

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 19 JULY 1923

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 19 JULY, 1923.

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

MEMBER SWORN.

MR. P. A. McLACHLAN.

Mr. P. A. McLachlan, having taken the oath and subscribed the roll, took his seat as member for the electoral district of Merthyr.

QUESTIONS.

SELECTIONS FORFEITED, 1916-1922.

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

“How many selections were forfeited in the years 1916, 1917, 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921, and 1922, respectively?”

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. W. McCormack, *Cairns*) replied—

“1916, 774; 1917, 543; 1918, 937; 1919, 1,013; 1920, 1,044; 1921, 812; 1922, 702.”

INCREASE ON ESTIMATED COST OF INKERMAN IRRIGATION SCHEME.

Mr. SWAYNE asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

“Out of the increase from the original £130,000 estimated as the cost of the Inkerman Irrigation Scheme to the present one of £500,000, how much is represented by the purchase of material and machinery, and how much in wages to employees on the job?”

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS replied—

“The figures quoted in the question are incorrect. Original estimate, £131,000 (wages, £19,728; machinery and material, £111,272). Cost to 30th June, 1923—Wages, £98,927; machinery and material, £293,924. Difference—Wages, £79,199; machinery and material, £182,652.”

ADVANCES TO TREASURER UNDER COMMONWEALTH BANK AGREEMENT, ETC., ACT.

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

"1. What is the net amount which the Treasurer could have claimed as loan from the Commonwealth Bank and the net amount actually drawn under clauses 10, 11, and 12 of the agreement, during the period since the State Savings Bank business was handed over to the Commonwealth Bank?

"2. What rate of interest is charged on such loan?

"3. What is the net amount received by him as profit under clause 15 of the agreement during the same period?"

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

"1. Amount available and accepted under agreement, £1,493,665.

"2. 4½ per cent. per annum.

"3. State's share of net loss to 31st December, 1922, £9,638 16s. The result of the transactions for the half-year to 30th June, 1923, is not yet available."

SOUTH ERISBANE RAILWAY EXTENSION TO GAS COMPANY'S WORKS.*

Mr. FRY (*Kurilpa*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

"1. Has the necessary survey been made and plans been prepared for the construction of a railway from the present terminus at the Adelaide Steamship Company's wharf in Stanley street (near Victoria Bridge) to the South Brisbane Gas Company's works in Montague road?

"2. If so, will he make known to the House—(a) The route selected; (b) the estimated cost of construction; (c) when the work of construction will be commenced?"

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

"1. The scheme was brought under my notice by Mr. W. Dobbinson, Highgate Hill, in March, 1923, but no survey has been made.

"2. See answer to No. 1."

LOSS UNDER COTTON GUARANTEE.

Mr. EDWARDS (*Nanango*) asked the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock—

"1. What was the total amount lost on the cotton guarantee on last season's Queensland crop?

"2. What proportion of loss was a charge on the State, and what proportion was made good by the British Cotton Growers' Association?

"3. What is the estimated loss, if any, to the Commonwealth and State on the crop just harvested in Queensland?"

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Eacham*) replied—

"1. The total loss to the State on the crop of 1922 was £23,016 12s. 3d.

"2. For the charge to the State, see No. 1. The British Cotton Growing Association paid £6,688 13s. 2d., being the balance available under their agreement to find £10,000 to recoup any loss upon a fixed price of 1s. 6d. per lb.

"3. The ginning has not been completed, nor have any account sales been received from Europe of this crop, therefore no information can be given."

ALLOCATION OF PROCEEDS OF "GOLDEN CASKETS."

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

"1. What total amount was allocated to his department as proceeds from the 'Golden Caskets' held during the year ended 30th June, 1923?

"2. How much was allocated by his department from 'Golden Casket' proceeds to the maintenance of hospitals during that period?

"3. Were any such proceeds utilised for other purposes during that period? If so, what were the purposes and the amounts so used?"

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

"1. £160,804 8s. 10d.

"2. £136,289 2s. 11d.

"3. Yes. Bush nursing grants, £500; baby clinics (purchase of sites), £1,922 2s. 2d.; advance to Works Department in respect of erection of the training school for baby clinic nurses, baby clinics, and maternity wards, £15,000."

PROFIT OR LOSS TO QUEENSLAND ON AMALGAMATED SAVINGS BANK BUSINESS.

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

"As, according to clause 15 of the Commonwealth Bank Agreement Act, this State shares equally with the Commonwealth in any profit or loss attaching to the amalgamated Savings Bank business in Queensland, and according to the last Auditor-General's report the State has contributed £13,086 as its proportion of the loss up to 31st December, 1921, will he state what has been the profit or loss to Queensland for the half-years ended 30th June, 1922, 31st December, 1922, and 30th June, 1923,"

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

"Half-year ended 30th June, 1922—Profit, £1,718 10s. 11d.; half-year ended 31st December, 1922—Profit, £6,672 2s.; half-year ended 30th June, 1923—Information not yet available."

QUEENSLAND STAFF FOR BRITISH EMPIRE EXHIBITION.

