Queensland

# Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

## Legislative Assembly

**WEDNESDAY, 18 JULY 1923**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## WEDNESDAY, 18 JULY, 1923.

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

## QUESTIONS.

### EXAMINATION OF TRADE APPRENTICES.

Mr. ROBERTS (*East Toowoomba*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

"1. What was the number of youths who sat for trade apprentices—Brisbane, Rockhampton, Ipswich, Townsville, and Toowoomba—during the periods 1st July, 1921, to 30th June, 1922, and from 1st July, 1922, to 30th June, 1923?

"2. What was the number who passed such examination—Brisbane, Ipswich, Toowoomba, Rockhampton, and Townsville?

"3. What was the number of such successful applicants appointed—Brisbane, Ipswich, Toowoomba, Rockhampton, and Townsville?

"4. What were their ages—(*a*) At time of examination; (*b*) at time of appointment?

"5. Have other appointments as trade apprentices been made at aforementioned places during the period 1922-1923?

"6. If so, what number?"

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

"1. No examination for trade apprentices was held between 1st July, 1921, and 30th June, 1922. The number who sat for examination between 1st July, 1922, and 30th June, 1923, was as follows:—Brisbane, nil; Ipswich, 78; Toowoomba, 18; Rockhampton, 130; Townsville, 68.

"2. Brisbane, nil; Ipswich, 63; Toowoomba, 13; Rockhampton, 50; Townsville, 42.

"3. Brisbane, nil; Ipswich, 21; Toowoomba, 8; Rockhampton, 17; Townsville, 11. Since 30th June additional apprentices have been appointed after passing the prescribed examination.

"4. (*a*) At time of closing applications all candidates were between the ages of fifteen and sixteen years. One lad had passed the University examination and was employed on probation before the railway examination. (*b*) At time of appointment thirty-seven were aged fifteen years, eighteen were aged sixteen years, thirty-seven were between fifteen and sixteen years, nineteen were over sixteen years old.

"5. Yes.

"6. An apprentice watchmaker and an apprentice signwriter were also appointed at Brisbane for their special trades."

### BRISBANE TRAMWAY TRUST AND TRAMWAY EXTENSIONS.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*) asked the Home Secretary—

"In connection with the administration of the Brisbane Tramway Trust Act of 1922, will he answer the following questions:—

"1. Has a general scheme for the future development of the tramways been prepared?

"2. Has an advisory board under the Act been appointed; if so, who are the three members appointed?

"3. As the Act provides that the trust may undertake extensions without waiting for the general scheme to be adopted, but is subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, will he state if any such approval has been applied for?"

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. Stopford, *Mount Morgan*) replied—

"1. No.

"2. No.

"3. (*a*) Duplication of Clayfield line; (*b*) duplication of Bulimba line; (*c*) duplication of Logan road line; (*d*) loop line at Exhibition."

GENERAL WHEEL TAX REGULATIONS UNDER MAIN ROADS ACT.

Mr. KERR asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

"1. At what date were the general wheel tax regulations under the Main Roads Act completed?

"2. What is the reason that such regulations have not been gazetted?

"3. Is it intended to give effect to the legislation passed in this connection?

"4. What steps are being taken by the Government towards the prevention of road destruction by heavy loads on wheels with narrow tyres?

"5. Have any weight-of-load regulations been prepared, and is it proposed to enforce them?"

The PREMIER (Hon. E. G. Theodore, *Chillagoe*), in the absence of the Secretary for Public Lands (Hon. W. McCormack, *Cairns*), replied—

"1. Draft regulations only were prepared during the latter portion of 1921.

"2. The matter of gazetting the regulations has been held over—(*a*) In order to see the effect of the proposals which have been made in Victoria, which it is understood have not yet been given effect to; (*b*) because wheel taxes on ordinary vehicles are at the present time collected by a number of local authorities; and (*c*) because of the difficulty of fixing a flat rate of tax for each kind of vehicle for every main road in the State.

"3. Yes; after suitable arrangements have been made as to the collection of the fees, and after the matters mentioned in the answer to question No. 2 have been finalised.

"4. The Weight-of-load Regulations, 1921, have been gazetted, and a number of shire councils have been requested to take action thereunder.

"5. See answer to No. 4. The Weight-of-load Regulations, 1921, were gazetted on 5th December, 1921, on page 232. Action will be taken where there is any possibility of damage being done to new works constructed under the Main Roads Acts, 1920 to 1922, or to works existing on main roads prior to the commencement of the board's operations."

TENDERS AND CONTRACTS FOR INDIGENT BURIALS IN METROPOLITAN AREA.

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

"Will he lay upon the table of the House the whole of the papers dealing with the tenders and contracts for the indigent burials in the metropolitan area?"

The HOME SECRETARY replied—

"If the hon. member will call at the Home Office the papers will be submitted for his perusal."

COMMONWEALTH CONTRIBUTION FOR RESEARCH WORK IN RE BUNCHY TOP IN BANANAS.

Mr. KING (*Logan*) asked the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock—

"1. Has the Government been advised by the Commonwealth Government that the latter Government is prepared to contribute £1,500 to enable the Bureau of Science and Industry to conduct research work into the cause and cure of 'bunchy top' in bananas, providing this and the New South Wales Governments each contribute an equal amount?

"2. If so, is it the intention of the Government to accept such offer?"

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE AND STOCK (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Eucham*) replied—

"1. No.

"2. When such offer is received, every consideration will be given to it. Meanwhile, we are co-operating with the New South Wales Department of Agriculture in an endeavour to solve the problem."

COLLECTION OF FEDERAL AND STATE INCOME TAX.

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

"As the preparation of both Commonwealth and State income tax returns will shortly be exercising the minds of taxpayers, is he in a position to state what will be the conditions surrounding the collection of Federal and State taxes in Queensland for the year ending 30th June, 1923?"

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

"Representatives of the Commonwealth and States are at present conferring upon the matter, and a statement of the position will be made as early as possible."

CONDITIONS IN RE LEARNING TRADES AT TECHNICAL COLLEGE.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE asked the Secretary for Public Instruction—

"1. Is it possible for a youth of, say, eighteen years of age to attend a Technical College in his spare time to learn a trade, and, if so, what are the conditions he has to comply with?

"2. Is there anything to prevent boys who are above the entrance-to-examination age from learning a trade in their spare time under experts should they so desire?"

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

"1. Instruction in trade subjects in Technical Colleges is complementary to that given in workshops, and lads attending trade classes in Technical Colleges are employed in trade workshops during the day. The manual instruction provided in the Technical High Schools in woodworking and sheet-metal working is intended to correlate the class work in mathematics with that in manual subjects, and thus to act as the connecting link between the schools and trades. Some lads, whose objective is the life on the land, also attend the day classes for elementary trade work. A youth of, say, eighteen years may attend evening classes in woodworking for amateurs, but it is not possible for him to learn a trade in technical classes alone.

"2. Representatives of employers and employees maintain that the fully fledged tradesman cannot be trained solely in a Technical College. If a lad is above the ordinary age for apprenticeship he may apply to the Arbitration Court for permission to enter a trade, and the Court has, in a number of cases, approved of boys entering trades even up to the age of nineteen and twenty. It is not possible for a lad to learn a trade apart from the atmosphere of the workshop or job."

## PAPERS.

The following paper was laid on the table, and ordered to be printed:—

Balance-sheet of the Public Curator.

The following paper was laid on the table:—

Regulations dated 22nd February and 6th July, 1923, under the Health Acts, 1900 to 1922.

## CIRCULATION AND COST OF "HANSARD."

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report of the Principal Shorthand Writer on the circulation and cost of "Hansard" for the financial year ended 30th June, 1923.

Ordered to be printed.

## PEST DESTROYERS BILL.

INITIATION.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Eacham*): I beg to move—

"That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to regulate the sale of insecticides, fungicides, vermin destroyers, and weed destroyers, and for other purposes."

Question put and passed.

## TRUST ACCOUNTS BILL.

INITIATION.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Flinders*): I beg to move—

"That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to provide for the regulation and management of trust accounts."

Question put and passed.

## WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. J. Mullan, *Flinders*): I beg to move—

"That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Workers' Compensation Acts, 1916 to 1921, in certain particulars."

Question put and passed.

## INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. W. Forgan Smith, *Mackay*): I beg to move—

"That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to further amend the Industrial Arbitration Act of 1916 in certain particulars."

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): I call "Not formal," because I think that at this stage, when the Minister has given notice of his intention to introduce this Bill, it is only right that the House should be furnished with some particulars with regard to what the contents of the Bill are likely to be.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: You will get that in Committee at the next stage.

Mr. TAYLOR: But we are anxious to know at the present time. The least the Minister might do is to take the House into his confidence to a certain extent. It is only right and fitting that we should have some knowledge of what the contents of the Bill are likely to be. If they are to be such as were foreshadowed some time ago at a certain convention, I think we should know it, and I hope that the Minister will give the House some idea as to what form the Bill is likely to take.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*): I support the contention of the leader of the Opposition, that we should have some information from the Minister at this stage. We understand that this legislation has not been initiated in the caucus room, and that it has not been initiated in the Cabinet room. (Government laughter.) Whilst hon. members opposite may have some idea of what this legislation proposes to do, they will remember that at the junta where it was decided upon even the Press were excluded, so that we are rather at a disadvantage on this side. I do not believe that even the "Daily Standard" was permitted within the walls to take a report of what was going on, so that we are hampered in every way concerning what this legislation may really mean.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CORSER: I hope the Minister will be so good as to give us some information as to the contents of the Bill.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: It extends the operations of the Industrial Arbitration Court to all occupations

Mr. CORSER: I think the Minister should not mind giving the House the information by way of speech instead of by way of interjection.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. W. H. BARNES (*Wynnum*): It is perfectly true, as the Minister has interjected, that at this stage of the introduction of the Bill it is not usual to have a full discussion, but I would remind him that the Opposition have been very considerate in respect to the other items already dealt with, and I think he should have the courtesy to give the information desired, and so facilitate the passage of the motion

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I do not mind.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not a stage at which the provisions of a Bill can be discussed, and I cannot permit any further debate.

Question put and passed.

## ADDRESS IN REPLY.

### RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*): I must first of all congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply upon the way in which they handled the question before the House and the showing they put up on behalf of the Government, considering the poor case they had. I would like to take this opportunity, too, Sir, of personally congratulating you on your elevation to the high position you occupy in this Chamber. I am reminded of several incidents which have occurred from time to time under your rule, and I think that your desire for fairness has always been present, and that anything which may have happened with which the Opposition have not agreed may be put down to the cast-iron discipline of party politics, and that for anything by which you have in our opinion given us cause for offence you are to be all the more commended by your own side, considering the party political situation. I think, however, that it will not be long before the people of Queensland and of Australia generally will see the absurdity of party politics and of the rule of a junta outside this House which does not allow individual members of the House to express their opinions.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: The Rockhampton convention.

Mr. CORSER: No; the Emu Park Convention. However, I can say that we certainly agreed with your rulings whenever they favoured us—(laughter)—and, generally speaking, outside the party ties which everybody on that side has under our present system, I feel sure that you have exceeded the expectations of most members on your own side.

It is to be sincerely hoped that during the next three years the Government are going to carry out the policy which has been dictated to them by the Emu Park Convention.

I am not going to say one word just now against the man who believes in the extreme effect of the policy that was advocated by Labour members during the election campaign, but I am going to say something against the man who does not believe those things which he claims his party stands for. The sooner this Labour Government of Queensland stand up and bring forward the planks of their platform upon which they have agreed, the sooner we shall have a changed and good Government in this State.

Mr. PEASE: You are always saying that.

Mr. CORSER: The sooner we are able to decide against a Communistic Government or the Red Objective, the sooner we shall have an opportunity of defeating the present Government. Our friends opposite during the elections told the people of the State that they did not believe in any alteration in the wages system, whereas we know that the chairman of their convention—Mr. Demaine, who is held in esteem by all of them—told the Convention, and told the people of the State, that the Labour party were out for the abolition of the wages system, and until that came about the worker could not receive the full reward for his labour. They have told us further that in altering the present condition of affairs, which will give to the worker the full reward for his labour, it is necessary to bring about a condition of affairs that will mean the abolition of private capital. If we are going to abolish private capital, we are going to abolish everything that is private. We are going to lose the ownership of the farm, we are going to hand over to the workers the control of industry and the control of the means of production. That is not my statement. Hon. members opposite do not believe anything until it is quoted to them. They believe that capital can only be abolished by the workers uniting in one class-conscious economic organisation, and taking hold of the means of production. That means to take hold of the farm.

Mr. COLLINS: Where is that statement taken from?

Mr. CORSER: Does the hon. gentleman not stand for that resolution? If we could only bring hon. members in this House to agree to a definite course of action in the interest of their own conscience, then we are likely to see just what are the feelings of the people in this State.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: Why not start at home and get an agreement on your own side?

Mr. CORSER: They are in agreement in that they are bound to act as one. The position is that members on this side have freedom of conscience, and they are allowed to carry on as they so desire.

Mr. CARTER: Lack of unity.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: You are only able to carry on as half a one.

Mr. CORSER: Half a loaf is better than no bread, and half freedom is better than none at all.

Mr. CARTER: It is like an unborn egg.

Mr. CORSER: The hon. gentleman is like an addled egg. (Opposition laughter.) Hon. members advocate that there can be no peace until the capitalistic system of production is abolished, and there is one class—the working class—handling, controlling, and operating the fields, factories, and workshops. That is very definite, but is that contained in the Governor's Speech? Is that contained in the list of Bills that His Excellency read in this Assembly?

Mr. HARTLEY: You ought to have read it. It is the shortest one on record.

Mr. CORSER: It was not necessary to read it. The hon. member will not answer. We know the details of the Bills were all ready, but they did not contain any inference that the Government are out for the abolition of the capitalistic system and for control by the workers of the fields, factories, and workshops. That is their platform.

Mr. COLLINS: What are you quoting from?

Mr. CORSER: I am quoting from the "International Socialist."

Mr. COLLINS: I thought so; that is not our platform.

Mr. CORSER: Does the hon. member for Bowen say the Labour party does not stand for the abolition of private ownership of the farm?

Mr. W. COOPER: Of course we do say that.

Mr. CORSER: Do you not stand for that resolution? Do you not stand for the abolition of private ownership? Of course you do.

Mr. HARTLEY: Don't alter that word "resolution" into "resolutions."

The PREMIER: Didn't you say that we stood for the confiscation of the Savings Bank deposits?

Mr. CORSER: I do not say that the hon. gentleman stands for confiscation, but those who drive him do.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Oh!

Mr. CORSER: The other side stand for the confiscation of the home, the farm, and all banking accounts that are held privately. All things that are privately held under the socialistic system must be abolished. They say now they do not believe in the abolition of the wages system as a means of bringing it about.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Of course we do.

Mr. CORSER: The Secretary for Mines was the only member on the Government side who was brave enough in the election campaign to make that statement. I have nothing to say against a man who is brave enough to say from the platform what he stands for.

The PREMIER: You have no time for yourself then.

Mr. CORSER: I have more time for the Labour party to try and bring them around to the right way of thinking than in sitting down meditating about myself.

[4 p.m.] We know that the president of the Emu Park Labour Convention, Mr. W. Demaine, was responsible for this idea—

> "The abolition of the wages system and the substitution of common ownership and control of industry must be kept more before the people than it had been."

If it were not for the driving force behind our friends opposite, then there would be a possibility of something much more moderate during this present session; but what I complain about is that, whilst they have their own objective, they are introducing Bills which, to us, look very simple and very good. But there is always something behind them of which we have to be very wary. During the election campaign it was stated that we, as a Country party, had no right to represent country interests, but it was pointed out that all except one member on our side was directly interested in the land and connected therewith. It was true, too, that the Government ran ten candidates whose occupation was that of farmer, and every one of them was defeated, so that, when we come to this House after this election, the country interests in particular are represented by members of the Opposition.

Mr. COLLINS: The leader of the Country party was beaten on the primary vote.

Mr. CORSER: The then leader of the Country party, the hon. member for Dalby, had the biggest majority that he has ever had in an election.

Mr. COLLINS: He only had a minority of votes on the primary count.

Mr. CORSER: I know it was one of those seats you were most disappointed over. We want to know whether in this session the Government are going to adopt the policy set for it at Emu Park, or whether they are going to substitute their own idea of State enterprise. We have a policy of our own which stands for the control of an industry by those engaged therein.

Mr. COLLINS: Of what?

Mr. CORSER: The control of the marketing of the products by the primary producer.

Mr. KIRWAN: You had better be careful. Mr. Bebbington got beaten on that in Rosewood.

Mr. CORSER: We believe in the control of the products by those interested therein, in the interests of those who are working in the industry as against State control, to the detriment of the people who are engaged in it.

Mr. HARTLEY: That is socialisation of industry.

Mr. CORSER: Under our co-operative system the interests of those engaged in the industry will be guarded by themselves. They become part owners—co-operative owners—as against State control of those engaged in the industry.

Mr. HARTLEY: You are only preaching socialisation of industry; you ought to be over here.

Mr. CORSER: You believe in control by the State.

Mr. HARTLEY: We believe in socialisation of industry, and that is what you are preaching.

Mr. CORSER: We also believe in preaching in season and out of season against the big corporation and the combine.

Mr. KIRWAN: Oh, what nonsense!

Mr. CORSER: The Labour party have stated that the American Meat Export Company's works should not have been allowed into this country, and they took the then Government to task for affording the company facilities to become established. But what are the Government doing in regard to the cotton industry? They have brought from the other side of the world a big cotton corporation, and have given them, not what the last Government gave the American Meat Export Company—which was a piece of land for which they paid—but have given them the control of the whole cotton industry of Queensland.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: We appointed them as selling agents.

Mr. CORSER: Who owns the cotton?

Mr. HARTLEY: The Government own the cotton until it is sold.

The PREMIER: The Government own the cotton.

Mr. CORSER: The British Cotton Growing Association takes the responsibility of that cotton from the time it is picked.

Mr. HARTLEY: As selling agents, the same as you people do.

The PREMIER: There are two cotton associations—two quite different concerns—the British Cotton Growing Association and the Australian Cotton Growing Association.

Mr. CORSER: In the State Government Insurance Office's journal we see that there is a boast there that an insurance scheme has been adopted for the insurance of cotton from the time it is picked until it is finally disposed of, or put in operation by the Australian Cotton Growing Association (Queensland), Limited, and that arrangements have been made with the State Insurance Office under which the cotton-grower will be protected in respect of all cotton that is stored on his premises against fire, flood, and certain country damage, and that the cost will be covered until the cotton is safely landed in the United Kingdom. That insurance has been taken out by the Australian Cotton Growing Association.

The PREMIER: On behalf of the Government. Do you still assert that it is not the property of the Government?

Mr. CORSER: If it is the property of the Government, why does the association insure it?

The PREMIER: The hon. member for Burnett does not know what he is talking about. They are acting as agents for the Government.

Mr. CORSER: They are acting as agents for the Government? We will see what power they have been given. They have sent here an adviser, who is the head of the experts in Australia—Colonel Evans.

The PREMIER: Who sent him?

Mr. CORSER: He was sent from the British Association.

The PREMIER: He was brought here by the British Government through the British Empire Cotton Growing Association—not the Australian Association.

Mr. CORSER: The British Cotton Growing Association sent that man here.

The PREMIER: No—the British Government through the Empire Cotton Growing Association.

Mr. CORSER: So that the British cotton interests are represented by that gentleman?

The PREMIER: No.

Mr. HARTLEY: You are floundering, and you don't want to know.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. CORSER: I will read an extract which appeared in the metropolitan Press of 10th May last:—

> "Colonel Evans, the cotton expert from England, who was loaned by the Empire Cotton Growers' Association to Queensland to advise cotton-growers of this State in matters pertaining to cotton culture, returned from Sydney by the mail train last night.
>
> "Colonel Evans attended the conference of the Ministers for Agriculture of each State, on behalf of the Queensland Government, to give advice to the Ministers, where necessary, on behalf of the Queensland cotton industry.
>
> "The subject discussed at the conference which was of most interest to Colonel Evans was the forming of quarantine regulations to prevent the introduction into Australia of pests to cotton. On the recommendation of Colonel Evans, it was decided to submit to the Government of each of the States that the State Governments should act in unison to keep the cotton industry in Australia free of destructive pests.
>
> "The Government of New South Wales intends to apply to the Queensland Government for the loan of Mr. Evans' services in the interests of the cotton-growers of Northern New South Wales. Also, subject to the approval of the Government of this State, the Federal Government intend, in the course of the next three months, to despatch Mr. Evans to the Northern Territory, where cotton culture has recently been commenced."

They propose to deal with cotton interests for the coming year.

Mr. HARTLEY: On behalf of the Secretary for Agriculture.

Mr. CORSER: Those are just the words I wanted you to say. That man, who was paid and sent here by the British cotton interests, represents in Melbourne our Secretary for Agriculture in deciding whether we shall go in for ratoon cotton or not. When that is so, what chance has the farmer got? Not only did the Government take the British cotton-growing organisation into their bosom, but they prevented a fair debate and a fair consideration being given to this point, when this gentleman, who is paid by the British interests to advise the Government, went to Melbourne as the nominee for the Secretary for Agriculture to decide on a common plan of operations throughout the whole of the States.

The PREMIER: Do you assume that the British Cotton Growing Association is a private or a semi-private association?

Mr. CORSER: I am assuming that the Government's leading expert is paid by British cotton interests, and that those interests are dictating the policy to the Queensland Government.

The PREMIER: That is absurd. You are wrong.

Mr. CORSER: This big British cotton interest was one of those corporations which the Queensland Labour Government condemned, and said that it was all State action.

The PREMIER: The funds come from the State.

Mr. CORSER: Who paid the guarantee on the first crop of cotton?

The PREMIER: £10,000 came from the British Cotton Growing Association.

Mr. CORSER: They are the same concern.

The PREMIER: No; they are different concerns.

Mr. CORSER: They are the same concern, and the same millions are involved. I

am not going to say one word against the British Cotton Growing Association, or against their personal desires and interests as a business concern and as business people; but I do say that the Government should not take into their bosom the interests of the British manufacturer and not give the same hearing to the local grower. I am not going to condemn the Premier for the action he has taken so far in our cotton business. The Association advised the Premier not to allow ratoon-grown cotton. They put up such a case that it was difficult for any man to decide on the advantages of ratoon cotton in the interests of the future of the industry, and, so far as the Premier's action went, he certainly had a very difficult task, and I do not know that he could have done anything else up to the present. But he should have tried to defend the interests of the State and the future cotton-growing of the State against something which was condemned by these big interests which have had no experience of Australian ratoon-grown cotton. They have used it, and did not know the difference. The word "ratoon" made it look to them as if the idea was some huge dangerous bogy. A number of people think that, if ratoon cotton is grown, the boll weevil is going to get into it. Where that weevil is going to come from I do not know, but that is the big argument that is put up. I say to the Premier that I trust that not only will he give ear to the sound advice of Colonel Evans and all the experts connected with British cotton interests, but that he will consider also the point of view of the grower. I trust that at the conference that is to be held the Premier will give the most serious consideration to the point that cotton has not been grown here to any great extent; but that all that has been grown has been allowed to ratoon, and nothing has been said against it.

