statement was "gagged" last year in a similar way to what it was this year, and hon. members sitting on this side of the House were not given a reasonable opportunity to discuss that statement.

The PREMIER: All Oppositions are fractious.

Mr. TAYLOR: It is a good thing the Premier did not say that the Opposition were fractured, because we are not. (Laughter.) We are here seriously to endeavour to carry on the business of the country and to criticise where we think criticism is necessary, and certainly, if ever there was a time when criticism was necessary on the financial transactions of the Government and on their

transactions generally, I say that time is the present, and I support the leader of the Opposition in his objection to the proposal put before us to-night to curtail by two days the debate on the Estimates. Further, I do not think the double shift is necessary. There is quite sufficient time for us to get through the whole of the business which the Government have on their sessional programme in the way we have been going for the last two months without inflicting this double shift on us.

The PREMIER: Did I understand the hon. member to say that the Financial Statement was "gagged" last year?

Mr. TAYLOR: Yes.

The PREMIER: The hon. member is wrong. It was not "gagged" last year.

Mr. TAYLOR: No one knows better than hon. members opposite that morning sittings are the most ragged sittings of Parliament. You get seven or eight members in the Chamber. The rest are within the precincts of the House certainly, but there is nothing more wearisome or discouraging to hon. members attempting to criticise the finances of the Government than all-day sittings, which are absolutely unnecessary. If it is necessary to get through the whole of the programme which the Government have outlined, we are prepared to sit till Christmas so that the business may be carried out in a satisfactory way.

Mr. SIZER (*Nundah*): Seeing that we are to lose two days on the Estimates by accepting the Government's proposal, it would only be fair if the Premier were to agree to suspend the Standing Order providing for seventeen days' discussion on the Estimates and increase the number of days to twenty. That would give us the same opportunity to discuss the Estimates that we had in previous years.

Hon. W. FORGAN SMITH: The House of Commons only take four days to get through their Estimates.

Mr. SIZER: If the hon. member would be prepared to accept the practice of the House of Commons in all things, what a wonderful change we would see in this Chamber! If we were entitled to seventeen days on the Estimates when we had two Chambers, surely we should be entitled to more consideration now that we have a one-Chamber Parliament? I suggest that the Premier should agree to suspend the Standing Orders and allow us twenty days to discuss the Estimates.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): Independent of the fact that we shall be deprived of two days, I object to being obliged to meet at such an early hour each day. I feel that since the Council has been abolished the people expect the legislation which is placed before the Chamber shall receive full consideration, not only in the House, but also when members are not engaged in the Chamber. Ministers can rely on their officials to get any information they want, but Opposition members are in a different position, and have to procure the information they want off their own bat. It is unfair to have to take the second reading of a Bill at 11 o'clock in the morning after it passed the first reading stage late the previous night. Opposition members have a right to more consideration than members on the Government side, as Government members have not the same necessity as Opposition members to

[Mr. Vowles.



study measures which come before the House. When I sat on the opposite side it was not looked upon as being the duty of members behind the Government to criticise measures. Opposition members have the responsibility of studying Bills with a view to improving them.

The PREMIER: We will relieve you from that responsibility.

Mr. MORGAN: The Premier would relieve us from that responsibility, but it is our duty not to accept any consideration of that sort. If the Government were different to what they are, we could look at the matter from a different point of view. The Premier is anxious to get into recess, and no doubt recognises that the longer the House sits the greater will be the danger of some of his supporters breaking away from the party. (Government laughter.) I hope that we shall be able to prevent the burden of sitting two days in one being placed upon us.

HON. W. H. BARNES (*Bulimba*): There is another phase of the question which has not been touched upon—that is, the question so far as it relates to the officers of the House. It seems unfair that the officers of the House should be on duty so long.

The PREMIER: It was an eight-hour day, and now it is a twelve-hour day.