Mr. HARTLEY: That is not true.

Mr. CORSER: I am speaking of the past; all our old growers had to grow ratoon cotton.

Mr. HARTLEY: They made a failure of it.

Mr. CORSER: They did not. I think that, if the same attention is given to the land, and ratoon cotton is adopted, we shall have just as clean cotton and a better return, as the season will be longer.

I notice that an amount of interest is being given by the Government to the Upper Burnett land settlement scheme, and I sincerely hope that the areas that are to be opened there will be opened in such areas as will permit of not only a living, because it is not only the Government's interest and duty to make available land for selection, but will make the conditions such as to enable the settler to prosper thereon. When we look at that tremendous area, it behoves every man in the State to do his best to make settlement there a success. I feel sure that every member of the Opposition will do everything in his power to make it a success, even if it is not altogether carried out to his own liking. I would again impress on the Premier, and the Secretary for Public Lands in particular, the necessity of not being guided by those who will endeavour to lead them to make the areas too small. An amount of land has been resumed, and £173,000 was all the compensation paid for land in the Upper Burnett, comprising, with the area held by the Crown, an area of 3,000,000 acres. An amount of that land, known as the Upper Burnett Agricultural Scheme, which was confiscated from the past owners, will be 25 or 30 miles away from the railway when it is built, and it is hardly right to say that all the land under the scheme will be agricultural land.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Do you know that a motor lorry service will be initiated and run in connection with the railway?

Mr. CORSER: I know that some of the land will be very hard to get at even with motor lorries, and nothing can be grown there to encourage the advent of motor lorries. I am not disparaging the scheme, but it is my duty to say these things now when there is an opportunity of rectifying them. We know that during the last seven years, while the present Government have been in office, land settlement has decreased by 5,400,000 acres. During the last seven years under the administration of the present Government the area of land selected has amounted to 4,800,000 acres as against an area of 10,000,000 acres selected in the previous seven years under a Liberal Administration. Although the Government have got so far behind in the opening of land, it is to be sincerely hoped that they will not open any land until such land has had the full consideration of the Crown and the department, so that no mistakes will be made. There is one great factor in the successful settlement of the Upper Burnett, and that is water for the individual settlers. I have always held, and have moved in that direction in this House, that, in the opening up of all Crown lands, water should be found for the individuals on each block. I am not altogether enamoured of the communal water system. I see it is suggested in His Excellency's Speech; but the communal water system has been tried in the past in my district and has not proved a success. There is always a difficulty as to the ownership, care, and responsibility, and individual ownership certainly stands out on its own in regard to settlement in the past. That information is available in the Public Estate Improvement Branch of the Lands Department.

Mr. COLLINS: We will win the next war by private enterprise, according to you.

Mr. CORSER: The hon. member says there are going to be no further wars.

One great interest which is concerning the minds of the people of Queensland at the present time is our grazing industry. The grazier is having, and has had, a bad time. A good deal of the responsibility for that rests on himself. The troubles of the grazier to-day should be a means of galvanising cattlemen into some action on behalf of themselves. The interest that the Government might show might be the interest that was shown in the time of war when the cattle industry of Queensland first received its setback. When our meat was handled by the Australian and British Governments, no individual care was taken of the handling or disposing of our meat, and our troubles soon started. Hon. members on the other side have asked, "Why do not the cattle interests do something?" I might ask the Premier, "Why do not they do something?" They claimed, when they introduced the Primary Producers Organisation Bill, that they were going to wipe away all the troubles of the man on the land; they were going to provide an organised system

so that he could find a market for his products, and they were going to attend to the wants of all sections of country interests by organisation. That Act provides for the inclusion of the graziers, and yet not one step forward has been taken by the Government in the interests of the meat industry. Why? Because they are interested here in the retail business, and it would not do for them to say one word about lifting the price of meat, because of the interests concerned. If we were to dump 19 per cent. of our meat over and above our exports, then it would be far better for us all.

The Government are faced with a loan. Just previous to the last election the Premier visited the Trades Hall. He was very proud of the last loan operations, and he said to the people at the Trades Hall—

> "I may add that in the next few days it is confidently expected that an insurance company which has already purchased £275,000 worth of stock will take up the remainder of £225,000; that the brokers originally applied for £500,000 to be allotted. (Cheers.) They were very pleased to find that this insurance company——"

These supposed cormorants—these people who are condemned here—they were glad to put their hands together at the Trades Hall at election time and take £500,000 from one of these cormorants to help them to carry on the business of the State—and now they are going further to regulate the operations of insurance companies, and they state in this House that they should all be abolished and the whole thing given to State enterprise. Yet in the very first loan floated in Australia afterwards, when they wanted £1,000,000, they got £500,000 from one insurance company, and got it from Victoria—because they were offering a bigger interest than were the Federal Government for their loan floated at the same time. These cormorants, who are good enough to provide the Government with money to put men on the railways at election time, are only fit to put the boot into as undesirable citizens when the House is sitting; but our Trades Hall friends and Government members put their hands and feet together to give them a "Hear, hear" just before the election. (Laughter.)

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

The PREMIER (Hon. E. G. Theodore, *Chillagoe*): I would like to answer one or two of the criticisms that have emanated from the Opposition during the course of this debate. Before referring to the speech made by the leader of the Opposition, I should like to correct the apparent misapprehension that exists in the mind of the hon. member who has just resumed his seat, in regard to the standing and appointment of Colonel Evans. The hon. member endeavoured to show that, owing to the fact that Colonel Evans was appointed apparently from some private institution, and that institution was acting for the Government in the handling of cotton here, the Government were handing the control of the cotton industry over to private enterprise. The hon. member is badly misinformed in regard to the question. The British-Australian Cotton Growing Association is the association concerned. It is well known now in Queensland that Mr. Crawford Vaughan is the principal official of that organisation. The association is a private institution, and has done much in bringing capital to Queensland for the purpose of developing the cotton industry. It is true it has been encouraged by the Government. Surely the Government are not open to criticism because we have encouraged that association? No one would desire, least of all the Government, that such a private concern should get unfettered control of the cotton industry; but in this matter the association is merely acting as agent for the Queensland Government. The Queensland Government do not sell the cotton to the association, but they make the Cotton Association an allowance for the ginning, handling, and transhipment of the cotton to England—a certain definite allowance set out in the agreement which, later on in the session, will be more fully explained by the Secretary for Agriculture, who acted for the Government in making the agreement. Colonel Evans is not officially connected with that association. The Government, for the purpose of endeavouring to encourage and assist the cotton industry, sought the advice of the Empire Cotton Growing Association, which is a semi-Government body in England, established by the British Government for the purpose of promoting cotton growing in the Empire—we sought their advice for the selection of the best cotton culture expert that we could get. After some months of delay and search the Corporation recommended the appointment of Colonel Evans, and they generously undertook to pay his salary during the first two years. We, of course, agreed to the terms. Colonel Evans is here under the direct control of the Queensland Government, but his salary is paid by the Empire Cotton Growing Corporation. That association has no connection with the British Australian Cotton Growing Association, or any connection with the British Cotton Association, which is an association of manufacturers in Lancashire. Because of a similarity in the designation of these three associations there is likely to be some confusion, and, apparently, the hon. member for Burnett has badly mixed up his information in regard to the matter.

Some hon. members on the other side of the House who have addressed themselves to this debate have been endeavouring to explain the Government victory at the elections, and have tried to give reasons for their own defeat. The hon. member for Nundah, in the admirable and moderate speech which he made last night, referred to this subject. He apparently ascribed the success of Labour to the redistribution which took place a couple of years ago, and which he apparently thinks was a most unfair scheme. I want to assure the House that there was no gerrymandering in regard to the redistribution—there was no political influence exerted. (Opposition laughter.) There was no political influence used in an unfair or improper manner so far as I know, or so far as has ever been exposed here or elsewhere in regard to the work of the Redistribution Commission. Members, the boundaries of whose electorates were being affected, did wait upon the Commission and make known their own views. That applies to members on the other side of the House as well as to members on this side. Indeed, the chairman of the Commission has informed me since this criticism arose, that, out of twenty-nine members of the Opposition party in Parliament last year who gave evidence—or if not evidence, at any rate who saw the

[5.30 p.m.]

members of the Commission in regard to the boundaries—twenty-six of them expressed satisfaction with the result of the work of the Commission; so, in the face of that, it seems to me to be rather late in the day for hon. members to come along and talk about gerrymandering. It seems to me as if hon. members are floundering around looking for an excuse for their defeat when they refer to alleged gerrymandering. I want further to remind hon. members that the redistribution took place under an Act of Parliament passed by a Liberal Administration—by the Kidston Administration—not by the present Government. The provision was on the statute-book.

Mr. VOWLES: It was not carried out in the spirit of the Act.

The PREMIER: It was. There was no amendment of the Act prior to the redistribution. The Commission was appointed, and they exercised the powers and functions prescribed by the Act.

Mr. VOWLES: They ignored the claims of the country in favour of the industrial sections.

The PREMIER: The extraordinary thing is that, while one section of the Opposition party complained about what they call the lop-sided nature of the representation under that scheme—the giving of more representation to the country by the quota principle—the country members of the Opposition were growling because they were losing seats under the redistribution. It was impossible to satisfy both parties, and, indeed, this party had nothing to do with the principles adopted, as they are embodied in the original Act, which requires the commissioners so to redistribute the seats as to strike a quota in the first instance, and then allow for city seats 20 per cent. above that quota, and for country seats 20 per cent. below the quota. That was the principle proceeded on, and it must have been considered a good principle to be supported by Nationalist and Country party members of that day who sat behind Mr. Kidston. I am not sure whether the hon. member for Dalby was in the House at that time.

Mr. VOWLES: Why should my electorate have more votes than the city of Townsville?

The PREMIER: The Act which the Kidston Government passed does not ensure stable constituencies. The moving population is bound, in the course of a few months or a year or two, to upset the balance. The quota has to be adopted at the time the redistribution is made. If there are movements of population immediately following the redistribution, it is bound to alter the proportion of representation. You cannot have a monthly redistribution or even a yearly redistribution; but to suggest that there are great evils under the system, and that they were engineered by the Labour party for the purpose of political advantage, is a statement which is not borne out by the facts of the case.

Mr. VOWLES: The hon. member for Rosewood said it was so.

Mr. W. COOPER: The hon. member for Rosewood said nothing of the kind.

The PREMIER: Hon. members are often reported to have said things that they have never said. The hon. member for Dalby knows that; he has had bitter experience of it. No hon. member on this side can be accused of using any political influence in connection with the alteration of the boundaries of his electorate. Personally—and my own electorate has been quoted on a number of occasions—I never once saw the Commissioners and never went near them. An alteration was made, and a very great change made, in the boundaries and area of the Chillagoe electorate. It seems to me that it is rather late to come along at this stage, over two years after the redistribution, and pretend that there has been gerrymandering. If the real reasons for the defeat of the Nationalist party and the Country party are required, one need only to refer to what happened during the election—to the kind of appeal that the Nationalists and Country party were making—fully to understand it. The people themselves would have to be rather low down in the mental scale to have accepted their policy and statements by returning those parties to power. Look at the advertisements published in the metropolitan Press of hon. members opposite! One glaring advertisement appeared in the "Courier" two days before the election, which read—

> "Workers awake! Throw off your chains"—

(Government laughter.) This was published especially in the Merthyr electorate, to secure the return of Mr. Peter Macgregor. It also said—

> "Face the fact that those who claimed to be your champions have so reduced Queensland's credit that to-day men of thrift and enterprise refuse to start new industries until you secure a new Government."

There was nothing further from the truth than that. Then, another great advertisement appeared in all the metropolitan papers about the same time—

> "Save your State in her hour of need!"

Piteous appeals based on the supposed ignorance of the people! But such advertisements did not get them anywhere. To cap all from the point of downright misrepresentation, commend me to the appeal to the electors published over the names of the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Dalby. (Opposition laughter.) The hon. members laugh. I cannot understand it. This is one of the statements which appeared—

> "We are of one mind"—

(Government laughter)—

> "in warning the electors that unless their verdict on polling-day is decisive and unmistakable, this State will be committed to another long step in the direction of Russian Sovietism."

I ask the leader of the Opposition whether he really believed in his heart of hearts the statement that we were committed to Russian Sovietism.

Mr. TAYLOR: The policy you were committed to. If you carry out the Emu Park Convention resolutions, it is true.

The PREMIER: Then, again—

> "With its pitiless war on human liberty, religious freedom and private ownership of all property, farms, and business undertakings."

I ask the hon. member as a reasonable man, and one who will allow others to have opinions differing from his own, whether that is a fair kind of appeal to make, and whether it represents the facts of the case? I ask him whether he believes that the party sitting behind me is committed to an attack upon human liberty, religious freedom, and the other things stated? The facts of the case are that that appeal was probably not written by the leader of the Opposition, but at any rate he takes the responsibility of issuing it, and it seems to me that the extravagance of such statements to some extent accounts for the debâcle.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Just the same as some of the "Daily Standard" statements.

The PREMIER: I want first to finish the argument about the causes of the defeat, which hon. members opposite cannot understand. A writer in the "Daily Mail" the other day sets it out very succinctly, and I will quote one or two extracts. It is headed—

"THE DEBACLE.
"WHY LABOUR WON."

The writer signs his name as "Isaso"; I do not know who he is. The "Daily Mail" takes the responsibility of the publication, and for the sake of the argument set forth here I will quote it—

> "(1) Why were we so badly beaten in the elections? and (2) Who is to blame? My answers are: (1) We got what all level-headed men expected; and (2) We ourselves, and nobody else. . . .
>
> "We fought on absolutely wrong lines. We fought as we fought twice before, and from first to last the cry and our echo was anent 'the sins of the other fellow.' . . .
>
> "All sorts of abuse and vilification was indulged in. We called the Ministerialists by the offensive name of socialist, communists, Bolsheviks, and banditti.
>
> "Smarting under this unfairness the moderate and decent unionist was thrown into the arms of the extremists. We called them disloyal, knowing it to be 90 per cent. false, and knowing that many of the Ministerialists had sent their sons—aye, and lost some of them—to fight for the Empire. . . .
>
> "We went before the electors everywhere with our hands full of muck and tongues full of venom—utterly biased, trying to convince the worker that the man that gave him good wages, cheap meat, cheap insurance, unemployment security, and many more benefits which were accentuated in his own newspaper was utterly immoral and unworthy to represent him in Parliament."

The opinions of that writer are the opinions that were held by a great many electors in Queensland, and, as a matter of fact, it has been pointed out time and again by hon. members on this side of the House in reply to the pathetic attacks of the Opposition during the last Parliament, particularly that this party stood for a sound and rational policy. The picture that they drew of the Government policy was a wholly false picture. It was quite wrong on their part; it was unfair and unscrupulous for the Opposition parties to draw a picture of a ravening Bolshevik, of a bloodthirsty monster, and to say that that was a picture of a Labour man. Yet that is what has been going on in Queensland for the last three years, though it is also perfectly obvious that the people of Queensland did not believe the slander.

Mr. BRAND: That is what you did in connection with Mr. Bebbington.

The PREMIER: During the election, I quoted from a letter which was printed and circulated in the Rosewood electorate, in which Mr. Bebbington promised common ownership of property, and I said that if he believed in common ownership he was guilty of all those things which he charged against us—that, if we were Bolsheviks for believing in common ownership, he himself must also be a Bolshevik for holding the same belief.

The leader of the Opposition quoted certain figures relating to the income tax on companies. I do not know how he arrived at the figures, but they are certainly erroneous. Certainly they are quite wrong as to the rates which companies have to pay in Queensland. He says that the tax payable by a company on its profits in Victoria works out at £133 6s. 8d. per £1,000 of profit, and in Queensland at £313 6s. 8d. So far as I can discover, those figures are wrong in each case, and they are certainly wrong so far as Queensland is concerned. In Queensland the rate of income tax on profits of companies commences at 1s. 3d. in the £ if the profits do not exceed 6 per cent. on the subscribed capital, and rises, in proportion to the rate of profit, to 3s. in the £ when the profits exceed 19 per cent., plus super tax in all cases. If a company is earning only 6 per cent. in Queensland, the amount of tax will be £75 per £1,000 of profits, and not £313. I cannot understand how the hon. member made a mistake of that kind. Figures similar to these were used during the election, and I made an explanation in one of my manifestoes correcting the misstatement—for it was an obvious misstatement—but the hon. member repeated it the other night. No company, no matter how great its profits in the aggregate, nor how great the rate of profits, would have to pay as much as he suggests. If the rate of profit was 10 per cent., the company would have to pay £87 10s. out of each £1,000, and I appeal to hon. members to say whether that is a burdensome tax. The facts are, and I think they are pretty well recognised, that the system of taxation of companies in Queensland is fairer than any which obtains in any of the other States, and, if you take into consideration the basis of the taxation, it is less burdensome. In New South Wales there is a flat rate of 2s. 6d. in the £, no matter how small the rate of profit may be. A company may be struggling and making a profit of only 2 per cent. or 3 per cent. on its capital, but it pays 2s. 6d. in the £. On the other hand, a company may make a profit of 20 per cent.; it, too, pays only 2s. 6d. In Victoria I think the flat rate is 1s. In Queensland the tax is calculated in accordance with the rate of profit on the subscribed capital of the company, which I think is fair; and I would like hon. members to take notice of that fact because it seems to me that Queensland must be damaged when erroneous statements of this character are circulated.

Mr. KERR: How do you arrive at the subscribed capital?

The PREMIER: It is fully set out in the Income Tax Act. It is the capital actually subscribed and used in the business, and it

may also include reserves and undivided profits used in the business.

Mr. KERR: You deduct them to make the ratio of profit greater.

The PREMIER: No. The undivided profits are allowed as capital for the purpose of arriving at the rate of profit. That is absolutely fair, and I challenge anyone to say that companies which are making no more than a fair rate are placed at a disadvantage as compared with those in other States.

Something has been said by several hon. members, including the hon. member for Nundah, about immigration. He expressed regret at the absence from the Governor's Speech of any reference to it. Of course, the Speech cannot cover everything which forms part of the activities of, or is a subject of consideration by, the Government in the course of the year. It is not generally taken to be a review of the history of the State during the period it embraces.

Mr. BRAND: Are you sympathetic towards immigration?

The PREMIER: Entirely sympathetic. If the hon. member will be patient, I will tell him exactly what the policy of the Government is in regard to immigration. If it has not been mentioned in the Speech at the opening of Parliament, it has nevertheless been made perfectly clear to the public from time to time, and it was specifically referred to by me in the policy speech that I delivered at Cairns before the election. There is no mystery about the Government policy in regard to it. We have not been afraid to state our views, nor have we feared to stand up in any way to this question. We have proceeded on the lines that it is necessary to have caution in respect to immigration to Queensland. In formulating an immigration policy, or committing ourselves to the introduction into this country of newcomers from overseas, we are bound to profit, if we can, by the lessons of past experience. We would indeed be a very short-sighted Government if we ignored the mistakes that have been made by Queensland in the past, or that are being made in other States now, for I think that any mistake to which a Government might commit a State is bound to react upon it very adversely later on. Before stating more clearly what the Government intend to do, let me call attention to the inconsistency of the Opposition. On the one hand they have been going up and down the State—not merely recently, not only during the last week or two, but for years past—trying to make out that there is more unemployment in Queensland than in any other State in the Commonwealth. They have never appeared to be tired of asserting that in Queensland thousands and thousands of workers are unemployed, and in their election literature they had it published that there were at that time 32,500 unemployed persons in the State. That statement was wholly false, but supposing that it were true, how could they defend any policy of bringing newcomers to Queensland?

Mr. VOWLES: Why not, if they are going to create work and development? (Government laughter.)

The PREMIER: That seems to me to be the answer of a shiftless politician. The Opposition knew that there were thousands of unemployed here, but they wanted to bring thousands more! Where is the consistency of the two statements? The Premiers of the Southern States, Sir George Fuller and Mr. Lawson, have been talking very grandiloquently about immigration. Sir George Fuller spoke about bringing Britain's unemployed millions to Australia. It is all right to talk that way if it is only a question of making a pleasant speech with no intention of acting up to it. But let us look at the figures hon. members quoted of the alleged unemployed workers of Queensland. They spoke of 32,500 during the election, and it was pointed out to them that there were at that time under 2,000 unemployed in this State. I think that up to the 30th June last the statistics show that not more than 1,500 persons were looking for work and registered at the bureaux.

Mr. BRAND: They are the registered unemployed.

The PREMIER: I said those registered at the different bureaux throughout the country. If men are out of work, and are looking for work, they will register for employment.

Mr KERR: And go week after week for months.

The PREMIER: If a man is out of work in any centre, whether it be in Brisbane, Rockhampton, or Townsville, he will register his name if he wants work. The Government and private employers, through the labour bureaux, have employed a good many thousand men during the last twelve months. That is the reason why the unemployed register their names. I do not know what was the origin of the figure of 32,500 which was given as the number of unemployed at a certain date. I know that there were not 32,500. There were not 2,000 unemployed men looking for work at that time. The only explanation I can give for that figure—unless it was a deliberate concoction, which I would be very sorry to think it was—is that the person responsible calculated amongst the unemployed, or the men that were idle, not only those searching for employment, but the inmates of the hospitals and the asylums; and men out of work through being on the retired list. They could not have found 30,000 unemployed and in want of work in Queensland at any time for a great many years past. At the time those figures were used there were only 1,500 bonâ fide workers searching for work in Queensland. An attempt was made to show that Queensland had more unemployed than any other State in the Commonwealth. What is the position in New South Wales—not only then, but to-day? I have here an extract from the Sydney "Daily Mail," dated 7th July, which gives a flashlight photograph of scores of unemployed lying out in the open and sleeping in the Domain in Sydney. It makes this reference—

> "In the Sydney Domain lie sleeping a number of poor starved devils who walk the streets by day vainly seeking for work. Some of these are immigrants brought here as a result of our costly propaganda to secure the much needed increase of population we hear more than enough about . . . No Government has ever shown such callous indifference to the unemployment question as the Fuller Government . . . . Roughly, 20,000 men are out of work in this State, whilst Sir George Fuller loiters round the world proudly boasting of his immigration policy."

The two questions are inseparably con-

nected. It would be nothing less than criminal for a Government to bring thousands of workers into a State while there were thousands of unemployed there. I am not asserting that at the present time there are thousands of unemployed here. I think we are rapidly getting back to normal conditions. If it were not for the difficulty occasioned by seasonal operations, and the necessity for workers going from one calling to another, we would probably have no unemployed worth speaking about in Queensland to-day. We know that thousands of workers have come from the other States since the beginning of the year. Probably four times as many have come from the other States since the beginning of the year as there are unemployed in Queensland to-day. That indicates that we are rapidly getting back to normal conditions. As the Government land settlement schemes are being advanced with a good deal of celerity, it is more than likely we may have to make provision to bring newcomers to Queensland, because an increased population must be the objective of any Government in Queensland. The reason there could not be greater absorption of newcomers during the last four or five years was because of the cessation of land settlement owing to the war, and then followed the necessity for getting returned soldiers on the land and using what land was available for that purpose. There was the financial difficulty also to be considered. All those factors had some bearing upon the delay in opening land for settlement. Everyone surely knows what the Government are doing in regard to opening land for settlement. The Burnett land scheme involves about 3,000,000 acres, and the first portion of that area will be available for settlement in October, when 1,500 individual blocks will be opened for settlement. The Dawson Valley scheme is proceeding at a very rapid rate, and in a year or so a very large number of settlers will be placed on that area. The Tully River district, where it is proposed to erect a new sugar mill, will offer opportunities to 200 or 300 individual settlers. The Palmerston area will probably be able to accommodate 800 settlers. The resumption of land in the sheep areas, in the Roma wheat areas, and in the Goondiwindi district will all help to solve this question. It is quite on the cards that in the course of a year from now we may not have a sufficient number of applicants for land to settle on the land that we shall have available, and then we can look abroad for more. I think it would be a foolish and unwise policy to bring here thousands of new settlers before those preliminary preparations are made.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I am afraid that the hon. gentleman has not courage enough.

Mr. KIRWAN: We have common sense.

The PREMIER: That shows the essential difference between the policy we have adopted in Queensland and what is pursued in New South Wales and Victoria. All they have done there—and they take great credit for their immigration schemes—is to sign an agreement with the Commonwealth Government, whereby the Commonwealth Government undertakes to raise in the case of New South Wales £30,000,000 sterling and lend it to the State, and the State is to receive a certain number of immigrants up to 6,000 a year until 30,000 are absorbed. They have done nothing to prepare for the absorption of those immigrants into the industries of the country. All they have done is to enter into an agreement to borrow the money. We could have done the same here. Would that have got us anywhere? We would have been holding out false hopes to the applicants in England, who would have thought that they could come here and settle down on productive farms immediately on arrival. That is the wrong way to go about it. We must open up the lands that we have got as rapidly as we can, and in as large areas as we can; and we must make provision for the proper development of those lands by railways, roads, and water supply; and then we must give the first opportunity for settlement on that land to our own Australian natives—to those who are in Queensland, and to those who are in Australia—not because we want to discriminate between our own Australian natives and the people overseas, but because they are more likely to make useful citizens and successful agriculturists. If hon. members will examine the facts relating to the class of immigrants who are coming to this country, they will find that they are not agriculturists or men with agricultural experience. A very small percentage of them have ever worked on a farm before. That is to be expected. England has a great shortage of agricultural workers, and any immigrants to Australia are recruited from large cities, and have had city experience and not rural or agricultural experience. It is suggested that we should bring them out in thousands. That would be a short-sighted and an unwise policy to pursue. We do not intend to do that. When the time arrives to bring newcomers to Queensland we shall endeavour to have created in Queensland an inducement to those settlers, so that they can be rapidly absorbed in industry under the established industrial conditions that are recognised in this country at the present time. As soon as our land settlement schemes are properly developed, we can absorb thousands of newcomers a year, not necessarily agriculturists, but men who will take the place of those who go on the land in Queensland, and in that way we will get far better results than under any policy adopted in the other States at the present time.

Not much has been said on the financial question during the debate, but reference has been made to the large railway deficit. This is always included in anti-Labour speeches here and abroad where Queensland has been criticised. The critics of the Labour party assume that since Labour has been in office there has been an accumulated deficit of £8,000,000 on our railways. There is nothing of the sort. There have been deficits. There was a deficit of £1,750,000 one year, and £1,500,000 another year; but in each year in which there is a deficit it is liquidated. It is charged to consolidated revenue. The deficits which exist at the present time—and which are the experience to-day of the railway systems of Queensland and Australia—are the result of a deliberate policy on the part of Governments to endeavour to give as cheap service as possible to the country-dwellers, and to make up the loss on the railways by direct taxation on those who could afford to pay such tax.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: And make more unemployment by so doing.

The PREMIER: I ask the hon. member and those who have been criticising the policy of the Government in regard to railways to say whether we should increase fares or freights.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: You have already done that.

The PREMIER: We have done it on two occasions, and the total increase in freights has been 18 per cent., as against an increase in New South Wales in the same [5 p.m.] period of 66 per cent. In every other State in Australia the railway increases amounted to at least twice as much as the increase in Queensland. If the hon. member for Warwick says it is wrong to have a deficit of £1,500,000 in regard to railways, he, or the members on his side of the House, should suggest what we should do. Do they suggest that we ought to increase freights or fares in order to reduce or wipe out that deficit? If they think the policy the Government are pursuing is wrong, foolish, and disastrous, let them say what should be done. There are only two alternatives—either increase the freights or cut down wages and extend the hours.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: This party would have increased production and made the railways pay.

The PREMIER: It has been shown, so far as production is concerned, that there has been a greater increase in the ratio of production in Queensland in the last eight years than in any similar preceding period in the history of the State——

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: And a greater increase in the volume and value of primary products.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: The tonnage on the railways is less now than it was eight years ago.

The PREMIER: That may be so, but not in the case of the volume of the products of the industries of Queensland. It only shows the impossibility of getting the same financial result as you got in 1912-13-14, when there has been an absolute natural and inevitable increase in wages, costs, and materials of the railways, while they are only carrying the same tonnage. Does the hon. member suggest that the added cost of working and maintaining the railways should be added to the freights, and that they should be made higher? Every one engaged in any industry knows that wages, cost of materials and stores, and everything else are higher by 200 per cent. than in 1914, and that this is not singular to Queensland.

Mr. EDWARDS: Yes; but the chief reason is that on some lines there are only three trains a week now instead of twelve.

The PREMIER: Does the hon. member suggest that we could reduce the deficit by running twelve trains a week instead of three where three are quite sufficient? That seems to be the typical criticism indulged in in regard to railways. Let me say that the Government have recognised that they ought not to have increased the fares and freights above what is absolutely necessary and inevitable. We have deliberately refrained during the last four or five years in putting on any increase, and, in spite of the heavy deficit, we have actually to-day reduced the charges on farm produce, live stock, dairy products, and so on, in order to give the primary industries the advantage of cheap transportation. It seems to me just about as ridiculous to claim that the railway deficit is the result of bad finance, as it would be to claim that we have not made a surplus on the road system of Queensland. No one would suggest that we should bring up a balance-sheet showing a surplus in regard to the road system, and they are highways just as much as railways. The road system is just as much a means of transportation of goods as the railways, and in both cases they are services which the State would be very foolish to expect to be made paying propositions under the circumstances. I want to emphasise again that the railway deficits each year are made a charge on Consolidated Revenue. A big proportion of income tax which is placed upon those best able to pay, goes towards liquidating that deficit, and thus each year the deficit is worked out.

Something has been said in regard to the loans which are shortly maturing by the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Dalby. One can entirely agree with their expectation, and hope that these loans will be converted at the cheapest possible rate to the State in order that there shall not be any great additional charge in the interest bill of Queensland. I suggest that the best way the Opposition members can assist to achieve that is to refrain from slandering the State—

Mr. MAXWELL: We don't slander the State.

The PREMIER: And from misrepresenting the financial position. It is a bad thing to use loose talk, even in the height of political excitement, and to make the definite assertion that the State is on the verge of insolvency.

Mr. MAXWELL: Who said that?

The PREMIER: That was frequently said.

Mr. MAXWELL: We did not say that.

The PREMIER: If the hon. member for Toowong is going to challenge my statement, I can bring two or three extracts to prove it.

Mr. MAXWELL: Not by me.

The PREMIER: No; but by political critics of the Government of what they described as the chaotic condition of the State —that it was going headlong to bankruptcy and insolvency. There is no truth in that.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: The position of Queensland is sound. Whatever criticism is offered against the Government for this expenditure and that, hon. members ought to refrain from saying anything which might be used abroad and in other States to the effect that Queensland is unsafe financially, because that impression is only false.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: The hon. member for Dalby expressed surprise and disappointment that there should be a reference to the sugar question in the Governor's Speech.

Mr. VOWLES: I did not say that at all.

The PREMIER: He rather chided the Governor for making any reference to the Commonwealth Government. It seems to me that the reference to the Commonwealth Government on that subject was unavoidable, as the delay in settling the sugar question was quite out of all reason, and the whole responsibility of the delay entirely rests on the Commonwealth Government and on no one else. It was a very mild reference, because I endeavoured to recognise the principle and tenets of courtesy due to another

Government in making reference to any official documents or policy. I have not endeavoured to make political capital out of the actions of the Commonwealth Government, but merely mentioned the tardiness of that Government in relation to the question, which was absolutely true. If the hon. members opposite assume that we, as a Government, have nothing to do with sugar they are entirely on the wrong track. It is inevitable that any Government in Queensland to-day would have to take cognisance of the situation. Our intervention was moved by the industry itself, first of all by reason of a conference held in January last, and subsequently by the Australian Sugar Producers' Association and United Cane Growers' Association. At their direct suggestion the Sugar Pool was created, and an arrangement was entered into which will have to form the subject of an arrangement between the Commonwealth and State Governments. Further, the Sugar Pool of Queensland has authorised the Queensland Government to enter into arrangements with the Colonial Sugar Refining Company in regard to refining. It is unavoidable that this matter should have cropped up, as I regard the sugar question as a subject above party contention. It is a very bad thing for the industry if it is not. If it has been a subject of party contention the last three or four years—undue party contention at any rate—the blame for that is not on the shoulders of the Government but elsewhere. We have endeavoured to deal straightforwardly and honestly with the industry, without any intention of making political capital out of it.

Hon. members have also expressed their surprise that in the Governor's Speech there are no extreme measures forecast, and that there is nothing in the nature of communism and red revolution and those other things which they have spent two or three pleasing months conjuring up in their own minds. They are surprised—because they had got themselves to believe through the constant misrepresentation of the case that they were fighting a Bolshevist party—to realise that the party they are fighting—the party that the people of Queensland have returned to office—are a sane and rational Labour party. The people apparently did not believe those extraordinary villainous pictures of Labour that were drawn on behalf of the Opposition.

Mr. KERR: You paid a man to come up from the South and draw similar pictures of the Opposition.

The PREMIER: The Labour party did not speak with two voices. When we were facing the electors I stated in my policy speech the policy of the Government. You will find no red revolution there—no suggestion of disruption, of the violent overturning of the existing order. You will find there expressed the intentions of the Labour party towards social and political reform, and they were clearly set out and advocated by Labour candidates throughout the election. The same sentiment, the same rational policy, is embodied in the Governor's Speech. Why, then, this extraordinary self-delusion on the part of the Opposition with regard to Labour? Why do they not try to face facts, and realise that Labour is a sane party, advocating a straight-out, clear-cut policy, which they have advocated for the past thirty years, and which does not involve the adoption of Russian Sovietism or any other monstrous policy of that type? The Labour policy is a policy which we are not ashamed of. The hon. members' surprise is the outcome of their self-deception. If they had not been so busy painting the Labour party red, they would not have been so extraordinarily dumbfounded when they saw the Governor's Speech.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ELPHINSTONE (*Oxley*): Ever since I have been privileged to be in this House the party opposite, led by the Premier—the gentleman who occupies that position to-day—has never hesitated to attach any stigma or blame to the Opposition for any irrational or questionable utterances and actions which have taken place outside of this House by parties or individuals opposed to Labour. That gentleman never hesitated to make the greatest possible use of such with a view to belittling this party during the last campaign. We heard frequent references made to bribery and the attempts we were alleged to have made to undermine the moral calibre of certain members of the Government to gain political advantage thereby. We have had to stand up to that because it is in the game; but now this gentleman turns round and begins to weep and cry because wild utterances made by supporters of the Government attach to him the responsibility for those statements and utterances which were made by a section of the party which he represents. I say a section, because it is perfectly obvious that the Premier himself is not a socialist. He may say so to tickle the ears of his supporters, but we know that he is too wealthy a man, too well established, and enjoying too much the fruits of individualism to be a socialist. (Opposition laughter.) However, to get the support and assistance of those gentlemen who sit opposite to me now who are red socialists without any doubt, and in order to hold the party together, he exercises an autocracy and domination over them that absolutely cows them into subjection. (Government laughter.) Who was it that directed when the last election was to take place? The Premier, without consulting one of his supporters. This great Czar dictated when the election was to take place. How many of us heard utterances of surprise from the hon. members opposite, who rushed back from the Blue Mountains and other parts of Australia where they were enjoying themselves—surprise to find the fiat had gone forth that the elections were to take place on 12th May? How is it that this gentleman exercises that autocratic, dominating force? It is the fact that he won the elections for them and kept them in their soft billets. (Laughter.) I want to ask the Premier this question. He attributes to us all the blame for the errors, utterances, and actions outside of this House by people who are opposed to Labour. To be consistent, must he not also take the blame for all those utterances and statements which emanate from those Red Socialists outside the House and who support his party?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: We have just heard from him the remarks of a man who is apparently sincere in what he states—that he stands for all the accepted order of things; that he does not believe in revolution, and all those things of a disruptive nature. At the same time, the rank and file of the Labour party, and the leaders of the Labour party in other States who are not enjoying

the sweets of office—which makes a very big difference in the utterances of people—these men have adopted all kinds of diabolical methods, such as "fake ballot-boxes" and other underhand methods—to which this party has never sunk, and, please God, never will—to secure the reins of office and the domination of their party machine. The Premier has to take his share of those responsibilities. He must soon declare himself, and say where he stands in this matter. Declaring himself elsewhere to be a socialist, when he comes here he is nothing of the sort; he is apparently an ordinary individual at the head of a Government that intends to progress and push Queensland ahead by individualism and private enterprise. That is the position.

Personally, I am pleased that the Premier has told us a few home truths as to why the United and Country parties failed at the last election. I admit we failed, and failed lamentably.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: It has been unprecedented in the life of Australian politics for any party that has occupied the Treasury benches for eight years to go again before the country and be returned with an increased majority, as the party opposite has done. I am not going to deceive myself or allow my friends to be deceived as to why it is the parties are in the House as they are at the present moment. The position is this: In the first place, and I say it without any hesitation, no army or body with divided ranks can ever defeat, or hope to defeat, a well-organised and well-disciplined body like we see opposite. The time has come when Queensland should understand this position thoroughly. Hon. members opposite have been returned with a big majority. There is no exhilaration. You do not see them shouting it from the house-tops. The present opening of Parliament was the quietest that I ever attended. The Labour party are flushed with success, not because they feel that it is they who have won, but that it is we who have lost. (Government laughter.) You men who have not the vision of a mouse probably laugh at that. I mean that they have not won on their merits, but have won on account of our demerits. That is the position. The Premier has made some pretty caustic references to our methods, and a number of them are deserved. In an election time mob psychology is a very important matter, and hon. gentlemen opposite are masters in the matter of mob psychology and window-dressing. When this election came we found that the Government windows were dressed with very attractive bargains which appealed to those who were looking for something that was cheap. We saw this window of the Government littered with "Golden Casket" tickets, showing how the people could get rich quickly by such methods. We saw this same window with race tickets displayed showing that racing in its present frequency was going to be retained in Queensland if this Government were returned to power, and therefore all the supporters of institutions such as that naturally came under the Government's banner. We saw also that the important banner of the licensed victuallers' trade was raised in its great strength. This vested interest, with its money and support, got behind this party that stands for humanitarian principles, to help to bring this great Labour party back to power. We also saw £55,000,000 of money floating about that had been supposedly introduced into Queensland by this Labour Government, and which the Premier has never yet been able to substantiate, and was wise enough to switch off so soon as he saw he was in deep water. We saw also this great question of high wages and short hours. This is the sugar-coated pill which the people have swallowed. They have been given a taste of the sugar first, and have been left to find out what are the real tastes of those particular medicines. (Government laughter.) I am being very fair in my criticisms to-day, as I am criticising myself as well as hon. members opposite. Another reason why the parties opposed to the present Government failed was because we had no objective. (Government laughter.)

Mr. CARTER: Yes—the Treasury benches.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: I think I can safely say, speaking for the great mass of the Opposition, that we are not so desirous of occupying the Treasury benches as hon. gentlemen opposite, who, once they leave them, will never be able to earn an income one-half of what they are enjoying to-day. We have no financial incentive to occupy the Government benches. We naturally, as public men, are desirous of taking a responsible part in the conduct of our country's affairs, but as to the financial reward, which is the great incentive of hon. gentlemen opposite, it is of little or no interest to us, because the great bulk of us are doing better without it.

One of the reasons why we failed was because we lacked an objective, and, to give hon. gentlemen opposite credit, they have never hesitated to say what their objective is, and they have made their position quite clear to the electors of Queensland.

Mr. DUNSTAN: We do not keep it in the back window.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: You were too busy criticising the Government to get one up for yourself.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Personally, I have never indulged in public utterances wildly criticising the Government. When the seller of political objectives goes before the people, he must first of all learn the lesson of advocating the quality of his own wares before he criticises the other man's. The Premier to-day has made his position quite clear in that he does not stand for those extreme actions to which so many of his followers are committed. Therefore, a great responsibility devolves upon him to see that he retains that stand, because many people in Queensland have reposed their confidence in him, recognising that he, and not the band behind him, is going to see that these extreme objectives are not going to be put into operation. But I would remind him of the fate that overtook his predecessor in office, the late Hon. T. J. Ryan, who was pushed out of the party by a certain element because he was not prepared to go fast enough.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Cowardly!

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: The Premier was spoken of in one of the daily papers yesterday as the "Red Cross Knight." All I hope is that he will not be pushed out like the late Hon. T. J. Ryan was and then forgotten, and receive no gratitude from the party he led to victory. I suggest to the

Premier that he bear that prominently in mind, because those of us who can read the signs understand that the time is not very far distant when the hon. gentleman will be dismissed from Queensland; and, when his power has been removed and the control which he exercises in his party has been relinquished, we shall then see what the party opposite really stands for, which is a matter of doubt and uncertainty to us to-day. In one breath they say they are socialists and communists, and in the other breath they say they stand for law and order. The extraordinary position is this—although the party opposite say they are bitterly opposed to the system of capitalism, it is remarkable how they love the capitalist's money. That is a most extraordinary thing. It was mainly due to the cunningly devised plans adopted to utilise the capitalist's money in the last election, or just prior to it, that they were successful, to a certain extent, in retaining the reins of office. It was by the expenditure of loan moneys, which are the savings of capitalists, that they were able at an opportune time to absorb the unemployed who were wandering round Queensland and to collect them in the electorates of Queensland where their voting strength could be best felt. That was the position, and it is remarkable how these men, who are bitterly opposed to the system of capitalism—who are committed to its extermination—never fail to make the greatest use of it even to the extent of using it to retain the seats they occupy to-day. It seems to me remarkable that they should preach about the destruction of capitalism and the abolition of wages. One hon. member opposite, at any rate, has unhesitatingly stated that he believes in the elimination of the wage system—and yet by the expenditure of loan moneys—moneys belonging to the capitalist—and promising high rates of wages they retain their position. The Secretary for Mines stood up and said that he believes in the elimination of the wage system, and that socialisation means the elimination of the wage system; and at the same time there were leaflets being circulated in his electorate which said that, if Labour was returned, the workers would get high wages and shorter hours, and therefore they should support the Labour Government. Where is the consistency in that? Is is not pardonable under those circumstances that we on this side of the House should be in such confusion as to where the Government stand at the present juncture?

The Premier has made reference to the loan question, and it will be a most important one during the next two years. As we know, there are £13,000,000 falling due [5.30 p.m.] for renewal on 1st July, 1924, which is costing us under 4 per cent., and £12,000,000 falling due on 1st April, 1925, which is costing us 4½ per cent. It will require the combined efforts of both parties in this House to see that the money is renewed on favourable terms to Queensland. When we go, as we have to do, to Great Britain for the renewal of these loans, we must see to it that no attempts are made to make political capital out of the situation, but that we all combine to see that this important time in Queensland's history is going to be passed over in the most economical and satisfactory manner. I presume that we shall have the Premier visiting England early next year; I anticipate that will be the position. I hope to be in England at the same time, and, if I can be of any assistance to him while he is there, I promise him readily that anything I can say to enable the people there to understand Queensland in its true light, and to assist him to renew these loans in a satisfactory manner, will be willingly and quickly forthcoming. The position to-day is that the American market, so far as new loans are concerned, is practically closed, because the value of the pound sterling has increased to such an extent that it is not desirable to go to America and pay the high rates of interest required. The previous favourable time was discovered for us by the late Sir Denison Miller, whose death I sincerely deplore. We have not got him to assist us to raise a loan on profitable lines in America, and, therefore, we cannot look for £550,000 profit on the conversion of these loans, as was the case two years ago. Consequently we have to go to Great Britain. I say advisedly, as I have said before, that I sincerely hope that the Government by their actions in future are going to do nothing further to disturb the good name of Queensland in the markets of Great Britain. The Government may try to secure satisfaction from what they know to be a misstatement—that the delegation helped to create a bad odour in Great Britain—but they know in their own heart that by their legislation and utter lack of appreciation of an honourable understanding or an honourable construction of a contract, they have themselves maligned Queensland, and they have to remove that stigma. The men who have created it are the men who should remove it, if a proper feeling is to be created that Queensland has come to her senses and realises that financial obligations must be respected. It would be a great satisfaction to me, and I am sure to all the members of the Opposition, if we were to wipe out that slur upon Queensland's good name at home, and be able to renew our loans there which are falling due for renewal in such large sums on terms equivalent to, or as good as other States can secure. We shall then appreciate that Queensland's bad name has been eliminated, and that we are all pulling together to push this State ahead in a manner which its potentialities deserve. In spite of any Government, Queensland, given good seasons, must progress. I believe one hon. gentleman yesterday made reference to the fact that during the last eight years greater activity has been introduced into Queensland than ever before. I make bold to say that Queensland—I do not care what Government is in power—with its great possibilities and innumerable resources must progress; but the rate at which we progress will be largely influenced by the method of government. Queensland has been created by individualism—by pioneers who have gone forward looking for a reward in keeping with their efforts—and it is only by that means that Queensland can continue to progress. Remove this socialistic wet blanket which is damping people's ardour, and give them an opportunity to appreciate the fact that they are independent creatures, to be paid according to the effort they put forth, and you will then see Queensland go ahead at a rate which will surprise many of those who have such a pessimistic outlook with regard to it. That is the doctrine I have always stood for, and it is a doctrine which I am satisfied the Premier believes in, and, as soon as he is able to shake himself free from those shackles which

are tying up his better self, we shall see him just as keen an advocate of the system as I am myself.