HON. W. H. BARNES: People think that the work of the officers ceases when the House finishes; but that is not the case. The Premier knows that quite well. Hon. members have pointed out that full consideration cannot be given to Bills, because the Premier says that the Government purpose putting their whole programme through. What possible chance will there be for us to do justice to Bills introduced into this House when we have to deal with the second reading and Committee stages at one sitting, and in a way that is not in the interests of the country? I want to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that at one time there was a revising Chamber. We had an Upper House which rectified some of the mistakes which were made in this Chamber. No one would be foolish enough to say that some of the Bills passed here did not require amendment. Whether we like it or not,

Mr. Speaker, the Premier is [11 p.m.] desperately in earnest, and wants to get into recess. Whether he kills you or the Chairman of Committees in the attempt or not does not matter. You understand what it means. You have to sit there listening to the debates. You know that when men are taxed physically, as a result of a long sitting, they are apt to lose their tempers, and there may be some necessity to get more proxy votes. That will not be in the best interests of the State. It may even be the Premier himself, as the result of trying to do too much. (Laughter.)

The PREMIER: Far better to do too much than too many. (Laughter.)

HON. W. H. BARNES: The Premier knows all about it when he throws an insinuation like that across the chair.

The PREMIER: I beg to move—

“That the question be now put.”

Question—That the question be now put—put; and the House divided—

In division,

The PREMIER: I declare that, in addition to voting in my own right, I vote for

the “Ayes” as proxy for Messrs. Coyne, Gilday, and McCormack.

AYES, 35.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Jones, A. J.
„ Brennan	„ Kirwan
„ Bulcock	„ Land
„ Collins	„ Larcombe
„ Conroy	„ McCormack (Proxy)
„ Cooper, F. A.	„ Mullan
„ Cooper, W.	„ Payne
„ Coyne (Proxy)	„ Pease
„ Dash	„ Pollock
„ Dunstan	„ Riordan
„ Ferrieks	„ Ryan
„ Foley	„ Smith
„ Forde	„ Stopford
„ Gilday (Proxy)	„ Theodore
„ Gillies	„ Weir
„ Gledson	„ Wellington
„ Hartley	„ Winstanley
„ Huxham	

Tellers: Mr. Bulcock and Mr. Conroy.

NOES, 31.

Mr. Barnes, G. P.	Mr. Macgregor
„ Barnes, W. H.	„ Maxwell
„ Bell	„ Moore
„ Cattermull	„ Morgan
„ Clayton	„ Nott
„ Corsor	„ Peterson
„ Costello	„ Petrie
„ Deacon	„ Roberts, J. H. C.
„ Edwards	„ Roberts, T. R.
„ Fletcher	„ Sizer
„ Fry	„ Swayne
„ Green	„ Taylor
„ Jones, J.	„ Vowles
„ Kerr	„ Walker
„ King	„ Warren
„ Logan	

Tellers: Mr. Logan and Mr. Nott.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Original question (*Mr. Theodore's motion*) put; and the House divided:—

In division,

The PREMIER (Hon. E. G. Theodore, *Chillagoe*): I declare that, in addition to voting in my own right, I vote for the “Ayes” as proxy for Messrs. Coyne, Gilday, and McCormack.

AYES, 35.

Mr. Barber	Mr. Jones, A. J.
„ Brennan	„ Kirwan
„ Bulcock	„ Land
„ Collins	„ Larcombe
„ Conroy	„ McCormack (Proxy)
„ Cooper, F. A.	„ Mullan
„ Cooper, W.	„ Payne
„ Coyne (Proxy)	„ Pease
„ Dash	„ Pollock
„ Dunstan	„ Riordan
„ Ferrieks	„ Ryan
„ Foley	„ Smith
„ Forde	„ Stopford
„ Gilday (Proxy)	„ Theodore
„ Gillies	„ Weir
„ Gledson	„ Wellington
„ Hartley	„ Winstanley
„ Huxham	

Tellers: Mr. Brennan and Mr. Foley.

NOES, 30.

Mr. Barnes, G. P.	Mr. Macgregor
„ Barnes, W. H.	„ Maxwell
„ Bell	„ Moore
„ Cattermull	„ Morgan
„ Clayton	„ Nott
„ Corsor	„ Peterson
„ Costello	„ Petrie
„ Deacon	„ Roberts, J. H. C.
„ Fletcher	„ Roberts, T. R.
„ Fry	„ Sizer
„ Green	„ Swayne
„ Jones, J.	„ Taylor
„ Kerr	„ Vowles
„ King	„ Walker
„ Logan	„ Warren

Tellers: Mr. Costello and Mr. Peterson.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The House adjourned at 11.14 p.m.