The question of taxation naturally follows on the matter of the loans. The Premier, in his policy speech in Cairns, made reference to the fact that taxation was becoming a great burden, and that some step would have to be taken to give relief to those people who are being oppressed by it. He proposes to do that, I presume, by the amending measure which is mentioned in the Governor's Speech, which has as its object the increasing of the exemption up to £300 for married men, and also a greater exemption in regard to children. I am very glad that the Premier has stolen this plank out of the United party's platform for the purpose of assisting those who are suffering severely from the burden of taxation to-day.

The PREMIER: That speech was made before the United party's platform was published.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: No. How can the Premier expect to give these exemptions and this relief in taxation when loan moneys are being expended at the present rate and money is costing the price it is? In his most sanguine moments the Premier must appreciate the fact that he is not going to renew £25,000,000 of loan money in London at the same rate of interest which he is paying at the present time. He must be prepared to face approximately another 1 per cent. interest—which is going to mean another £250,000 upon the taxpayer. Most of the loans raised will be for the renewal of existing loans, for the redemption of which we have made little or no provision. How it is possible to take steps in regard to relief of taxation, and at the same time to pay so substantial an amount of money representing interest on the loan indebtedness of the State, I cannot conceive.

There is one thing I am going to suggest to the Premier, and I have the British Government's precedent for doing it at a time when that Government were sorely exercised in regard to their expenditure and in making ends meet; that is, that he adopt the principle which was adopted by the British Government of appointing a Commission of inquiry of business men into methods whereby the Government can save money. I do not suggest that that Commission should have the power to interfere with any political principles involved, because those are naturally in the keeping of the party which has been returned to power, but in the conduct of the country's affairs, the conduct of departments, in the conduct of State enterprises, which are forming so important a part in the Government's activities, I am satisfied that hundreds of thousands of pounds could be saved if a Commission of business men were appointed to study ways and means. For the Premier's guidance, I will just read the terms of the appointment of the Commission in Great Britain by the Lloyd George Government, when they were up against the question of great expenditure. They were set out in these words—

> "To make recommendations to the Chancellor for effecting forthwith all possible reductions in the national expenditure in supply services having regard especially to the present and prospective position of the revenue. In so far as questions of policy are involved in the expenditure under discussion, that will remain for the exclusive consideration of the Cabinet; but it will be open to the Committee to review the expenditure and to indicate the economies which might be effected if particular policies were either adopted, abandoned, or modified."

As a result of the inquiries of that Commission, which was known throughout the world as the Geddes Commission, millions of pounds were saved to the taxpayers of Great Britain, and I contend that if a similar Commission were appointed here of men concerned for the interests of Queensland, they could devise ways and means, even from their very business knowledge and experience, which would assist the Government to keep down expenditure. No one wishes to see the burden of taxation increasing, because all of us in our sane moments know that the community suffers by high taxation. It is no good hon. members opposite endeavouring to satisfy themselves that the taxation falls on the shoulders of those who they say can bear it. We must appreciate the fact that taxation affects the whole of the community; and, whilst that is so, it is absolutely essential that we should find ways and means of, at any rate, not increasing it. I have already shown how these loans which are to be raised, and these renewals which are so prominently before us, will considerably increase the expenditure for interest on the public debt, and for my part I cannot see how we are going to avoid an increase in taxation unless we discover ways and means of economising. And, in order to discover them, I suggest the appointment of a Commission of the character I have described.

Mr. COLLINS: How would you economise?

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: I am not going to make suggestions; I am not going to say that the necessity for economy is particularly clear in any one direction; but I am going to say that, if a body of business men were to tackle this problem—quite free from political bias—they could suggest ways and means by which it could be effected.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: I want to tell the hon. member that in the sphere of industrial activities—and that is where stagnation is most pronounced—the question of taxation is a most important one. You have here six States of the Commonwealth, all of whom are competing for the new industries which enterprising men from the old country and other parts of the world can establish. You have emissaries of those industries coming to Australia to ascertain the conditions which will surround them if they are opened up. What is the first thing that confronts them on their arrival in Queensland? Taxation, which is twice as high as that of many of the other States of the Commonwealth, and that is one of the worst advertisements for Queensland. It means that a man naturally goes to that part of the Commonwealth where taxation is low, and he is permitted to gather more of the fruits of his labour, and who can blame him? So that, whilst taxation remains so high in Queensland, it follows that industries will lag. The Premier referred to the great advance which he said had been made in the industrial activities of the State. I suggest that, if he studies his statistics carefully, he will see that from an industrial or secondary industrial point of view, Queensland has not

progressed—that she is practically stagnant. The number of factories to-day is practically on a par with that of ten years ago, a fact which absolutely endorses the argument that I have just used—that, from a secondary industry standpoint, Queensland is stagnant, and will remain so so long as the fruits of men's labours are taxed to the extent to which I have called attention.

Another point which naturally calls for some consideration at this stage is closer settlement. I am delighted that the Government are showing such activity in this respect. The proposed resumption of these big holdings is a step in the right direction. Not only is it going to help materially in the solution of the railway problem, as has already been pointed out, but it is also going to help the Government considerably by giving them more rents, and it is furthermore going to help towards greater production, because, if a big holding is divided into reasonable carrying areas, it stands to reason that collectively they will produce more than if it were kept in one big holding. Further than that, such a subdivision keeps money within the State, and that is to me a most important point. I have no time for that gentleman, no matter what his political beliefs, who comes to Queensland and extracts a considerable profit out of it, and then goes to Victoria or New South Wales or some other part of the world to spend it. He is a menace, particularly in a young country like this, which requires all the assistance it can get to push its industries ahead. Therefore, by breaking up these estates, which are generally owned or leased by men living elsewhere in Australia or other parts of the world, the Government are going to create greater activity in Queensland and increase production. Another point about the matter which is most important is that it is going to change completely the political atmosphere of Western Queensland. Instead of those electorates being represented by socialist members, as they are to-day, they will in the future be represented by men whose chief political belief is the success of primary production; and they will not be hon. members opposite. The big station which to-day is owned by one man probably has thirty socialistic votes and three anti-socialistic votes. When this closer settlement scheme is effected, we shall find that the same area will probably carry 150 votes, ten only of which will probably be socialistic and 140 of which support a platform in which primary production stands first. So I look forward with satisfaction to this development from that point of view also.

I want to draw the attention of the Premier to one other thing, and one is encouraged to do so in these days, because there is an extraordinarily placid atmosphere in this Chamber. Every hon. member seems quiet and subdued—whether he is impressed with the importance of the occasion, or whether he is tired of his job I do not know—you are the only gentleman, Mr. Speaker, who has introduced an innovation, upon which I compliment you. There is a thoughtful air about other hon. members, the portent of which I do not exactly know, but one is encouraged to think that it is a step in the right direction, and I venture to stress consideration of the fact that the great need of Queensland is efficiency, whether it be efficiency in State activities or industrial activities. We want efficiency in the conduct of affairs in this House, efficiency in this respect—that, instead of studying the issues before us from any party point of view, we study them from the point of view of Queensland, for only by so doing shall we assist Queensland. We want to try to inculcate right through the public service the feeling that their ambition shall not be to watch the clock, but to give of their very best to the State, and to see that they do all they possibly can to push Queensland ahead. I argue that, if efficiency were the motto or keynote of the activities of our railways—another great problem of this State—there would be very little question of how to overcome the deficits. I have recently travelled in Northern and Central Queensland, and I have been shocked on many occasions at railway inefficiency. The further you get away from the seat of operations here the greater you find it. That is a grave thing to us. It means the loss of money and the material, and the loss of opportunity in our railway development. But I am hoping that, if we can only instil into the minds of railway officials, from the highest to the lowest, the great keynote of efficiency, we shall find another method of achieving that economy which is so important. And we want efficiency in our industries. That efficiency can be best maintained and encouraged by payment by results. You can never expect efficiency when all men are paid alike, quite regardless of their production. Therefore, I contend absolutely that payment by results is the keynote of efficiency.

Mr. COLLINS: Who is going to be the judge of that?

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: I wish to speak now to a class that I am reminded that I represent. A great deal rests with the employers themselves as to whether they get greater efficiency from their staff than exists to-day. If the employers encourage the better elements which are to be found within most men by giving them a share in the profits which the employer is too anxious to glean, I am quite sure we will get greater efficiency.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Then you do not believe in the wages system?

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Call it what you like. I do not believe in a system of low wages. I believe in the system of paying a man in accordance with what he produces.

I was much impressed by the remarks of the hon. member for Kennedy, who, from what I could see, will be a valuable adjunct to this House. He is moderate, gentlemanly, and dignified—qualities which should be embodied in a representative in this House—the most dignified position a man can be placed in. I was delighted to hear him give voice to the hope that the high moral tone of Parliament would be maintained. I want to tell that hon. gentleman that there is not a single member of the Opposition who wishes to have anything else in this House but what he desires to see. I want to tell that hon. gentleman that he went out of his way to be unfair to the Opposition in attaching to it responsibilities which do not belong to it. I want to tell that hon. gentleman that there is a great deal of work for him to do within his own party. It is not in keeping with the high dignity of the House or the dignity of a Premier to secrete stenographers behind screens when any gentleman calls to interview

him. It is not dignified, nor is it maintaining the high moral standing of the House, or in keeping with the high moral tone of this House, to bribe railway men on election day by telling them that they are going to have a holiday, and that, if they work, they will be paid time and a-half. That is not improving the high moral tone of the House, nor is it improving the high moral tone of the House to distribute the electoral seats in the manner which has been done. Time will not permit me to rebut many of the arguments advanced by the Premier. It is not improving the high moral tone of the House to take hundreds of railway construction men and dump them down in an electorate and absolutely destroy the voice of the residents in that electorate, and return to this House a man committed to socialism when the residents themselves want Country Party representation. It is not in keeping with the high moral tone of this House when we have electoral rolls existing to-day which permit of a man being on three rolls at the same time. Even the Home Secretary had his name on two rolls before his attention was called to it. I have in my possession particulars from a gentleman who has received a summons for not voting at the last election, and whose name is on three rolls at the same time.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: He could only vote once.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: It is clear that the high moral tone of Parliament and of politics generally is not going to be maintained while those temptations for wrong-doing exist. I support the hon. member for Kennedy in his desire to see the high moral tone of this House maintained, and I sincerely hope that, as charity begins at home, he will show his determination by beginning in the home in which he lives to-day, and we will to the best of our ability assist in improving the moral tone of this House by following the admirable example that you, Sir, have set in maintaining the dignity of the Speaker.

Mr. COLLINS (*Bowen*): I wish to congratulate you, Sir, on being again appointed to the Chair, but, as representative of a fairly radical electorate, I must be true to myself and say that I cannot agree with the sentiments expressed by the leader of the Opposition, when he said—

> "I would like to compliment you on restoring to the Speaker's chair in the person of yourself the official robes of office."

I would like hon. members to carry their minds back to the election of Speaker on 9th September, 1919, when the Hon. William Lennon, who occupied a position in the Labour Government as Secretary for Agriculture and Stock, was elected to the Speakership of this House.

Mr. CORSER: He knew he was only there temporarily.

Mr. COLLINS: On the 10th September, 1919, he established a precedent in this House. As you are well aware, he walked into this Chamber in his ordinary attire, read prayers, and took his seat in the chair that you are now occupying. That was the first time in this State that a Speaker had come into the Chamber and occupied the Speaker's chair in his ordinary attire.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Would the hon. member wear robes if he were appointed to the position of Speaker?

Mr. COLLINS: You, Sir, were appointed to the position on the 9th January, 1920, on the resignation of the previous Speaker, and you followed the example set by your predecessor, the Hon. W. Lennon, and came into this Chamber in your ordinary attire as the First Commoner of this State, read prayers, and took your seat. You presided over this Chamber for a period of two and a-half years in your ordinary attire, and you had to preside as Speaker when this Chamber was passing through what I call stormy times. They were the most stormy times that I have seen during the time that I have had the pleasure of occupying a seat in this Chamber, which has been for ten years. Owing to a defection of one of the Government supporters, we on this side numbered thirty-seven and the Opposition numbered thirty-five. Your conduct at that time in presiding during the stormy period just mentioned by me cannot be cavilled at by any one. A general election was held recently, and a Labour Government was again returned to this House. As you are well aware, a Labour Government has had to make precedents in the past; it has got to make them in the future. You again were elected to that high position of Speaker, and I must admit, as one of the members of this party, that I got the shock of a lifetime when I saw you coming into this Chamber with your robes on. (Opposition laughter.) Having said that, I want to make my position quite clear. Democracy is not to be judged by its clothes. I know of a friend of mine who wore a tall silk hat and was just as great a democrat as I am myself; still I have known men wear dungaree pants and support crusted Tories like the leader of the Opposition. (Laughter.) I am well aware that old customs die hard. I am well aware that in the British House of Commons the Speaker not only wears robes, but he has someone to carry portion of it when he comes into the Chamber. No doubt the hon. member for Oxley would like to see that. I would like to quote from Tennyson's "Locksley Hall—Sixty Years After"—

> "Is there evil but on earth? Or pain in every peopled sphere?
> Well be grateful for the sounding watch-word 'Evolution' here.
> Evolution ever climbing after some ideal good
> And Reversion ever dragging Evolution in the mud."

I claim that there was a reversion when you decided to wear the robes.

I want to congratulate the mover and seconder on the Address in Reply. They are two old friends of mine. I am satisfied that, as time goes on, they will be a credit to this House, and a credit to the party with which they are associated.

[7 p.m.]

I want to say that the Labour party and the Labour movement which I am associated with stand for evolution.

Mr. KIRWAN: Hear, hear!

Mr. COLLINS: I want to pick out the last line of that quotation which I have just read and apply it to the Opposition—

> "And Reversion ever dragging Evolution in the mud."

In other words, they do not want to advance,

but seek at all times to drag us back instead of assisting us to go forward.

The Premier this afternoon, in a very able speech, made reference to the reasons why this party was successful at the elections. While he said a good deal on the subject, I am going to say a few words as an old battler in the Labour movement——

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. COLLINS: And give my opinion as to why we won the election. It was no surprise whatever to me. I would have been surprised if the position had been reversed. First of all, there is a great difference between what we represent and what the parties sitting opposite represent. We are the Labour movement—something that has a soul. I am not using the word "soul" in the sense that theologians use it. What I mean by "soul" is that we represent a movement that has higher aspirations, and, as one of those who has battled to some extent with other members in this Chamber, whose hair has turned grey in the fight, blazed the track, ploughed the fields, and sown the seed, I want to say that we are now reaping the harvest——

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. COLLINS: Not so much for ourselves as for the masses of the people we represent. I am proud to have been associated with this movement all my life, and hope to be associated with it right to the end of my time on this planet.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: You nearly slipped when you went into the Queensland Club.

Mr. COLLINS: No; but I will deal with the hon. member before I sit down. I want to point out one of the reasons why we were returned. When I contested the Bowen seat in 1915 I used these words on a public platform—

> "Labour, to do effective work, must remain in office for a period of three Parliaments, or nine years."

I am pleased to say that, after a period of nearly eight years, when we appealed to the country, the electors of Queensland practically said, "Well done, you good and faithful servants! Go back and continue the good work you have done in the last seven years and eight months." The electors have practically said that we have done good, sound, effective work. I am one of those who believe that in launching out on what our friends opposite term the socialisation of industry we cannot lay the foundation stone in one, two, or three years. We are now only reaping that which we have sown in the shape of our State enterprises, after a period of a little over eight years. The work we have accomplished is something wonderful, such as has never been accomplished in any State or in the civilised world before. Our friends opposite are going to remain in opposition, because, with the intellectual development of the mass of the people, it stands to reason that their only hope is in supporting this Labour movement and party of ours.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Why did they not remain in power in New South Wales?

Mr. COLLINS: Hon. members opposite refer from time to time to the Emu Park Convention. I want to say that to stand still means death either in the individual, State, or nation. This party can no more stand still now than it could in the early days of the movement. It must keep marching on from victory to victory, and must change its outlook from time to time to suit the times. Similarly, the world of science advances, and we make use of the inventive faculty for the benefit of man. The future is ours. It belongs to the working classes. I remember on one occasion a prominent Tory member, in reply to my conversation, saying, "I cannot conceive how we get into Parliament." Neither can I. We are gradually going on towards our ideal. What is that ideal? I heard an hon. gentleman—a deputy leader of his party—and with his intelligence he ought to be ashamed of himself, quoting something from a newspaper cutting as the Labour party's objective. He knew nothing about that objective. For the benefit of hon. members opposite, I will quote it. It is "Socialisation of Industry, Production, Distribution, and Exchange." I am reading it slowly so that hon. members will grasp the meaning of it. What does it mean? It means the emancipation of man from man. In other words, it is owing to the tyranny of the few who have exercised their influence in the world for thousands of years that we are in our present position.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. COLLINS: It is only by the working classes taking possession, not only of this Government but later on of that of the Commonwealth and of the civilised world, that we shall make the progress that we ought to make as a civilised people.

Now let me examine for a few minutes one of the causes that led to the defeat of hon. gentlemen opposite. First, we had an admission from the deputy leader of the United party—did I say "United party" I can see no unity among them—(Government laughter)—that they had no objective. No wonder they had got no objective. I can easily understand why the hon. member for Oxley says that his party had no objective. I will tell you why. I remember in 1918 the hon. member coming into this House with a flourishing of trumpets and sitting alongside the present leader of the Opposition. He looked round at the so-called National party and said, "There is no hope of becoming leader of this party," so he cast his eyes upon the front bench opposite, occupied at that time by the Country party. After a time he gravitated right from the back bench down to the Country party benches.

Mr. SIZER: You are quite wrong.

Mr. COLLINS: He shifted to the Country party benches, and, when he found he could not get the leadership of the Country party—of course he had been watching the then leader, the hon. member for Dalby—and, when he looked round at the members of the Country party he found, as he stated in that famous interview down in Melbourne, "They have no experience in the government of a country." On looking round he found they did not recognise him as they ought to do, and he said, "This is no good to me. I will have to start out and form a new party," and he attended the Rockhampton Convention and helped to form what is now known as the United party. Fancy having an admission from the hon. member for Oxley that his party has no objective! It is certain the hon. member for Oxley has an objective. First of all, his objective was the leadership of the National party; later on

the leadership of the Country party, and I suppose he is now aiming at the leadership of the United party.

Mr. CARTER: Any party at all.

Mr. COLLINS: Just before that the hon. member for Oxley admitted that he was not fitted to lead any party, and he said to Sir Thomas Robinson, "Oh, do come and lead us out of the quagmire we find ourselves in at the present time." (Government laughter.) Sir Thomas Robinson looked at the men who then formed the Opposition in Parliament, and more than likely he said, "I will have nothing to do with them." Later on the hon. member for Oxley went along to Rockhampton and, amongst others, said to Sir William Glasgow—a native of Gympie—"Come and lead the United party." I lived in Gympie for a number of years and know the Glasgow family very well, and I know that Sir William Glasgow is too shrewd a man to be caught by the hon. member for Oxley. Sir William Glasgow looked at them and more than likely said, "Although I may be a very good general and have led men on the field of battle, I am not going to lead this motley crew." (Government laughter.) Then they went to the country with a leader they did not believe in, and were still crying out—or their newspapers were crying out for them—for some man of ability to come and lead them. I am satisfied that this party, even if the present Premier went out of politics to-morrow, would not need to go round the country asking for some man to come and lead them. Their own actions show that the party opposite are not fit to occupy the Government benches. Let us deal with another hon. member—the hon. member for Albert. That hon. member, when we were sitting in Opposition in 1910, 1911, and 1912, said he was a State Socialist. I have been looking for some of his State socialism ever since he made use of those words. That hon. member was a member of the Denham Government, and later on when in opposition he was a member of the Nationalist party. Later on he, too, joined the Country party, and I think the Country party is now well rid of him, because no one could convince me that he is a typical representative of farming interests in Queensland. At any rate, that gentleman, too, shifted from the Nationalists to the Country party. I think the hon. member for Oxley must have exercised an evil influence over him, because he, too, joined the United party. That is No. 2. Now let us take the hon. member for Murrumba—Mr. Warren. He came into this House likewise as a Nationalist. When the Country party came into existence he joined the Country party, and then he joined the United party. Those are three members who go to make up what is called the United party. The fourth member is Mr. Peterson, the member for Normanby, who was a pledged Labourite and signed the Labour party's platform. He left this party to join the Country party. I do not know what happened to the hon. member after he joined the Country party, because he, too, afterwards joined the United party, and, when I listened to that hon. member last night, I could see that he was two men in one, inasmuch as having been associated with the Labour party for a number of years, half of his speech was a Labour speech and half the opposite. He used to turn round now and again and look at the hon. member for Oxley as much as to say, "Am I saying the right thing, Mr. Deputy Leader? Am I expounding the United party's platform, or am I still expounding the Labour party's platform?" (Laughter.) He was a mixture—there is no getting away from that. (Government laughter.)

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Like your Premier.

Mr. COLLINS: The Premier is able to look after himself, as the hon. member for Oxley knows. And, when referring to the hon. member for Oxley, I do not think the Premier will require his assistance when he goes to London. (Government laughter.) The Premier will do very well without him. Those are four men who help to make up the United party—the party which sets out to criticise men on this side, who have got a platform, who know where they are going, and who are taking the necessary step by step towards their objective, meaning to attain that objective, no matter how long it may take to reach it. We represent an evolutionary force; we were always an evolutionary force. We had to wait for practically a generation before we reached the Treasury benches. We always fought on evolutionary and constitutional rights. My opponent in the recent election was a member of the United party. He was a young man; but I had the biggest majority I have had since I represented Bowen. This young man, following the advice of older counsellors, went on to the platform and talked about the restoration of constitutional government. You, Mr. Speaker, know full well that any Bill which we put through this Chamber has to receive the assent of the Governor as the representative of King George V. We have never passed a single measure which was not constitutional. I want to ask our hon. friends opposite, who profess so much lip loyalty and are always prating about their loyalty, why they set out to insult the Governor of this State? The Governor is the representative of His Majesty King George, and they therefore insult the King himself In the event of their being returned to power, would they have set out and removed this unconstitutional Governor? They would have done nothing of the kind. Why do they set out and try to deceive people by telling them that we passed unconstitutional measures? That is the kind of piffle I had to reply to in my election campaign. I was ashamed to think that in the twentieth century a young man in the prime of life could be found, as it were, trying to seduce the electors to vote for him on such grounds as the restoration of constitutional government. Hon. members opposite expected to win, but they are in the wilderness, and may expect to remain there. I am inclined to think they will have to get some Moses or Joshua to lead them out of the wilderness, or else they will never reach the promised land. (Government laughter.) They are devoid of ideas. I have listened to them ever since this debate commenced. I could go over on the opposite side myself and criticise the Government better than any hon. member opposite has criticised them. (Government laughter.) Last night one hon. member interjected, when the hon. member for Burke was speaking, "Why don't you bring that up in caucus?" If we were to admit hon. members opposite to our caucus meetings, they would be surprised. (Opposition laughter.) Let me deal for a few minutes with the hon. member for Carnarvon. I listened to his speech last

night, which was the best he has delivered since he has been in this House—I believe in giving credit where credit is due. The hon. member wants to be more careful. He said that members on the other side were free agents, and that they did not have to obey their leaders. I interjected, "You must be a group of anarchists, then." (Opposition laughter.) There is no man in this House who knows more about discipline than the hon. member for Carnarvon.

Mr. COSTELLO: You know a bit about it.

Mr. COLLINS: The hon. member told us last night that they were under no discipline whatever, and could practically do and speak as they like. How can they hope to succeed without discipline? This party would not be on the Treasury benches to-day if it had not discipline. We are the teachers of discipline. We are a disciplined army on this side, and it is about time hon. members on the other side became a disciplined army, too. (Laughter.)

Passing from that, I was very pleased to hear my friend the hon. member for Townsville, and my friend the hon. member for Herbert—who had the largest majority of any man in North Queensland—deal in an able manner with the sugar industry. But before I refer to that, I want to point out some of the results of the election. I am sorry to say that what is known as North Queensland has still one black spot on the map. Out of sixteen members returned from the North, one sits in opposition to this party —the hon. member for Mirani. He is the black spot on the map of North Queensland. Without that black spot the whole of North Queensland would be white. (Laughter.) And, when we come to Central Queensland, we find that there is one little black spot there in the person of the hon. member for Normanby. (Renewed laughter.) In fact, of the twenty-nine members sitting in Opposition to this party, twenty-seven belong to Southern Queensland. In other words, if the State were divided into three States, we would have only one Oppositionist in each of the Northern and Central States. (Laughter.) What we have to set out to do is to counteract the influence of the southern Press. It is they who return hon. members opposite. Hon. members on the other side must admit that they are not returned by any ability they possess—(laughter)—but by the men who can pay other men to write the leading articles in the daily newspapers advocating their cause. It is almost inconceivable to me that the workers of this great metropolitan area should return ten men belonging to the Tory party to this House. (Opposition laughter.) I sometimes go through the West End and the wonder to me is how the hon. member for Kurilpa ever came to be returned for that constituency. (Renewed laughter.)

The hon. member for Townsville and the hon. member for Herbert made splendid speeches about the sugar industry. The hon. member for Townsville was the Labour candidate at the last Federal election, and he would have been returned but for the stupidity of the sugar-growers on the one hand and the stupidity of some of the local workers on the other, misled by the literature sent out by hon. members opposite, in which they were told that the Labour party was opposed to the sugar agreement. Nothing of the kind! I say that the Commonwealth Government, who were at that time led by Mr. Hughes, could, if they had wished, have renewed the sugar agreement before the Federal election took place. What is the good of blaming the Opposition for anything we may do? Yet that is what the argument of hon. members opposite amounts to. We take full responsibility for what we do, and the Hughes Government should take responsibility for what they did. What is the result? Queensland sent down to the Federal House of Representatives eight Tory members and six Tory Senators, or a total of fourteen Tories. What have those fourteen men been doing since they were returned? If they wished, they could have exercised influence over this man Bruce, who wears spats, I am told, whatever they may be—(laughter)—this Prime Minister by the name of Bruce—who is no relation, I believe, of my friend the hon. member for Kennedy. They could, at any rate, have exercised sufficient influence to make him renew the agreement. The hon. member for Herbert put his finger on the right spot when he suggested the reason why it was not renewed. It was not renewed, first of all, because it was a step towards the socialisation of industry. Everybody in connection with the industry was satisfied. The workers were satisfied; the growers were satisfied.

The hon. member said the other night that it was in effect bringing about what is known as the socialisation of industry. Of course, the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth does not stand for that part of our programme. It is no use blaming the Labour party. Let them put the blame on the right shoulders, and that is on the shoulders of the present Tory Government who are in power in our Commonwealth. I quite agree with the Premier that it is time the sugar industry was lifted out of the domain of party politics. The sugar industry should be stabilised. When we had a fairly decent thing, why was it not left alone? It did not suit our friends in the Commonwealth Parliament, because it had a smack of socialisation of industry about it. Those hon. members have betrayed the sugar industry. The hon. member for Townsville called their action "the great betrayal."

I believe that this Government should do all that they can in the direcion of land settlement. While I do not want to say one word against the cutting up of the large estates in Western Queensland—let them be cut up—I want to say to the Premier that we cannot settle a large number of people in Western Queensland if we are going to resume the whole of Western Queensland. A thousand settlers placed upon 10,000-acre blocks in Western Queensland will require 10,000,000 acres of land, and to settle 10,000 men there will require 100,000,000 acres of land, which is more land than there is in Western Queensland. The real settlement must go on along the coast, because on 100,000 acres we can settle at least 1,000 persons, and on 1,000,000 acres we can settle ten times that number. The real settlement and the real development must take place along our coast. There is no better place for that to-day than in the far North. So far as my experience goes, the North is one of the most fertile places in the whole of the Commonwealth. The whole of the district from Innisfail right through to Tolga, a distance of nearly 100 miles, which a few years ago was dense scrub, is now being cleared, and will be utilised for dairying and mixed farming. That district has one of the best

rainfalls, not only in Queensland, but in the whole of Australia. That is where settlement can take place. The Commonwealth is lacking in its duty to Queensland. They are talking about the defence of Australia, and they are talking about spending £1,000,000 here, and £1,000,000 there, in connection with defence: but why do they not set out and spend millions of pounds in the far North? Why do they not lend this Government the necessary millions to build railways through the far North, more particularly from Mount Molloy right through to Cooktown, and open up that high hinterland where we have hundreds of millions of feet of timber? That is the real defence. I am tired of listening to this talk about defence, defence, defence, by having brass hats and drilling men, and doing this and doing that. That is not real defence. If the Commonwealth did its duty by this State we would have the settlement that I have just mentioned. That would be the true patriotism. We do not want this shoddy patriotism that we hear about in connection with the waving of flags, and the saluting of flags, whether red, green, or any other colour. What we want is the development of this State, so that we can build up that virile people that we hear so much about, and then probably there would not be so much talk about immigration if we made the conditions good in our own State. I was pleased to hear the Premier say that the first duty in connection with land settlement was to the people who live here. Great Britain is one of the wealthiest countries in the world, and she should be able to solve her own unemployed problem. Every immigrant, before leaving the shores of Great Britain, should be subsidised by that country. Our first duty is to our own people in Australia, without worrying about those who live in Great Britain. The hon. member for Nundah talked about giving soldiers freehold. Is that a solution of the problem? It is, according to hon. members opposite. I have yet to learn that land will produce more bushels of wheat per acre under freehold than under the perpetual leasehold tenure. It will produce just as much, no matter what the tenure may be. The solution of the problem is not in freehold. I am going to give good advice to the members of the Opposition. We were told, when the soldiers went to the war, that they were great patriots. They were slapped on the back and told they were the best men Australia could produce.

[7.30 p.m.]

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: They were.

Mr. COLLINS: At that time there were 12,186 persons in Australia who owned the bulk of our freehold lands.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Do you own any?

Mr. COLLINS: What is wrong with the hon. member for Nundah advising these freeholders, considering the soldiers went to fight for the protection of their freehold, that they give some of their freehold to these returned soldiers. They are not likely to do that. They come here, though, and blame the Government for what they have done for the returned soldier. If I had my way, there would be no soldier settlements but the settlement of soldiers. There is no trouble in my electorate in this regard, and I have just as many returned soldiers as there are in any other electorate of Queensland. None of the returned soldiers worry me because we have no soldier settlements but the settlement of soldiers; they mix with the other citizens and recognise they are no longer soldiers but civilians.

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

Mr. SIZER (*Sandgate*): I wish to congratulate you, Sir, on your re-election as Speaker. I do not wish to reiterate a lot of the arguments which have been gone over by hon. members on both sides of the House, but intend to devote myself to a subject which is pretty much before the public to-day, and one which vitally affects the whole of the metropolitan area, in addition to a large section of my electors in particular. That is in connection with the milk question, which has been so prominently before the public through the medium of the Press during the last few weeks.

I wish to deal with this subject from several aspects, and to say at the onset that I want to advocate that the Government will accede to the farmers' request that they be given an opportunity of forming a pool to deal with the whole milk supply of the metropolitan area. In doing so, I do not wish it to be understood that I am an advocate of pools generally, because I recognise pools are probably justifiable in extreme circumstances—they are justified as a means to an end—but they are not justified as an end in themselves. I do not think at this juncture that the position of the milk supply of Brisbane would be better controlled under the pooling system than it is at present. There is a general outcry for some reform in connection with the milk supply. It is coming from all sections of the community. It is coming from the masses of the people, who want a purer and cheaper supply, from the medical men and health authorities, who are continually complaining that milk, being one of the most necessary foods, when impure is detrimental, particularly to young lives and to the community in general, and it is coming from the producers of the milk themselves, who are particularly anxious for some decision for all time for the industry in which they are engaged. Probably the one which exercises the minds of people most is the health point of view, and that can only be overcome by a rigid supervision of the milk distributed to the public. We hear a lot of empty talk and hot air about some dairies being so unclean and filthy as to be the cause of public contamination through the milk. There may be some truth in that, but certainly not to the extent we are often led to believe. I say there is much need for reform in this direction. We have a Dairy Act which, no matter how efficiently it may be administered so far as sanitation is concerned, does not entirely overcome the difficulty of providing a pure milk supply. I fail to see how it is possible, because under the Dairy Act to secure what we are really anxious to do would practically require a dairy inspector allocated to every dairy during milking operations.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That is a great reflection on the dairy farmer.

Mr. SIZER: Not at all.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Not that each farmer requires to be supervised by an inspector?

Mr. SIZER: The Secretary for Agriculture knows a lot about this question. He

knows that some men are clean, and others dirty milkers; they are natural habits; they cannot help themselves. A man may follow the regulations laid down by the Dairy or Health Acts, and even wash his hands after milking each cow; but in the meantime he might cut up tobacco and go on milking, and, as we all know, some men milk deep down in the cans.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You don't suggest that is a general practice?

Mr. SIZER: No, but I say it is a possibility, and to prevent that you would have to have an inspector standing over them all the time, which is a practical impossibility. There is only one way we can overcome that difficulty, and that is by having all milk going through the pool tested immediately it is received at a depôt.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Do you mean to say by that method you can find out if it is contaminated with tobacco?

Mr. SIZER: If the Secretary for Agriculture has followed the milk question thoroughly, and gone into the methods of the Coastal Co-operative Company of New South Wales, he will find a test for every possible source of contamination. An up-to-date depôt can test for every class of contamination possible.

Mr. BULCOCK: Tell me where they test for tuberculosis, for instance?

Mr. SIZER: I say they are able at the Coastal Co-operative Company's depôt—I have seen it for myself—to test milk for every possible contamination.

Mr. BULCOCK: They only test for cream contents, butter fats, and solids.

Mr. SIZER: They are able there to trace that contamination to its source. Is it not more possible, when the milk comes into a depôt, for it to be tested there, and, if it contains any impurity, to be rejected? Once it is accepted it must be passed through a pasteurisation plant, and, in turn, distributed to the people as pure milk. If contamination takes place, then it must be after it has left the depôt and before it reaches the consumer. We know it can be contaminated by the consumer through the use of dirty utensils. An elaborate scheme on these lines, as in other States, would result in a higher grade of milk being produced. In my experience, if the Government gave encouragement in the shape of a slightly better price for higher grade milk, there is not the slightest doubt that the great mass of farmers would try and improve their herds so that they could produce the highest grade milk in order to receive the fullest amount possible under the scheme. That in itself has much to recommend it as a means of overcoming the difficulty. If the milk is concentrated in such a depôt and handled in such a manner, the public, from a health point of view, would have the greatest protection—a protection that should be easily practicable. Working in conjunction with the Health Department, I am inclined to think that the supply could be made as nearly pure as it is possible to get it.

Mr. BULCOCK: Don't you think that the herd should be under veterinary supervision on the farm?

Mr. SIZER: Certainly. Now, take the question from the producer's point of view. These people are anxious to receive remunerative returns for their labour, and at the same time are anxious to secure stability for their industry. By stability I mean that under the present system during the winter months there is no difficulty in disposing of all milk supplies; but during the surplus season producers find themselves in the predicament of being held up once or twice a week and having to separate or lose. They want stability. With this scheme it will be incumbent upon the pool to make the necessary distribution. At present Brisbane is starving for a cream supply. If you ask your milkman to-day to supply you with a pint of cream, he will probably tell you that he will have to make special arrangements to separate that pint of cream. Under the scheme I suggest the producer can see that the whole of his milk can be taken, and by separating, and developing the cream trade, there would be little difficulty, after a short space of time, in handling the whole of the milk within the 50 miles radius. Then there are butter factories to manufacture any surplus into butter to relieve producers for the time being. So with proper organisation and development there should be no difficulty in disposing of the surplus in the form of cream. Then there is no reason why the dried milk industry, for the purpose of cooking, should not be developed. If the pool will accomplish such manufacture and provide a pure milk supply, we will give security and stability to the producers.

Now we have the question of dealing with the "hot milk" men—I mean men who have their own dairies and deliver their own milk. With a growing city such as Brisbane this is becoming a difficulty, and, as Brisbane expands, we shall find that we have dairies in the hearts of thickly populated suburbs. I do not know what the Health Department think; there may be no injury so far as health is concerned, but this situation is certainly inconvenient to residents of such districts. At the same time we must recognise the right of those "hot milk" men to their dairies. I think that by the establishment of the pool such dairymen could draw their supplies from the pool. This would relieve them of the arduous work of milking and vending, and would be just as remunerative to them. So that difficulty could be overcome without any hardship to anyone in the community. In fact, such a move would be welcomed eventually by the "hot milk" man as an easier means of earning a livelihood.

The biggest question is that of distribution. Undoubtedly there is a tremendous lot of overlapping, and, without any great flight of imagination, one can see how many carts could be eliminated. It would be difficult at first to organise on these lines, and the pool should start out by utilising the services of the existing organisation of vendors.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is what they propose doing.

Mr. SIZER: We should endeavour by an amicable arrangement to provide for the blocking out of runs. No doubt this would not at first meet with general approval, because the man who has a run in Queen street, delivering large quantities of milk in a short space of time, is in a more favourable position than the suburban man with a more arduous time and a more unfavourable centre. Then, you would have the difficulty that you would be taking away the personal initiative of ambitious men who expand their business by personal acumen and who penetrate into other people's runs, thus increasing their own

business. They would object because they would be penalised. That point will require some consideration.

Eventually, if this scheme is adopted, means will be available whereby the pool will be able to make adequate arrangements for distribution. The public will have a pure supply, the producers will have stability in their industry, and I think also, with proper organisation, the public may get the benefit of a cheaper price than they are at present paying.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: What is your idea of supervision? Should it be council or Government supervision?

Mr. SIZER: I certainly believe that the Government will have to exercise their powers of control through the Health Department. I think the Government is the proper authority. These things can be accomplished, and they are urgently needed. Now comes the constitution of the pool, and here, undoubtedly, is where the difficulty is likely to arise. I do not accept pools as being the end. I only accept them as a means to an end, and the end I have in view in connection with the milk pool is the formation of a farmers' co-operative company to control the whole of the milk supply of the city of Brisbane. The members constituting this pool must be elected by the senders of milk only. They cannot be elected by anyone else. The Government, who will be asked to finance the scheme, must naturally, during the time they are financially interested, be represented on the pool.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The Government so far have not been asked to finance it.

Mr. SIZER: Undoubtedly, they will be asked to finance it, and I anticipate that the amount required will be about £50,000. The Government, in this matter, are absolutely on trial, whether they know it or not. I am satisfied they have not realised it yet, as they have not said "Yea" or "Nay" to this proposal. If they say "Nay," then the whole of the Primary Producers' Organisation Act is gone to the four winds.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Not at all.

Mr. SIZER: This pool is only possible as a result of that Act. They have told the farmers that they could utilise that organisation for the purpose of establishing pools to control their own industry. The milk suppliers are asking the Government to redeem that promise by financing this scheme to the extent of £50,000, and, if the Government are not prepared to do it, then the death knell of the Primary Producers' Organisation has been sounded. It is here we are likely to split straws. The Government realise that, and they are trying to pass the responsibility on to the local authorities.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: No; we only asked them a simple question.

Mr. SIZER: The hon. gentleman, in his circular to them, said he considered it was their business.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: To supervise the milk business.

Mr. SIZER: It has nothing to do with the City Council whatever or with any local authority; it is a matter for those people who control the industry, aided by the Government, to establish this pool. The question of supervision from a health point of view is a matter for the Government or the Health Department.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The distribution of milk is a municipal matter.

Mr. SIZER: I do not think so. The Government have led the farmers to believe that, if they are prepared to organise their own industry under the provisions of the Primary Producers' Organisation Act, the Government will see it through.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: What do you mean by "see it through"?

Mr. SIZER: That the Government will see their wishes carried out. In fact, the Government were elected on that question, and now that they are asked to redeem their promise, they say it is a question for the local authorities. That is merely a quibble, and one that I can understand and appreciate. The Government are on their trial on this question, and we shall see their sincerity, because it is a bigger job than they anticipate, and is going to involve far more money than they thought at the first onset. They have been too fond of glibly saying, "We will give this to the primary producer, or we will give that to the primary producer. We have given this Act to the primary producers." The whole thing requires action, and no action can take place unless the necessary money is forthcoming. We do not want municipal control. In fact, the farmers will have nothing to do with municipal control.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That is your opinion.

Mr. SIZER: I feel that in this matter I am expressing the views of the suppliers—the greatest number of whom are in my own electorate. They have stated that they will have nothing to do with the pool if it is controlled by the municipal authorities.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: The South Brisbane Council are not of that opinion.

Mr. SIZER: Whatever the South Brisbane Council have to say, the other councils hold a different view, and the Government will have a most difficult task in getting unanimity amongst the municipal authorities. The Brisbane City Council have had this question under consideration for ages. They have had a committee sitting to deal with the matter, and they are still sitting, and I do not think their scheme will ever be hatched.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: They never honestly attempted to deal with it.

Mr. SIZER: I agree with the hon. gentleman that nothing has been done, and we cannot look for much help from the local authorities. In order to provide the necessary money to repay the Government it is suggested that the farmers themselves who control the pool should contribute 1d. per gallon on all the milk sent in to the pool for a period of five years. Approximately 10,000 gallons of milk per day are required for the supply of Brisbane, and, taken over a period of five years, a levy of 1d. per gallon will return approximately £75,000. Therefore, at the end of five years the farmers would be in a position to repay their obligation to the Government and have sufficient money to carry on their own scheme. They would have an asset as well of a value of at least £50,000, and a goodwill which would be worth

considerably more. As against that 1d. per gallon which would be deducted, they would receive shares according to the amount of milk supplied to the pool. After the five years the scheme would finance itself. It only needs a certain amount of assistance at the commencement to make it operative, and in five years Brisbane would have the most up-to-date milk supply probably in the world, co-operatively owned by the primary producers, and then hon. members opposite would be able to say that they had in some measure redeemed their promise to the farmers that they were out to assist them.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: What do you think we put the Act on the statute-book for? How many pools have we created so far?

Mr. SIZER: I do not care how many pools you have created. I shall not be satisfied unless you create this one. The Government have to face the position, and I ask them to give the scheme consideration. If there is anything in the Government's statement that they are anxious to improve the
[8 p.m.] position of the primary producers, this is one way in which they can achieve success in a comparatively short space of time. They can establish the pool, and at the same time satisfy the long-felt want for a pure milk supply. They can show their sincerity in that direction, and bolster up their scheme of a Primary Producers' Organisation. They can create a primary producers' co-operative company, and from that point of view achieve a great success; but, if they attempt to quibble and pass the scheme on to the local authorities with the object of deliberately getting it broken down, they are labouring under a political delusion.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That is a very unfair statement.

Mr. SIZER: If they are prepared to do that, they are labouring under a political delusion.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I am satisfied from your speech to-night that, if we do give them the pool, you will say that you forced it through.

Mr. SIZER: No, I would not take that credit.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Your suggestion is that we do not want the pool.

Mr. SIZER: The scheme has been approved of by the Council of Agriculture, and I shall be the first to give credit where credit is due when we see it accomplished.

I would like to deal with the question of immigration, which follows on the matter of pools. Pools are only a means to an end. We see nearly all our primary industries and some of our secondary industries unable to stand on their own bottom, and they are being bolstered up with pools, or with a subsidy.

The HOME SECRETARY: Why a subsidy?

Mr. SIZER: The hon. gentleman knows that it is necessary for a time. Hon. gentlemen opposite are faced with the problem that the majority of our industries are unable to stand by themselves, and yet they are only prepared to tinker with pools as an end. They may be necessary for a period, but the Government are not making provision for a fundamental solution of the problem. The pools cannot go on for ever. The Government established the wheat pool, and then said that the price of flour should not be increased, with the result that the price of offal was increased, and the egg producers were unable to carry on and wanted a pool. You make one patch to improve matters, and you have immediately to put another patch on to cover it up. The Government are not applying themselves to a fundamental solution of the question. The fundamental solution of the whole trouble lies in immigration.

The HOME SECRETARY: Does not co-operation do the same thing?

Mr. SIZER: It may do the same thing, but you are not providing for a fundamental solution of the question. You are hoping to solve the question amongst a small number of people, which simply cannot be done. On the other hand, if there is a glut of produce, and we increase our population, and the consuming capacity becomes double what it is to-day, we shall be a long way on the road towards overcoming the difficulty. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not grasped the question of immigration from the right viewpoint. Every immigrant would be an asset to the State, and certainly not a detriment, as some hon. members opposite seem to think. One of the arguments used by hon. members opposite is that the bringing of immigrants here is only going to increase the number of unemployed, but statistics show quite the contrary. The Commonwealth statistics show that in each State where there has been the lowest number of immigrants admitted the percentage of unemployed has been the highest. The following is a comparative statement regarding immigration and unemployment in the States mentioned:—

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT *re* IMMIGRATION AND UNEMPLOYMENT.

| — | Immigrants. | Unemployment. |
|---|---|---|
| 1919. | No. | Per Cent. |
| Queensland ... ... ... | 6,007 | 8·5 |
| New South Wales ... ... | 96,331 | 5·0 |
| 1920. | | |
| Queensland ... ... ... | 4,151 | 16·3 |
| New South Wales ... ... | 69,135 | 6·9 |
| 1921. | | |
| Queensland ... ... ... | 4,269 | 11·3 |
| New South Wales ... ... | 54,578 | 11·9 |

Strange to say, Labour Governments always seem to upset calculations, because in 1921 the Dooley Government were in power in New South Wales.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: What are you quoting from?

Mr. SIZER: From the Commonwealth statistics. The hon. gentleman will find that I am absolutely correct.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: You are absolutely wrong.

Mr. SIZER: Those figures are against the argument that immigrants increase the number of unemployed. Those figures speak volumes in that direction, and even the Premier himself and the Secretary for Mines recognise it. The Secretary for Mines, when speaking on the subject on 6th December last, said—

> "As one Australian speaking to another Australian, he urged his hearers to support a policy, the three big essen-

tials of which were—the peopling of this country compatible with its capacity of carrying a white population; the encouraging and fostering of primary production; and the establishment of secondary industries. Dealing with the first principle, he said we wanted more people in Queensland and in Australia, and, after travelling the vast North, he was more than ever convinced of the wisdom of that policy, and that the North was a white man's land. He who said there were sufficient people here was ignorant of the natural wealth and the great possibilities of our country, and it was a fallacy to think that more people meant more unemployment. He rather inclined to the opinion that more people meant more industry and more work—that was, provided the other two essentials were given effect to, and more people also meant the creation of the best market for any country, which was the local market."

Those are not my words; they are the words of the Secretary for Mines, and he has substantiated the words I have already quoted. We may as well also have the Premier's views. Speaking at the Country Press Association's Conference on 7th August, 1922, he said—

"As a matter of fact, unless we get a vastly enhanced population in the course of the next generation or two, Australia as a nation is doomed. A people can have only one inalienable right to a country—a right which is based on the occupation and use of the country. Therefore, we must have millions in Australia, because Australia is capable of supporting millions. We have only a brief space of time to realise that policy."

There is no mention of such a policy in the Governor's Speech, but we have the opinion of the power behind the throne, for at a meeting of the Trades and Labour Council in August last the following resolution was passed:—

"That the Council is opposed to any Government policy of immigration, and recommends that the Australian Workers' Union should concentrate on the organisation of rural workers, in view of the increased immigration."

There is no word of immigration in the Governor's Speech, but there is word of the organisation of the rural workers, because the power behind the throne has spoken.

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

Mr. KIRWAN (*Brisbane*): At the very outset of my remarks, I desire to offer to both the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply—in fact, I might say to all the new members—my sincere and hearty congratulations upon their maiden efforts in this House. As one who has been here something like eleven years, I can say that those gentlemen—and I include the hon. member for Nundah—have no reason to feel in any way discouraged at their efforts, and I am inclined to think that they will make their mark in this Chamber.

The hon. member for Nundah dealt with immigration, and proceeded to propound the principle that the more people brought into a country the more prosperous it would become. Might I ask that hon. member why Great Britain, her statesmen and her leaders, are at the present time anxiously considering schemes of emigration which will send thousands of her best people abroad to the Dominions. The hon. member should counsel His Majesty's advisers in the House of Commons to import people from other parts of the world, thereby establishing the principle which he enunciated a short time ago.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: How many are coming to Queensland?

Mr. KIRWAN: There are a good few. I take the stand on the question of immigration that the policy of this Government is correct. I am sure that they are prepared to bring in large numbers of immigrants, thousands if necessary, if we are able to place them in a secure position, so that they will not be like the immigrants landing in Western Australia and Southern States, who go back three or four months afterwards as stowaways unless they are in the more fortunate position of being able to pay their passages to the old land, there to give Australia the worst possible advertisement she could have.

We on this side are justifiably proud of the splendid and magnificent victory achieved by Labour on 12th May last. In my humble judgment, it is a victory without precedent in the annals of representative government, and the hon. members who formed the Cabinet of this party, and the gentlemen associated with it in support of the platform for which they stand, can take credit for the fact that to-day they are the only Government in the civilised world, and the only Government in any country which boasts of representative government, who were in power in 1915 and who to-day still hold the reins of power. All your great war leaders—men who rose on a popular wave—Lloyd George, Clemenceau, President Wilson, Orlando, even William Morris Hughes—Massey, in New Zealand, hangs on to office by the votes of two members of the Opposition—have fallen. The Labour supporters throughout the length and breadth of Queensland, particularly the rank and file, the battlers, the men and women who make it possible for the movement to go on and to make the progress it did at the last election, who are responsible for placing me and every other member of the party, whether he be the leader or the humblest follower, where we are, have reason to congratulate themselves on their splendid achievement in May last.

The hon. member for Nundah spoke of the defeat of Labour in the other States. I do not deny the fact; but it is a strange coincidence—it is a significant fact—that in this State, where the Labour party and the Labour movement were least affected by the divisions of the war, and where Labour members remained true to their pledges and the great principles of their movement, notwithstanding all the misrepresentation with which they had to contend, the people of Queensland placed the hallmark of their approval upon us, not only in elections during the war, but also in elections since the war.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Where do you carry your hallmark? (Laughter.)

Mr. KIRWAN: I just want to say that the proud position which the Labour party occupy in Queensland to-day is due to the fact that

they have been faithful to the principles of the Labour movement and have withstood all the ravages and divisions of the war.

With the measures mentioned in the Governor's Speech I do not intend to deal just here. I prefer to make any remarks I may have to make after I have had the privilege of studying them for myself. But it may not be amiss to make a few observations upon our friends on the Opposition benches, who were known before the election as the United party, who became during the election the Benighted party, and who are now known as the Disunited party. One reason ascribed for their defeat has been offered by the hon. member for Oxley. He said that they had no objective. Just imagine a party which claims to be a great party being in such a plight that it is possible for a gentleman associated with the movement to proclaim, after the great conference in Rockhampton, presided over by the great "brass hat," Sir William Glasgow, that they have no objective! I interjected during his remarks that they had an objective, and a very definite one, that was to oust this party from the Treasury benches; but, if they go on in the way they are going, there is a possibility that we shall remain here for a considerable time and they will remain in opposition for an equally long time.

The "Toowoomba Chronicle" of the 7th instant, in a leading article entitled "Disunited," made the following comment—

> "The political gloom investing the anti-socialists is penetrated with one ray of light. The Nationalists have decided to abandon association with the United party, whose incongruous and unworkable platform did as much as anything else to bring about the losses of the Nationalists at the last general election."

That is a remarkable statement. If there is one thing the hon. gentlemen opposite are remarkable for, it is the quick lightning change that they adopt in connection with their name. It does not matter whether they are known as the United party, the National party, the Liberal party, or any other party, they are the same old combination of political derelicts afloat on the sea of political opportunism, with sails set for any passing wind in the hope that they may get on to the Treasury benches. I wish to refer to the remarks of the candidate who opposed an old and respected member of this House—the hon. member for Toombul. I am sure I am expressing the sentiments of every hon. member in this Chamber and the staff associated with it when I say that we all regret that that hon. gentleman is at present prostrated through illness, and we sincerely hope that he and other members who are suffering from the prevailing epidemic will soon recover, and that once more we shall see them in their customary places in this House. The Mayor of Hamilton, Alderman Jenkinson, who opposed the hon. member for Toombul at the last election, speaking of the National party, said—

> "It was not mere followers that they wanted for their leaders—God forgive him using the name of 'leader'—(laughter)—but men with strength and individuality. Look at the House to-day! A fighting force on the Government side and a divided House on the Opposition side; an Opposition party that did not know which was its leader, with members who, when asked to cast their votes, had to scratch their heads and run the risk of getting splinters in their fingers." (Laughter.)

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: The electors of Toombul did not back him up in that.

Mr. KIRWAN: I am quoting this gentleman who has been associated with that party for a long time, and therefore he might be accepted as an authority. A remarkable manifesto, jointly signed by the leader of the United party, and the then leader of the Country party, to which reference was made this afternoon by the Premier, appeared during the election campaign. Speaking at Boonah on 24th April last, the then leader of the Country party, Mr. Vowles, said—

> "We are not going to allow the big proprietary interests in Brisbane to dominate us. That has been the real principle underlying the actions of those who have been throwing themselves so wholeheartedly into this unity stunt. The stunt is being worked by these big magnates to whom the word co-operation is anathema. From the word 'go' they were out to destroy us—the Country party."

Within a week of having made that statement the then leader of the Country party jointly signed with the leader of the United party an appeal to the electors of Queensland to elect them to hold the reins of government. He signed the statement in which this particular paragraph appears in large type—

> "Shall the Socialist Government, with its red objective and bitter class-conscious ideals, be returned to power, or shall it be, at once, replaced by a free Government, dominated by the ideals of justice to every class and equality of opportunity for all?"

How could the leader of the Country party at Boonah a few days before signing that document say that the United party was dominated by the big magnates of this city, or in other words by the money power? When the hon. gentleman got his instructions from the right quarter he was compelled to eat the leek and sign the joint manifesto, not only in his own name, but in the name of the leader of the United party.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Give us something about the Labour party in New South Wales.

Mr. KIRWAN: I will deal with New South Wales in my own time. Possibly I will pay the hon. member a compliment later in the evening. I read that during the elections the hon. member for Oxley addressed a meeting in support of Mr. Archibald in Ithaca in an endeavour to unseat my respected colleague, the hon. member for that district. He used a chart, and while he was engaged in the elucidation of some very complex problem, some wag at the rear of the meeting said, "Please teacher, may I go out?" (Laughter.)

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: What was the answer? Finish the story. (Laughter.)

Mr. KIRWAN: I want to deal briefly with some of the objections to the policy and the administration of this Government by hon. members opposite. I think it was the new leader of the Country party, the hon. member for Aubigny, who said that closer settlement had not progressed under this Administration

as it had done under previous Administrations. The hon. gentleman did not explain how it was possible to settle people on the land in Queensland while the Commonwealth Government were engaged in settling them in a foreign land for good and for all time. He overlooked the fact that during the administration of this Government thousands of Queenslanders were called away from the work on the farm and other avocations and were sent overseas. It is an unreasonable comparison to make now that things have become normal. The hon. member for Mirani made the startling statement, which is characteristic of the hon. gentleman, that under this Government agriculture has gone back. The hon. gentleman knows that is untrue. He knows that it is a slander on his own electorate and on the North of Queensland. I have a witness that I am going to put into the box in order to refute the statement of the hon. gentleman, and in order that he may take no exception to that witness I may state that it is no other than my respected friend, the Brisbane "Courier." In a special article on 14th October last, that paper stated—

> "In 1890 Queensland produced 2,000,000 lb. of butter and 170,240 lb. of cheese. In 1921 the butter total was no less than 60,923,194 lb., and the cheese output 15,200,527 lb. Figures such as these, which are contained in the report of the Registrar-General (Mr. G. Porter) on agricultural production in Queensland for the year 1921, show the gigantic strides that have been made in the dairying industry. Compared with the year 1920, the returns for 1921 show an increase of no less than 20,171,821 lb. of butter and 3,688,265 lb. of cheese, and easily form a record for the State. Dairy cows increased in number from 448,634 in 1920 to 554,208 in 1921. The value of the butter exported in the year 1920-21 was £2,964,204."

The point I want to drive home is that hon. members opposite are continually stating from the public platform, from the floor of this House, and we also have it from the editorial chairs of the daily Press, that under a Labour Administration the farmer will be driven off the land and there will be no agricultural prosperity at all. I say without fear of contradiction that, whether you take the sugar industry or agriculture generally, there is a prosperity throughout the State of Queensland to-day absolutely unknown in the reign of any Liberal or anti-Labour Government. In dealing with the area cultivated, the same article stated—

> "In 1920 there were 26,921 holdings, and the area under cultivation was 1,018,444. In 1921 the holdings had increased to 28,122, and the area under cultivation to 1,045,342, equivalent to 2.64 per cent. The value of farming machinery and implements was £3,294,533, an increase of £410,193 compared with the previous year. The labour employed in farming comprised 35,004 males (increase, 2,662), and 942 females (decrease, 56), and in dairying 20,391 males (increase, 3,231) and 15,293 females (increase, 1,065)."

There is an illustration to show that under a Labour Government, notwithstanding the alleged evil effects of land taxation, Labour legislation, and the general gospel preached by hon. members opposite, agriculture has progressed in Queensland. Some of the hon. members opposite stated that their party was largely responsible for the humanitarian legislation we find on the statute-

[8.30 p.m.] books throughout the length and breadth of Australia to-day. They can claim no such credit at all. I challenge the hon. gentleman to mention any of the great principles acknowledged by the great Governments of Australia—adult suffrage, old-age pensions, White Australia, or workers' compensation—which we have on the statute books to-day which are not there as a result of Labour's advocacy. Every one of those matters first found a place in the Labour platform and was first advocated here in 1890 by men like the hon. member for Bowen, who first blazed the track in North Queensland by preaching the gospel of Labour and making it possible as a result of the harvest sown for members of this side of the House to enter this Chamber. Hon. members opposite must admit that the Labour party were entirely responsible for creating public opinion to move hard-headed Tories, like the hon. member for Wynnum, to adopt some social reform. In connection with that there is one authority that I intend to quote, and I think hon. members on both sides of the Chamber, whatever their views may be, will certainly admit that he was one of the outstanding figures in Great Britain during the last century. He was a man of considerable intellectual attainments, he possessed gifts of statesmanship which he devoted—from his point of view and for the principles he espoused—to the cause of Great Britain and her Dominions. I refer to the great Liberal leader, William Ewart Gladstone, and I think he may be taken as a better authority than any hon. member on the Opposition benches. This is what he said—

> "I painfully reflect that in almost every political controversy of the last fifty years, the leisured classes, the educated classes, the wealthy classes, the titled classes, have been in the wrong.
>
> "The common people, the toilers, the men of uncommon sense, these have been responsible for nearly all the social reform measures which the world accepts to-day."

It is also true of Australia. I can remember, when Labour speakers stood up on the proverbial soap box at the corner of the street expounding the principles of the Labour movement and when we asked that every man and woman should have a vote because of their manhood and womanhood, they were told by the predecessors of the hon. members on the Opposition benches that they were advocating something which was unfair, something which would never find acceptance within the realms of practical politics, and that they were a band of visionaries and dreamers. But when the hon. members' interests were in jeopardy during the war and they wanted men to go abroad and fight, they did not say to every man who went up to enlist, "Are you a property owner?" or, "Have you anything to fight for?" No! So long as they were sound in limb and body they passed them as fit, and then passed them abroad to protect their interests, their wealth, and land possessions. When they asked, though, for a vote in the government of their country, they were told that that was only for men and people who had large business interests.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: Tell us who gave you adult suffrage?

Mr. KIRWAN: A well-known political character who once occupied a seat in this House—I refer to John Plumper Hoolan—made this statement in speaking in advocacy of adult suffrage, when the predecessors of hon. members opposite trotted out the old stock argument that that was for men who had a stake in the country—

> "There are plenty of men who have not a steak in their stomach, let alone a stake in the country."

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: State butcher shops did not exist then. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. KIRWAN: Take the question of white Australia. Hon. members opposite denounced that principle.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: You know that is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. KIRWAN: I say it is true.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: It is not true.

Mr. KIRWAN: I can remember a convention which was held in Melbourne in 1907. It was attended by leading ladies from the Nationalist organisation which backs hon. members at election times. They went down there and denounced the workers in the sugar industry. They referred to them as a band of criminals. They insulted their own kith and kin—men of their own race. They said that, since the kanaka had been abolished in Queensland, no white woman could be allowed out after dark, that no woman could trust her husband away from the house at night because of the class of men who were now working in connection with the sugar industry. (Opposition laughter.) This convention was presided over by Lady Clarke, and was attended by Mrs. Corrie, the late Mrs. Thompson, the wife of an ex-Mayor of Brisbane; Mrs. Chataway, the wife of an ex-Senator of Queensland; Miss Ogg, the secretary of the hon. member's leading ladies' organisation. These ladies spoke most disparagingly of the white men who were engaged in the industry, although they did not say that when they wanted them to go to the front and fight for them. Several other well-known ladies were also present. The fact that we have a White Australia to-day, and that we have a public opinion which will not tolerate any interference with that policy and which upholds the principles of adult suffrage, old-age pensions, and workers' compensation, is largely due to the splendid educational work indulged in by the members of the Labour movement and party.

The hon. member for Nundah made the remarkable statement that private enterprise was superior in every way.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIRWAN: I hope the next time a war is on that we shall apply private enterprise to it, and that we shall ask the hon. member for Oxley to tender for the work of protecting Queensland, and that hon. members opposite will make private enterprise responsible for everything else connected with the war. I guarantee the people here will not be as safe under old private enterprise as they would be under nationalisation. If during war time it is necessary for the Empire to apply the principle of nationalisation, not only to the collection of men, and to their drilling, but also in making provision for food supplies and everything connected with it, it is just as necessary in times of peace. The hon. member for Wynnum knows perfectly well that during the Denham-Barnes occupancy of the Treasury benches they received a cable from the Prime Minister of Great Britain outlining the provisions of a Bill which they were asked to introduce into this Chamber. On the afternoon they received that cable, with the consent of the Opposition, the Bill was put through in one sitting. What was the object of that Bill? To provide a food supply for Great Britain and her allies. Why did they not trust private enterprise and the squatters for that? Nothing of the kind! When it came to a question of protecting the Empire and making sure of winning that great war, they threw aside anything in the shape of private enterprise and nationalised all the manhood, food, and material of the nation from munitions downwards. They did not leave anything to private enterprise.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: It provided you with an excuse to steal the meat to make the State butcher shops pay.

Mr. HARTLEY: You enlisted and never went to the war. (Government laughter.)

Mr. KIRWAN: I had a certain amount of respect for the hon. member for Oxley, but he is not likely to keep that if he indulges in such stupid interjections.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: You answer that one.

Mr. KIRWAN: The hon. member knows perfectly well that, if the Government had taken meat which it had no right to take, they would have been taken to the Privy Council. As a matter of fact, they took the late Mr. T. J. Ryan, the then Premier of Queensland, there, and he wiped the floor with them, notwithstanding that they were backed by the opinion of leading counsel in Australia, who said that they were right and that the late Mr. Ryan was wrong. In the Mooraberrie cattle case, in connection with which the Opposition members talked of "the poor widow," the highest tribunal in the British Empire said to the State of Queensland, "You have done right."

The hon. member for Oxley made reference to the late leader of this party. He said something to the effect that he was pushed out. I want to say that that is not true. The late T. J. Ryan left the Queensland State Labour party because, like the big Australian that he was, he believed his duty demanded his presence in a wider sphere. It is too late in the day for hon. members opposite to slander him. When he was here on the Treasury benches they tried to discredit him by making untrue statements. If the spirits of the illustrious dead still participate in the concerns of this life, the spirit of Tom Ryan to-night says to this Treasury bench, and to the men who stand behind this party, "Go on and finish the good work! Build upon the foundations that I laid for you." I remember that during the election hon. members opposite said that if this party were led by the late David Bowman or Andrew Fisher it would be all right; but it was now in the hands of the "red raggers" and men of that kind. I have been associated with this Labour movement all my life time, and I see no difference in it to-day to what it was on the day when I was first enlisted into its services. Yet hon. members opposite tell me that they revere the memory of Bowman and Fisher, and now say they were all right.

I can remember the big boot strike in Brisbane when the late David Bowman took his place at the head of the bootmakers and asked for better conditions for the employees. The employers routed, defeated, and humiliated the strikers. They were beaten into subjection, yet the employers were not satisfied with beating the men to their knees; they picked out every man who took a prominent part in that strike and blacklisted him in every factory in Brisbane. The employer of that day did not care two straws if Bowman and his wife and young family were starving. They were out to victimise him and teach him a lesson; to prevent him using his right as a free subject to ask for better conditions for the people. Andrew Fisher was dismissed from the mines at Gympie, not because he was a drunkard or an inefficient worker, but because he was a leading spirit among the miners of that day. It is well known that he walked the streets of Gympie and, with the characteristic determination of the race from which he had sprung, said they were not going to drive him out of Gympie. And then the electors of Gympie, in 1893, sent him down to this House. Now, we listen to the maudlin humbugging sentiments of the party opposite, who say that, if we were like Fisher and Bowman, we would be respectable and decent people. The reason we are respected to-day is because we are in power, and if they could have humiliated us at the last election the workers would have got the boot put into them as did Bowman and Fisher.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: You forget we are the best friends of the working man.

Mr. KIRWAN: The hon. member for Enoggera had something to say about disloyalty. If there has been one result of this war, it is that we have less freedom to-day in Australia and throughout the civilised world than before the war, although we are told it was a fight for freedom. If I made statements in this House to-night like those made by John Dunmore Lang, or if I gave expression to the views stated by Sir Henry Parkes, hon. members opposite would want me to be deported because I was saying something which would bring about the disruption of the British Empire The Empire has not been built up on stuff of that kind. I remember seeing in "Reynold's Newspaper" where King Edward went to Hyde Park and listened to Republicans, where no doubt he got instruction and amusement. He came to the throne, and later his son became King of England. There is no good reason to believe that the Royal Family of England will be disturbed in any way, yet the hon. member for Enoggera talked about disloyalty. What about the loyalty of the crowd behind him? Here is a list of the subscriptions for various objects in this State—

| | £ |
|---|---|
| "Hughes testimonial ... ... | 5,000 |
| Subscriptions to defray expenses of London delegation ... ... ... ... | 4,000 |
| John Adamson's testimonial ... | 2,000 |
| Subscriptions to erect a refuge for old horses and stray dogs ... ... ... ... | 860 |
| Testimonial to V.C. heroes ... | 830 " |

£860 for the old horses and stray dogs, and £830 for the men who brought renown to this State and who wrote the name of "Australia" across the scroll of fame for all time? That was the time when we had big loyalty meetings in the Exhibition Hall, and the hon. member for Wynnum was one of the principal speakers. I saw a photograph in the "Courier" this morning showing another lot of Russians coming in here! A German consul is on his way to Sydney! His Majesty the King recently invited the German Ambassador to dine at Buckingham Palace!

Hon. gentlemen opposite covered their political nakedness with the Union Jack during the war. I have an exhibit here which may interest the hon. member for Oxley. We have heard a great deal about the results of Labour administration—of ruin and desolation. Here is a full page advertisement for the Labour Government in Queensland, which appeared in the "Telegraph" of 12th July—of glorious and immortal memory! (Government laughter.) It is not a description of the celebrations on that day, but deals with the widespread building industry in Brisbane: "Approaching a Record," "Present City Building Boom," "Three More Six-storied Buildings Planned for Queen Street." Do you think that those people, who never earned their money by swinging a pick, would invest their money in Queensland if they believed the statements that are made about the Government? The hon. member for Wynnum says one thing as member for Wynnum and another thing as a director of Barnes Limited. He erects a large building in the Valley; invests capital in Stanley street; then starts the Patriotic Insurance Company, of which he is the chairman of directors, and of which the hon. member for Warwick is also a director. As members for Wynnum and Warwick, they say one thing, but as directors for Barnes Limited, they are expending all their available cash in investments in this city. I wish them luck. I congratulate them, and I am pleased to learn that at the emporium they started in the Valley, in my electorate, they are doing a roaring trade. It only goes to show that the high wages and good conditions brought about by this Government have enabled a large firm like Barnes and Company, Limited, to open up in the Valley and secure a large share of the business. I hope we shall hear less of these slanders of Queensland. But, first of all, we should remember we are Queenslanders and that, no matter what our political differences may be, we should have the interests of the State at heart. Let us attack each other's principles—this applies particularly to members on the Opposition benches—let them attack this Government and not be slandering the State.

Mr. HARTLEY: What shall we attack? (Government laughter.)

Mr. KIRWAN: I must confess, in reply to the hon. member for Fitzroy, that I cannot say what he should attack. They are the softest lot that have ever been in opposition in my time. (Renewed laughter.) When we came here in 1912 I remember we tuned up the Denham Government, although we had only twenty-two members; but we were fighters. (Laughter.) We spent our spare time in the library getting ammunition ready to deal with the gentlemen occupying the Treasury benches, and it was due to the propaganda we put in during those three years when in opposition that we landed on the Treasury benches in 1915. I thank the

hon. members for their patient and attentive hearing, and I trust that what I have said has been of general interest.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. NOTT (*Stanley*): I am particularly pleased, Mr. Speaker, to see that you have adopted the robes of your office. In these days, too much observance cannot be given to symbol and ritual. The hon. member for Bowen said he was sorry to see this change, and he considered that it was a reversion to the dark ages. So far as I can see, it is not by any means a reversion to the dark ages. I regret that the hon. member for Bowen did not explain just how far he would like to go in the matter of the discarding of robes, and how far he would stop short of nudity. The hon. member for Bowen was a little inconsistent on this occasion, because, although he expressed disapproval of the Speaker wearing robes, he was very profuse in always referring to hon. members by the title of "Honourable" and we know that he —at least history so has it—enjoyed refreshments served by a waiter in buttons at the Queensland Club.

I am particularly pleased with the programme referred to in the Governor's Speech, and, so far as brevity is concerned, I have no fault to find. I am also particularly pleased with the Bills that have been promised in the Speech, as it shows that a number of us have been very accurate in our forecast as to what kind of legislation is likely to be introduced this session. So far as I can see from the Bills enunciated in His Excellency's Speech, the "red rag" element has not dominated the Government in any way. Of course we have had experience previously of Bills brought into this House, the principle of which the Country party could support to the utmost, but in a number of cases those Bills contained a clause that savoured of danger, and it may be that such will be found to be the case on this occasion when the Bills referred to are introduced.

His Excellency remarked in his Speech that he had paid a second visit to the North and West, and I am particularly gratified that he confirmed the opinion held by most people who have visited the North, and particularly by those individuals who have had the good fortune to reside in the North for a number of years—that it is a white man's country, and that it is a healthy place to live in. His Excellency mentions the fact that people going to the West and to the North should look for a higher remuneration than that received by people in the South. We can all subscribe to that sentiment. For years past certain people in the South have been saying that the North in unhealthy; but with the improved conditions in regard to housing and medical attention—consideration has been given to that matter in late years in connection with the hookworm disease—the men in the South will have to admit that North Queensland and Queensland generally have a climate equal to that of any other State in the Commonwealth. In his Speech the Governor stated that closer settlement was likely to be a cure for the ills that now exist in the North. We all agree with that; but the difficulty that presents itself to my mind is, where are you going to get the settlers from to go to the North and West? Certainly the prosperity in the sugar industry in recent years has done a great deal to populate the coastal belt in North Queensland, where population is particularly necessary. I am quite certain that there is room in Queensland for 30,000 or 40,000 more farmers than we have at the present time, and I am glad to see that the Government recognise that it is imperative, in order to bring about prosperity in Queensland, that people should be settled in the country districts. This has been postulated by the Country party since its inception some years ago; but I do not see how we can expect to populate the country districts without a scheme of immigration. I do not agree with hon. members opposite when they say that immigration must necessarily increase the number of unemployed here. Immigration in a country like Queensland should be a factor in making work for the unemployed already here. It is quite possible that immigrants coming into the country

[9 p.m.] may be able to carry on development work, and, if they bring a little capital with them, they may absorb some of the unemployed. To my mind, one of the greatest spokes in the wheel of developing country districts will be found in Arbitration Court awards. In industrial centres the Arbitration Court has increased the rate of wages to a very great extent, and those increased rates will certainly prevent men from going out of the industrial centres to the agricultural centres. You cannot blame them for it, because in the agricultural centres they cannot pay anything like the rate of wages which the industrial awards make it possible for workers to receive in the city. I believe the time has come when Arbitration Court awards are necessary; but if arbitration is to be successful it must be applicable, not only to industrial centres, but to every industry in the State; otherwise, I consider that arbitration must necessarily be a failure. Our present system of arbitration must sooner or later break down.

Mr. BRUCE: What do you suggest—direct action?

Mr. NOTT: The reason why I think the present system of arbitration must break down is because it is founded on a wrong basis. I consider that a mistake has been made in the decision to base the rate of wage on a family of a man, his wife, and three children. That is, I think, about double the basis which should have been taken in fixing the award, or perhaps a little more than double.

Mr. BULCOCK: Your objection to the principle is that the worker gets too much.

Mr. NOTT: In my opinion, the basis will have to be fixed on the primary industries, which have to compete in the world's market. If the basis is altered in that way, I believe that a very great improvement will take place. If the basis is fixed on industries which are only competing in our own State, or are practically State utilities only and have not to compete in other parts of the world, we can put those industries on an artificial basis; but, if you have arbitration in a number of industries in that way, as the hon. member for Sandgate pointed out, it is only a means to an end. The Arbitration Court is having somewhat the same effect in industrial undertakings as pools in primary industries. It is putting those industries on an artificial basis, and, if that artificial basis is at a very high point, it will mean that money will have to be obtained to bolster up the industries. So long as we continue the policy of borrowing

huge amounts of money, the Arbitration Court can be kept going, and the various industries depending upon it kept on an artificial basis. But, since one or two industries are on an artificial basis, it is only natural to suppose that other industries must languish unless put on a similar artificial basis; so that the Arbitration Court awards seem to me to be like the case of the kitten chasing its tail, and will continue to be so until the bursting time comes.

Mr. HYNES: But the same thing applies to the awards of the Sugar Cane Prices Boards?

Mr. NOTT: The Cane Prices Boards are practicable, because we are not competing in sugar with the outside world. If we were exporting sugar and competing in outside markets, the Cane Prices Boards would be an impossibility. We, as Queenslanders, and the rest of Australia have decided to put the sugar industry on an artificial basis, and it can continue on that artificial basis so long as we do not have to export a large amount of sugar.

Mr. HYNES: You really do not believe in the principle.

Mr. NOTT: The principle is quite all right; it is the basis which I claim is wrong.

There is another matter which the Country party are particularly interested in, and which a number of Labour supporters claim that they are interested in—that is, co-operation. It appears to me that co-operation is only tolerated and supported by the present Government from the fact that they hope to use it as a stepping stone to socialisation. If it is not so, I do not see why they should object, as they have done for three or four years past, to extend the Agricultural Advances Act to industrial workers. They have also voiced objections to the Whitley Council system and to profit sharing. If they were honest in advocating co-operation, they would do what they can to encourage these systems, and, if the workers had adopted them, there is no question that they could have owned many industries themselves on a co-operative basis. Probably they could have owned the coal-mining industry, and have been able to supply Queensland and other parts of Australia with coal. But it seems to me that the policy of the Labour party generally, and especially the O.B.U., requires that they must keep up a distinction between the workers and the capitalists. For that reason they do all they can to put a spoke in the way of the workers becoming owners of property through the Whitley Council or the co-operative or profit-sharing systems. They desire that a very large proportion of their supporters should practically be men who own nothing; consequently they will always be sure of obtaining a great deal of support from people who do not actually own anything.

I am very glad to notice that a Bill for the conservation of fodder is to be brought forward, and I hope that the measure will provide that the fodder shall not be taken from the farmers who produce it and put into dumps elsewhere. There should be some system whereby the fodder, as it is conserved, will be allowed to remain on the farm, otherwise, I am afraid that the loss and expense will be tremendous owing to the double-handling of fodder if it has to be brought back to the place it was taken from.

I do not see why fodder and water conservation should not be controlled by the State Advances Corporation, thus combining three activities in one, and probably effecting a good deal of economy. I look upon water conservation as one of the most important things to our western country, as well as to country adjacent to what is known as the coastal belt. I think it might be a very good thing for Queensland if 5 per cent., or some other percentage of any amount spent in boring or upon dams, were deducted from State income tax each year. That would encourage men obtaining holdings in the West to spend money on improvements, and the Government would not be likely to be out of pocket, because the more water a man put on a place the greater would be the income on which he would pay income tax. Many a man gets a property in the far West and works it with the existing water supply, simply because he thinks, "I do not know how long I shall have this place. The tenure is not too secure. I will take what I can out of the property; whereas, if some concession were given, very many men would spend large amounts in watering their holdings.

There is one other matter on which I would like to make a few remarks—I refer to cotton. The question of allowing the growing of ratoon cotton has been a very burning one, and to my mind the Government have made a mistake in banning ratoon cotton, for these reasons: In the first place, when a man sets out to establish a crop of cotton the greatest danger is in getting a successful strike, and getting his cotton to the stage where it can look after itself and stand the dry weather. If he does that, he usually gets a fair crop the first year. Cotton is not an annual crop. It is a perennial plant, although in countries where they have a winter severe enough to kill it ratoon cotton of course does not come into the question; and it is much better to have ratoon cotton in Queensland from a good plant crop than to run the risk of failing to establish another plant crop. I hold, too, that an abandoned or neglected plant crop is a far greater menace from the point of view of breeding disease than a well cultivated ratoon crop. It is an established crop; you know it is there. I had to plant two or three times before I got a plant crop, and other men have had to plant two or three times and then they got no crop except a failure. If you get a good plant crop, you have a good ratoon crop assured for the next year, and a good ratoon crop will be superior in the staple to a bad plant crop. In the dry belts of Queensland especially you will find that on the average the ratoon cotton will be superior to the plant cotton, because there the plant cotton has a pretty hard struggle to get hold of the ground and live through. Provided that the ratoon crop is kept clean, you are sure of bolls, whereas a neglected plant crop gets some bolls but the farmer will not harvest them. Whatever kind of insect attacks them—and there are many Australian insects which will acquire a taste for cotton—it will have a free hand. Just as in the fruit districts the greatest menace is the neglected orchards and trees, so will the neglected plant crops be the greatest menace to the cotton-growers of Queensland. There is this other advantage of ratoon cotton to the farmer. It saves him,

not all of the cultivation, but a good deal of the cultivation of the crop, whereas in ploughing out and replanting he may miss. Moreover, the cultivation of ratoon cotton will be analogous to the cultivation of ratoon sugar cane—much less than the cultivation of plant cane. I think that our idea in Queensland should be to get the greatest quantity of cotton marketed during the years when the prices are good. We know that this year and next year, and perhaps for some time onward, the prices will continue to be good; but cotton may be produced in large quantities in other parts of the world and the prices may come down. So I consider that the Government should do their utmost to see that the largest possible quantity of cotton is got from the farms of Queensland in the next two or three years; and I am quite certain that a far greater amount can be got by allowing the farmers to go in for ratoons than by blocking them. I think that, if the matter is sifted right to the end, we shall find that the negation of ratoon cotton has been based on a misconception as to what ratoon cotton actually means. It is probably what is spoken of elsewhere as bally cotton. Possibly those visitors who were so loud in condemning ratoon cotton were of opinion that it was second or third-grade cotton which had not matured properly—because, for instance, insects had punctured the bolls—although a staple was produced which might have a commercial value if treated rightly.

The hon. member for Sandgate stated that the consumption of milk in Brisbane amounted to about 10,000 gallons a day. If that is so, then I consider that there are very few people in Brisbane getting the quantity of milk that they should be getting. In a city the size of Brisbane the consumption of milk should exceed that quantity. There has been a good deal of talk on the milk question in Brisbane during the last three or four years. A good many of those individuals who did that talking were quite satisfied that they were only going to talk and that there was no intention of doing anything else. The hon. member for Sandgate mentioned the possibility of going in for the distribution of cream. In the distribution of milk we must be prepared for contingencies, especially in the warm weather, when we want so much more milk than what I might call the face value. We must be prepared to deal with a much larger quantity of milk than is actually required for consumption. Whether the milk supply is to be controlled by a pool, by the local authorities, or by the Government, there must not only be a milk depôt, but there should also be a butter factory, a caseine factory, and, perhaps, a powder milk factory as well, so that we can utilise the whole of the milk that is not absolutely fit for human consumption. We should be able to use the milk that, on account of the distance it has to travel, becomes really unfit for human consumption because of its acidity. I hope that this control will not become a piebald business. By that I mean that I hope that there will be no distinction between hot and cold milk. If we have the machinery for dealing with one class of milk, then it will be economical to deal with the other.

A lot has been said about humanitarian legislation. There has been a good deal of humanitarian legislation passed during the last twenty-five years, and it is only right that humanitarian legislation should be passed. No legislation could be of a more humanitarian nature than the legislation that will improve the lot of those living in the far Northern and the far Western areas, away from the centres of population.

The Premier stated that there was not a great deal of unemployment in Queensland. If that is so, why was it necessary to hand out £174,000 in relief in one year? It seems to me that that sum would pay for rations for 174,000 people for a week. I cannot accept the statement of the Premier and others that was delivered on the hustings with regard to unemployment. It was said that there was no unemployment in Queensland. Every person who was unemployed did not share in that sum of £174,000. There were many sons and daughters who lived with their parents, and there were many unemployed men who lived on the savings that they had previously made. When a further sum is added in respect of those people to that £174,000, I cannot see how anybody can claim that there was not a dreadful number of unemployed in Queensland during that time.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Does the hon. member know that a good deal more than half of that amount went to women and children, and not to unemployed men at all?

Mr. NOTT: That is so.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: We were paying State aid in addition.

Mr. NOTT: That is quite true. People should get State aid. There were many men obtaining rations, and I presume they were unemployed or they would not have got them. During the elections we were promised what I would call Country Party legislation. We were promised what I certainly consider is necessary and desirable legislation. The Government are bringing that legislation forward this session. I hope it will be honest and straightforward and will not be loaded, and I hope that, when the Bills are passed, they will be administered in the best interests of the development of Queensland as a whole, and not administered in the interests of a certain class only.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. A. J. Jones, *Paddington*): I will not detain the House at any great length. I propose to deal with one subject only.

Mr. CORSER: Is that the State iron and steel works? (Opposition laughter.)

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: In the Speech delivered by His Excellency in opening this Parliament he made reference to the British Empire Exhibition which is to be held in England next year. He says—

> "The British Empire Exhibition will be held in England next year. Queensland is participating in this venture in co-operation with the Commonwealth and the other States. My advisers are doing everything possible to ensure that this State's products will be creditably represented at the Exhibition"

I hope that sentiment finds a place in the minds of all true Queenslanders and of those who are capable of understanding and appreciating what a great advertisement to Australia this Exhibition is likely [9.30 p.m.] to be. Considering the position I hold in regard to that Exhibition, that of Chairman of the State Commission, it is not out of place that I should

trace its origin. The Exhibition was initiated away back in 1903, but on the outbreak of the war, in August, 1914, it naturally had to fall into abeyance. On the cessation of hostilities, however, the scheme was revived at a meeting held under the auspices of the British Empire League. That meeting was attended by Ministers, High Commissioners, and Agents-General of the various Dominions, and a resolution was unanimously carried to hold this Exhibition of the manufactures and products of the Empire. The choice of site fell on Wembley Park, London, and the following sentiments were expressed by the Right Honourable W. M. Hughes:—

> "You ask me, Sir, on behalf of the Commonwealth of Australia, to do all that is possible to make this Exhibition a success. That I give you my assurance we shall certainly do. We shall endeavour to be worthily represented, and I hope the promoters of this Exhibition will not hesitate to seek the co-operation of the Commonwealth in any way that they think necessary."

The Prime Minister of New Zealand, the Right Hon. W. F. Massey, speaking on behalf of New Zealand, said—

> "I shall be very glad, and I commit New Zealand to this—that New Zealand will do everything that it possibly can to make this Exhibition the tremendous success that it deserves to be."

The Hon. H. Mentz, speaking on behalf of South Africa, said—

> "General Smuts and Sir Thomas Smartt have asked me to assure you that they will do their best to make this Exhibition a success."

The Hon. Dr. S. F. Tolmie, speaking for Canada, said—

> "I am quite sure that I can say we in Canada will be glad to take a very earnest hand in making the Exhibition a great success."

Sir William S. Meyer, speaking on behalf of India, said—

> "I guarantee that India will do her best so far as in her lies to make it a great success."

Those sentiments not only prove that the representatives of the Dominions approved of holding this Exhibition, but they certainly committed their respective Governments to making it a success. So far as Australia is concerned, all the Governments of the Commonwealth readily agreed to co-operate with the Commonwealth in this matter. In the first instance it was agreed that the sum of £120,000 should be provided by the Commonwealth and the States for oversea expenditure. The Australian Pavilion will cover no less than 140,000 square feet, a greater space than that occupied by the whole of the Dominions at the Franco-British Exhibition and the Panama Exhibition. The sum of £120,000 was therefore found to be totally inadequate for Australia's requirements, and the then Prime Minister, Mr. Hughes, appealed to the various States and asked that that amount should be doubled. Queensland agreed to take part in this Exhibition, and the whole of the States readily agreed to this increased expenditure. The amount now approved of by the Commonwealth and States is £200,000. About £160,000 of this amount will be spent oversea in erecting and preparing the Australian Pavilion, which has one of the best sites at the Exhibition. Major Belcher, who visited this State on behalf of the British Government, was instrumental in aiding in selecting the site for Australia, and stated that it was almost the choice of the sites. The money required was allocated by the Commonwealth and States in this way: The Commonwealth will provide £115,000, and the balance, £85,000, is to be provided by the States on a percentage of population basis. New South Wales, with a population of over 2,000,000 people, representing 39 per cent. of the total population of Australia, will provide £33,150; Victoria, with 28 per cent. of the total population, will provide £23,800; Queensland, with 14 per cent. of the total population, will provide £11,900; Western Australia, with 6 per cent. of the population, will provide £5,100; South Australia, with 9 per cent. of the total population, £7,650; and Tasmania, with 4 per cent. of the total population, £3,400. A Federal Commission has been appointed by the Federal Government, comprising the Premier of each State and his Deputy—that is the position I am holding at present—and one commercial representative; the State Governments in each State have appointed a State Commission; and the State Commissions have appointed various subcommittees controlling each industry which will be represented at this Exhibition.

Mr. KELSO: What about sending some members of Parliament?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: It is quite competent for the hon. member to attend that Exhibition at his own expense. I hope that as many representative men of Queensland as can find it convenient will attend. I was very pleased to note that the hon. member for Oxley intends to visit England next year, and I have no doubt he will find a place in that Exhibition. Various committees have been formed representing each industry which will be represented at the Exhibition, and it is not difficult for one so closely in touch with the State Commission and subcommittees as I am to appreciate the good work that they are doing to make this Exhibition a success.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: You might tell me what they do.

Mr. KELSO: What is the opening date?

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: The Exhibition will open in April of next year, and extend to October of the same year. I do desire to pay a tribute to the members of the Commission and the subcommittees in this State for the very earnest work that they are doing, and the voluntary effort that is being put into Australia's part of this Exhibition.

At 9.40 p.m.,

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

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: It is impossible to gauge the benefit to Australia, but I am sure of the benefit she will derive from taking part in this great oversea function. In my opinion, if we are to be truly represented, and the great resources, possibilities, and wealth of Australia and Queensland are to take their place side by side with those of other Dominions, such as those of Canada, we should enter into the matter whole-heartedly. I have heard the man in

the street express the opinion that we should not be represented at this great advertising medium at all. It would be far better for us to stand out altogether than not to take up the work properly. Exhibitions, no doubt, have a great tendency to stimulate trade and to encourage manufacturing. In France all Governments have recognised that for many years past, and have attached the greatest importance to this form of encouraging trade and manufacture, and have made their exhibitions a national affair. Canada also leads the way so far as exhibitions are concerned. There they have maintained for the past fifteen years an Exhibition Commission, consisting of only one man, who has gathered around him a number of experts trained in the installation and preparation of exhibits. Their efficiency in this direction is great.

The objects of the Exhibiton are set out quite clearly in a handbook published in Great Britain. I would like to quote from that handbook the objects of the Exhibition:—

> "1. The Exhibition aims at taking stock of the resources of the Empire, and at showing how those which are as yet undeveloped or only partially utilised can be converted into wealth; to bring to light possibilities of growing more grain and wool, more sugar and more cotton, more timber and more fruit; of mining a larger quantity of metals; of adding in every way imaginable to the production of commodities which meet the world's needs.
>
> "It is proposed to bring together a complete collection of all minerals found within the Empire. Australia will be worthily represented in this collection.
>
> "2. The second object of the Exhibition is to make the peoples of the Empire better known to one another; to show how they work and how they play; what are their principal sources of wealth; what are the natural features of the land they inhabit; how they have built and adorned their cities; the nature of their schools and of their factories; the houses they live in.
>
> "Australian art will be given a place in the Imperial Art Palace.
>
> "3. The third object has a very important scientific side. Committees of eminent men are working in London to arrange displays calculated to arouse public interest in all efforts to conquer disease and unhealthy conditions of existence. Housing and sanitation will be given especial prominence. The Commonwealth of Australia will provide a health exhibit.
>
> "4. The fourth object of the Exhibition is to enable established industries to show what they have to offer and new industries to attract attention by proving what they can do. It is certain that directions can be discovered in which trade within the Empire can be very much increased."

That sets out the objects of the Empire Exhibition so far as Great Britain is concerned. The desire of the Commonwealth and State Governments is to show the worth of Australia—what she is capable of producing, what she is capable of manufacturing, and what she is capable of doing generally. The respective Governments can do this successfully only by the hearty co-operation of the people. We are accepting exhibits by donations, and I think, if success is to be achieved and we are to be worthily represented, we can do much by voluntary effort. Those who are manufacturers are helping in this direction. The wool and beef people and the mining community are doing much by voluntary effort to make the Exhibition a success. While we accept exhibits by donation, we also send exhibits on consignment. The persons who are good enough to allow exhibits to go over by consignment will get the benefit of having the freight paid overseas, also insurance on their exhibits, and they may get the benefit of a sale after the Exhibition; or, subject to certain conditions, during the currency of the Exhibition. Fifty per cent. of the profits of this great Exhibition will be distributed and divided among the Dominions, so some of the expenditure that the Commonwealth and the States has entered into may possibly be recouped in that way. We should not look at the small amount that we are likely to spend in this direction if we can get a compensating benefit. The Queensland Government is contributing £11,900 to the Commonwealth Government for the Exhibition, and there will be a further few thousand pounds which we shall require for procuring exhibits, for staff, and work to be done in Queensland and in Australia in getting the exhibits to the seaports. Our total expenditure from the State Treasury will be about £20,000. I believe there will be a compensating benefit not only to Queensland but to Australia generally. In Canada, I believe, the Provinces are subordinate to the Dominion in the matter of exhibits. The Commissions, both Federal and State, are endeavouring as far as possible to encourage a broad Australian sentiment in connection with the Exhibition. There may be times when one has to stand up for one's own State, but it would have been a good thing, when this Exhibition was first mentioned in Australia, if we had wiped out of our minds for the time being the imaginary border lines which separate the States, and had taken up the matter as Australians rather than as the representatives of the individual States. The identity of the States will be preserved by the proper labelling of the exhibits. That is as it may be; but the Australian sentiment will prevail right through this Exhibition, and we are endeavouring to foster the idea that we are first Australians and secondly Queenslanders or New South Welshmen, as the case may be.

It is well known to most people that the great war left the world very much poorer. Since the war, in Great Britain and in Australia, there is a scarcity of almost every necessity of life; there is a scarcity of foodstuffs; and there is a scarcity of raw material to keep our factories busy. The war may have been an advertisement for Australia and for Australian people, but it is not the kind of advertisement that we look for again. This Exhibition will be one of the best advertisements that Australia can possibly have, and we look forward to its being one of the best advertisements that Australia has ever had. Following the destructive period of the war this Exhibition should give a great stimulus to and cause a revival in trade and manufacture. Australia on this occasion is going to make a big effort to show what we can produce, and to show to

the world that we can produce wool equal to anything produced in any part of the world; to show that we can produce beef, cotton, timber, fruit, and agricultural products; and not only that we can produce them, but that we can manufacture in our own country some of our raw products into articles of use. We must prove to the people of the world at this Exhibition that we have millions of acres of land on which people can settle, and it is regrettable to know that, according to a financial report published quite recently, our imports to Australia last year exceeded our exports by over £30,000,000. That should not be. We should encourage manufacture in this country to such an extent that we should be able to export some of our surplus manufactured articles. This Exhibition will encourage people to come here; it will encourage money to be invested in Australian industries, especially if we can show to the people overseas that we have a country rich in natural resources, that we have all the fuel necessary for the carrying on of great industries, and that we have the raw products to manufacture into articles of use. I hope the Australian people will not complain of the action of the Commonwealth and State Governments in entering into this great Exhibition and providing the sum of money that is necessary to show what Australia can do. The Exhibition will do much to people this great country of ours.

I listened with a good deal of interest to one or two speeches delivered in this Chamber on the Address in Reply, and I have no hesitation in saying that our first objective should be to people this country. We want more people here, and the way to get more people here is to give every possible encouragement to primary production, to make land available for the people, and to establish secondary industries so that work will be provided for people who may desire to come and settle in this sunny land of ours. It is a fallacious idea to think for a moment that more people means more unemployment, or less work. (Hear, hear!) I believe that more people mean more work. More people create more work, and more people will mean greater prosperity for the States and for the Commonwealth. It is a fallacious idea to think that we as a Government do not believe in encouraging people to come here, and that we do not believe in immigration, because we do. It would be a sad thing, however, to bring a lot of people out here before we have land available on which they may settle, and before there is work provided for them by the establishment of the industries that can and will be established in Australia. A bold immigration policy should go hand in hand with a vigorous land settlement policy—(Hear, hear!)—with a vigorous railway policy, and with the establishment of secondary industries. We have all the natural wealth. We can grow the best beef, or beef equal to any that can be grown in the world. Certainly Argentina has a little advantage over Australia in that the cattle growers have given greater attention to the breeding of their herds and they are a little more adjacent to the market. But it is known that we can grow the best wool in the world and much of it, and more of that wool can be manufactured in our own country. If we encourage people to come here by the establishment of secondary industries, we are creating for the primary producers that which is the best market for any country—that is, the local market.

I believe this Exhibition will do much to encourage people to come here, by advertising Australia and showing what we can produce and manufacture. It will do much to maintain the White Australia policy, and it will encourage secondary industries and promote settlement. I do not intend to deal with any other subject. I [10 p.m.] particularly wanted to give the facts and the amount of expenditure which is necessary on the part of the Commonwealth and State Governments in order to give Australia the opportunity of showing what we are capable of doing. I am sure that the people of this State and those of the other States will assist their various Empire Commissions in making this Exhibition one of the best advertisements our country has ever had. I believe that, if energy and wisdom are made the cardinal features by those engaged in this work, the result of the Exhibition will spell something done for Australia.

Mr. WALKER (*Cooroora*): I have listened with pleasure to the Minister's interesting speech. We know that the Empire Exhibition will mean a great deal to Australia. I have been to a good many of these stunts during my lifetime—I went to a big one in the old country once—and I think they are of little value so far as advertising the State is concerned. In my opinion, the best way to advertise Queensland and the Commonwealth is to make the conditions more attractive in more ways than one, and, if we do that, we shall get all the people we want. What the Minister has said regarding what we can produce and manufacture is very true. We can produce anything in Australia; but unfortunately we cannot produce it cheaply enough to compete with people in the outside world, and that applies to our manufactures also. We know that we can manufacture anything in Australia, because we have the material and the right men to do it. The advantage which the Southern States have with regard to taxation compared with Queensland causes foreign capital invested in manufacturing concerns to go down South at the expense of Queensland. That has taken place a great deal more during the last few years than it did before. It is an unfortunate position for us to be in, and it is no use to advertise the State at a great expense unless we are able to produce at a profit. That is my opinion with regard to the Empire Exhibition. The Minister showed what we can do in the sending away of our products, and we know perfectly well what we can do.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The people on the other side do not know what we can do. One of the unfortunate things is that so much Queensland and Australian produce is not sold as such.

Mr. WALKER: For the simple reason that we cannot produce as cheaply as the other fellow. Take pines, butter, and beef; the reason why we cannot compete at present with other countries on the London market is because they are putting the particular product on the market cheaper than we can do it. A great deal has been said about Argentine beef. We know that the quality is a shade better than ours; but the point is that British capital has been invested in Argentina to the extent of £400,000,000, and those financial institutions are controlling their particular concerns there to-day. We know that the difference between chilled beef and frozen beef is

hardly noticeable, so far as the palate is concerned. Frozen beef is good enough for anybody, more particularly if frozen under Australian conditions and put on the market in reasonable condition.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: If it is handled properly by the cook, no one can tell the difference.

At 10.5 p.m.,

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Mr. WALKER: That is my opinion. The greatest advertisement we can get is to encourage British capital to be invested here in the building of our railways, and in other directions. I hope that Queensland will not spend too much money on this Empire Exhibition project at this particular time, because we want all the money we can get in Australia.

I was particularly pleased with the speeches of the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, and I was also struck by the manner in which the hon. member for Nundah delivered his speech. I am sure that these new members will be an acquisition to the House. Likewise I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, upon your return to the high position you occupy—I suppose one of the highest positions a man can attain in this State—and I recognise that the fact must be satisfactory to you more than to most Speakers, because you have acted with absolute impartiality. Anyone who sat in the Chamber last year and knew the position of the Government would never expect you to do anything but what you did. If we had been over there, we would have done the same thing, and expected our Speaker to do the same thing; and, if he had done it, he would probably have got criticism from your side. It is fair to acknowledge this, and I recognise that you are the fairest Speaker in my experience as a member of this House for sixteen or seventeen years, and most of the others came from my side of the House. You have been courteous to the greatest degree. But there is one thing I would like to say with respect to the occurrences of last year. We went through very strenuous times, and the Government amended the Standing Orders to stop discussion to some extent. That may be all right in a short session, but four and a-half hours to discuss each Bill, some of them voluminous measures, is not enough, nor is it fair to the country. We have heard a lot about government by evolution, but it is not government by evolution to force the "gag" on the Opposition unfairly. It is not fair to introduce a Bill to-day, put it through its second reading to-morrow, and its Committee stage the next day, more particularly since the Upper House has been abolished. Give us time to discuss all Bills; then you will be carrying out your democratic principles in the spirit in which you should.

There are one or two omissions from the Governor's Speech which I regret. There is no doubt that His Excellency has travelled a great deal and has a great deal more knowledge of Queensland than many Queenslanders who have not had his opportunities. He has entered into the timber and afforestation questions in a way which must commend itself to all persons who have them at heart. He has visited many centres, and the way in which he has spoken on many subjects has proved conclusively that he takes a keen interest in Queensland. We are particularly fortunate in having him as a successor to a man like Sir William McGregor, and he is a man of similar character.

I should like to make reference to one or two disabilities under which the people in the country labour in comparison with those in the towns, which up to the present the Government have not rectified. Take the cost of living and the various privileges which the people have in the towns, but which are denied to people in the country. We know perfectly well that the cost of living here is something like 10 per cent. cheaper than in a town like Gympie or Toowoomba. We think the time has come when consideration should be given to the cheaper carriage of necessaries of life over the railway, such as bread and meat and other things which are used every day by all classes, and on which the people in the country cannot afford to pay additional charges. Then, take the hospitals. We in the country take pride in keeping our hospitals going. We take pride in giving our guinea or our five shillings to that purpose; but we find also that we are taxed to keep up the Brisbane Hospital. I say that the time has come when you should not talk of the nationalisation of hospitals, but of putting the Brisbane Hospital on the same footing as those in the country, that is, make the local authorities or the people of Brisbane responsible for their own institution, and, if they will not do it voluntarily, tax them and not the people in the country for the purpose. It is a crying shame and a disgrace to the workers and all those persons connected with Brisbane that they do not keep their hospital in the same way as we keep ours in the country. Then, again, we in the country find that we are handicapped by having to pay higher railway fares than the people in Brisbane. Many workmen living on railway lines would like to get workmen's season tickets or other tickets on the same basis as the people in Brisbane, but they find, if they want to travel between Gympie and some other town, that they have to pay almost double the amount which they would have to pay if they were travelling the same distance near Brisbane. We should be placed on an equal footing with the towns. We should not have to sacrifice some of our pleasure in life because we want to go to town.

I would like to deal with school accommodation. We have a very sympathetic Minister. He travels through the country a good deal in connection with his work, and that appeals very much to the people in the country. At the same time, we say that we should get greater consideration from those people who earmark the money for school purposes. At the present time we want new schools in my electorate. Last year we had two schools put up by the people themselves, who did that rather than allow their children to go uneducated. I refer to the Flaxton School. At that place £240 was subscribed from about a dozen people for the purpose of building their own school. In the city you have those palatial schools and residences, stone buildings, and tennis courts, which is all very nice. I do not deny the city those privileges, but at the same time greater consideration should be given to the people in the country.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The department does not pay for the tennis courts.

Mr. WALKER: The department has to pay for the handsome buildings and many other privileges that are enjoyed here. In the country we do not press so much for school residences when we ask for schools. We get no residences at all. To-day I want three new schools and vast school improvements in my electorate. In some of the schools the children are sitting on boxes, and in some of them I believe they are using broken slates. That is a deplorable state of affairs, and conditions which do not exist in the towns. Probably the children will be educated just the same.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: At what school are they sitting on boxes?

Mr. WALKER: I will tell the hon. gentleman later on. We also know that some schools are short of furniture. Only the other day improvements were required at one school, and the money was immediately subscribed by the people. A bullock-driver came forward and said he would cart the timber out 15 miles free. That is how they get their schools built in the country.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Is that a provisional school?

Mr. WALKER: It is at Cooloothin.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: It is not a State school.

Mr. WALKER: The children in the town have advantages which are not extended to the children in the country. I understand that recently a regulation was issued, providing that, in order to become a teacher, a person must pass the University Junior Examination. Look how they will be disadvantaged in the country.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: It is not necessary that they should pass that examination.

Mr. WALKER: They must pass some examination equal to that examination.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Not quite. They must take an examination equal to the fifth class standard.

Mr. WALKER: We have high schools in towns like Gympie. What opportunities have we of sending our little girls and boys to those schools when there are no hostels for them? We do not ask for these hostels for nothing. We are prepared to pay for them. It is only fair to the country mothers that, when the little girls and boys are sent to school, the mothers may feel that their children will have the protection of a matron and they can lay down their heads and feel that they are being cared for there just the same as in their own homes. It is impossible for them to send their children there, and the result is that we have not got our right proportion of country teachers. In other words, they have to stay at home and milk, and are not able to do some of the finer work that the little children in Brisbane are privileged to do. The time has come when we should have a hostel in Gympie. Gympie is not the old mining centre. It is a farming centre, with one of the biggest dairy companies in Queensland keeping it going. It pays out about £400,000 to £500,000 a year, which keeps the whole of that district going. We ask that a hostel be put there so that we can take advantage of the higher education which the department is so liberally giving to this State.

Mention is made in the Governor's Speech of a Forestry Bill. We know that the forestry question has been troubling us a good deal of late. The Government have spent an enormous amount of money, but we cannot get information as to the exact amount of money spent in this direction because, I think, a costing system has not been used in connection with the industry, and it is impossible to ascertain how much has been expended. The Bill will not help to grow more pine than we are doing to-day, though under it the Government may be able to regulate the internal workings of the department. What we want to do is to show that we can grow pine commercially with success. The Government have not done that, although they have been at it for the last seven or eight years. My idea is to achieve that end by giving private enterprise a little encouragement. The time has come when the Government should adopt the systems carried out so successfully in other parts of the world, and especially in Europe at the present time.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: We are not stopping them.

Mr. WALKER: You are not giving us any encouragement, and you know that the land tax question is involved in any improvements to the land.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: No.

Mr. WALKER: I have been paying land tax on a small portion of pine on my own land. I had evaded it for a number of years, and then a man was sent up to do it for me. I speak feelingly on this particular subject, because my heart is wrapped up in the outside country. I recognise that, if you make the country attractive and prosperous, you will not have the people flocking to the metropolitan area to the picture shows and pony races, which they only know of in the country by the papers.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You don't expect the Government to grow proper hoop pine in seven years?

Mr. WALKER: No; but I expect you to do more than you are doing. You are now charging 16s. 6d. on certain timbers which were originally sold by the Government for 1s. 6d.

Mr. CARTER: No: we are not.

Mr. WALKER: I can only refer the hon. member for Port Curtis to Brooloo.

Mr. CARTER: I will give you some figures to-morrow.

Mr. WALKER: The Government now charge 16s. 6d. there as against 1s. 6d. previously.

Mr. CARTER: The average royalty is 5s.

Mr. WALKER: The Government are making an enormous amount of money out of the sale of pine, and I say that the time has come when some kind of costing system should be initiated, so that we shall know exactly where we stand. I know the Forestry Department have made a certain amount of money; but they have been dealing and speculating in timber too. They have been buying timber from the small sawmills at 29s. per 100 feet and handing it over to the Railway Department for 37s. 6d., without any handling at all beyond the book entry. That is why they are making money. And that is why hon. members opposite can talk about the Forestry Department and

what a good paying concern it is. In and around Gympie we have thirty-two areas, aggregating 224,000 acres, set aside as State forests. This means that we are almost locked up on the western side with State forests and timber reserves. We may have to retain these lands for timber purposes, but in doing so we are hampering the progress of Gympie, because much of the land is totally unsuited for the particular purpose for which it has been reserved. Some years ago I challenged the then Director of Forests, Mr. Jolly, on a similar matter. He took up my challenge, and, as a result, we spent two days going over the particular areas, and I was able to show that the land was unfitted for growing timber. I am prepared to do that also to-day. I would suggest that, when it is proposed to lock up land for forestry purposes, the matter should come before Parliament. At the present time action may be taken on the report of a junior officer, which is passed on to his senior, and then on to the Minister. The land is then locked up for ever, and only an Act of Parliament can take it from the department.

I venture to say that 20 per cent. of the land around Gympie is totally unsuitable for forestry purposes. Right along the Mary Valley line you see hundreds of acres of first-class fruit land, worth, cleared, £50 and £60 an acre. The Secretary for Agriculture knows that is perfectly true.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I don't agree with you at all.

Mr. WALKER: Then, I must appeal to the hon. member for Gympie, who has gone into this question with me. If you had settled your soldier boys along there, you would have had a successful settlement to-day. As a matter of fact, we had some of the Highland boys sent up there, and they are doing very well; but the Government charged them £10 an acre for that land. When you calculate the interest on the price of the land and the labour involved, you keep their noses to the grindstone all their lives and do not give them a chance. Not a penny of this money will be spent on roads.

If you want to have successful men on the land in Queensland, it would be far better to give the land away to everybody and not charge exorbitant prices which will prevent us having the success we want to see. We know that we were settling twice the acreage before this Government came into power. Still we have hon. members opposite asking us to notice the area settled last year. We ought to be increasing our land settlers by thousands every year on account of the age of the country and the natural increase of the population. The Secretary for Mines spoke of bringing in immigrants, which is a very sound policy, but we cannot get land for our own boys; it is locked up for State forest reserves, and there have been no recent resumptions. I was keenly interested in the speech of the hon. member for Bowen, who said that land was available in his district. Why is it not thrown open?

Mr. COLLINS: It has been thrown open.

Mr. WALKER: It should be advertised, and we would have any amount of men going there and taking up the land. Do you think the men who went to Beerburrum would have stopped there if the land around Bowen had been available?

One of the greatest troubles that we have at the present time is the question of supplying producers with markets. We have no markets worth having. Take the meat industry. It is going down, yet we have Agents-General and Trade Commissioners all over the place. They are not worth a snap of the fingers to the producers. We get no advice, but simply have to take pot luck and to employ our own agents here and there. The trouble is to get reliable agents. I have only to refer to the way butter a few years ago was manipulated in the London market to prove conclusively that the information we got is not of a reliable nature. That is our trouble, and if the Government would only concentrate on getting a market for what we can produce and seeing that we get a square deal, I venture to say they would be worthy of the confidence of the country for another three years, without doing anything else at all. Concentrate on the markets of the world, and the Government will be doing good work for our own country. Take meat to-day. We are producing good quality beef. It is no use saying our cattle are not good. They are good cattle well slaughtered, and the beef is well handled; but, unless we are prepared to go further and get on the British market with our own stuff—and we cannot do that without the assistance of the Government—we are never going to beat the British money invested in Argentina. That is the thing we are up against in the meat industry to-day. It is the same with butter which we are producing to-day. I would like to see the whole of the State enterprises which we know to be be failures wiped out. The Government have made big mistakes, and it is just as well to be candid and say we are going to waste no more money on these experiments that are non-paying. If they wipe them out, the Government will get the support of the Opposition. We will play the game with them. We will not make political capital of it, because all the political capital that could be made has been made already. Wipe these State enterprises out, and, if the money expended had been spent in assisting private enterprise to experiment in other directions, the Government would have done a great deal of good. I was going through Foggitt, Jones's factory to-day. See the work they have carried out. It is a credit to the firm. They are not only carrying out experiments in connection with the tinning of meat, but are also making experiments in the tinning of fish. That is the sort of thing that is going to do good to Australia, and, when that can be done by private enterprise, surely to goodness the Government could give them a little encouragement to carry out these many experiments to which I have casually referred.

There is another matter which is of vast importance to Queensland—that is, the renewal of loans falling due. By wiping out these State enterprises to which I have referred the Government will create a better impression in the London market. According to the "Courier" to-day, references were made in the House of Commons to State enterprises here, and they mix up the business with our railways through having no local knowledge. Let us create a better impression at home, and let the Opposition stand loyally with the Government in this matter, so that we can get our loan moneys under the best possible conditions. We have loans totalling over £25,000,000 falling due. That is an enormous amount of money, but I venture to say that, with the assistance the Premier must have, and with his fertile mind,

he will make a very good deal for Queensland. I am sure also that the loans which were raised in America recently have been an eye-opener so far as the hon. gentleman is concerned, and I do not think the Government will go to that country again for loan money.

We have also heard a good deal of talk about the sugar industry. I am not going to refer to the sugar agreement except to say that the Government have not lost any tears over the sugar industry on account of their past actions. It is no use saying they favoured the old agreement. I heard right through the political campaign that the Labour Government were responsible for the good conditions prevailing in the sugar districts, and that, if they were returned to power, they would see things were properly carried out.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That is so.

Mr. WALKER: The Government had nothing to do with it at all. When the agreement was brought in by Mr. Hughes, we know very well that the Premier put his signature to it just the same as he has to put his signature to something he does not approve of to-day. The Labour Government were not responsible for the old agreement. In Queensland we know that every Nationalist, Country party, and Labour member representing Queensland in the Federal House was in favour of a renewal of the old agreement.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: A number of Nationalists voted against a renewal.

Mr. WALKER: I venture to say that, if the Labour party were in power in the Federal Parliament, there would be found just as many voting against the agreement. We have only to look up the names in the old division lists to see that such would be the case. It is a deplorable state of affairs, and I do not think it should be brought forward as a party measure. We want to get back the old agreement, and I venture to say that even at this late hour, if the two parties work shoulder to shoulder, we shall be able to bring sufficient pressure on the Federal Government to secure an extension of the old agreement. We must have it in operation again for the sake of Queensland. The only way to get out of our difficulty is to present a united front. If we bring party politics into the business, it will be regrettable. In a few months the tariff question will be brought up, and then it will be found who the friends of the sugar-grower are.

Mr. HYNES: The increased duty is not an alternative to the sugar agreement.

Mr. WALKER: But the Labour party in the Federal House voted against the increased duty.

Mr. PEASE: No, they did not.

Mr. WALKER: The division list shows that.

Mr. PEASE: They voted for an amendment.

Mr. WALKER: I notice that an Income Tax Bill and a Forestry Bill are to be brought forward. I trust that encouragement will be given to big concerns, so that they can establish industries here and compete with the Southern States. The Liquor Act is going to cause a little trouble in the House again, as it did before. I think the suggestion of the Government to make the hours of business of hotels from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m., or, if possible, from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m., is a good one. I would like to see the hours limited in that direction, and employees in hotels given as good conditions as those in other industries. A Bill is also going to be brought in to encourage prospecting for oil, and to stop speculation in wild-cat ventures. I think that is a wise measure, and I hope that its scope will be sufficiently wide to enable amendments to be moved. I would like to see sufficient encouragement given to private enterprise of a genuine character, so that, if oil is discovered, the prospectors will have some reward for their work. I would like to see all property, freehold or otherwise, covered by the Bill, as that will give encouragement to oil prospecting. If the conditions are made the same as those which apply to mineral prospecting, it will be a good thing.

Mr. LLOYD (*Kelvin Grove*): I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Question put and passed.

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

The House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.