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

"In connection with the British Empire Exhibition in England next year, in which Queensland is participating, will he state—

1. What is the anticipated number of Queensland staff required in connection with the exhibits of this State?

2. How many have already been selected, their names, and to what positions?

3. How many are returned ex-service men?

4. Will he recommend or adopt the principle of preference to returned men in this connection?"

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

“The matter of oversea staff is now under the consideration of the Federal Commission.”

WORKERS' COTTAGES AT CANBERRA.

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

“1. Has he seen the statement appearing in the ‘Daily Mail’ of 18th instant, that a contractor has offered to erect workers’ cottages at Canberra, at a cost of £180 each, and experts’ statements that such cottages would in Sydney be rushed by 100,000 workers at £1 per week?”

“2. Will he cause inquiries to be made as to their suitability for Queensland in view of the great shortage in houses?”

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. W. Forgan Smith, *Macray*) replied—

“1. Yes.

“2. Yes.”

NET PROFITS OF STATE BUTCHERY.

Mr. GILDAY (*Ithaca*) asked the Secretary for Public Works—

“As the hon. member for Nundah stated that the State Butchery cannot compete against private firms in the open market, will he give the net profits of the State Butchery since it has been established?”

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS replied—

“The hon. member for Nundah spoke without knowledge of his subject, as had he referred to the Trade Commissioner’s Report last year, page 11, he would find that the net accumulated profit on the State butchers’ shops to that date was £140,686—approximately $\frac{1}{4}$ d. per lb. After allowing for payment of meat export companies’ claim and loss on consignments of frozen meat, the net accumulated profit of the State Butchery business to 30th June last was £51,928 15s. 1d. As to competing against private firms, I would add that during the past year the business has increased. In Brisbane alone last week the State shops served over 40,000 customers.”

NET PROFITS OF STATE FISHERY.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*) asked the Secretary for Public Works—

“1. Will he give the net profits of the State Fishery since it has been established?”

“2. If no profits, what was or is the total loss?”

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS replied—

“1 and 2. The accounts for 1923 are not yet completed, but I refer the hon. member to page 42 of the Trade Commissioner’s Report to 30th June, 1922, showing a total net loss to that date of £30,502 18s. 8d.”

THE STATE TRAWLER.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE (*Oxley*), without notice, asked the Premier—

“Is the State trawler still resting at the expense of the Government, or has it found a new home?”

The PREMIER replied—

“It is still resting.”
(Laughter.)

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: You mean rusting.
(Renewed laughter.)

PRIVATE SAVINGS BANKS BILL.

INITIATION.

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

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirability of introducing a Bill to make provision for the regulation of Savings Bank business carried on in Queensland by private persons.”

Question put and passed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Mr. LLOYD (*Kelvin Grove*), who was received with Government “Hear, hears!” said: I must follow the example of other hon. members and congratulate you, Sir, on having been re-elected to the position of Speaker, and more especially on the manner in which your re-election was received by the House. A certain amount of adverse criticism is to be expected, but, I think, it was the minimum that the Opposition felt the position required. You have been congratulated on having resumed the official vestments of office, and it has been suggested that your doing so restores dignity to the proceedings of the House. I am not sure that the dignity of the House is such a frail thing as to require the wearing of vestments, but I think that, for practical reasons, it is a wise step. (Hear, hear!) When the Speaker leaves his private apartment and comes into the House, hon. members standing in the passage are ordered out of the way while he is passing through, and, as most of us do not wish to be ordered out of the way without knowing the reason, the wearing of vestments will be a means of letting us know whether the gentleman whom we have been ordered out of the way for has a right to have that done.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: It sounds as if you have been in contact with a policeman lately.

Mr. LLOYD: I had an experience which it is not necessary to go into now, because I believe that, under the new Standing Orders, the time allowed for speeches on the Address in Reply is now limited to forty minutes, so there is no time to waste on personal experiences.

I think that His Excellency’s advisers are to be congratulated on the Speech which has been put before the House. Complaints come from the Opposition that it does not contain enough information—that it is not sufficiently illuminating on the policy which the Government intend to carry out. This is common to all Speeches from the Throne, whether in this Legislature or in any other representative body of a similar kind in the British Empire, or in the King’s Speeches that have been put before the British House

of Commons. I am therefore rather surprised at the criticism coming from the quarter from which it did come. Opposition members have been specially entrusted to see that no violent or revolutionary changes are carried out. They are—I use the word in no offensive sense—the Conservative party, to see that nothing very rash or revolutionary is done; and it comes rather as a shock to find those hon. members advocating a departure so violent and revolutionary as a definite and explicit Governor's Speech. If the Speech does say nothing—which I do not think is the case—it certainly says nothing rather well, briefly, and concisely. It therefore differs very much from most documents which have the purpose of saying nothing; the general practice is to say nothing with an abundance of words.

I do not think the charges are justified. The Speech indicates the matters that will be dealt with during the session, and how those matters will be dealt with is a matter of general knowledge. The party which is at the present time in power in this House has had its policy before the people of Queensland for a great deal more than a quarter of a century, and any necessary elucidation as to current matters of policy were clearly explained in the manifesto of the Premier and in the official statements of Ministers during the election campaign. I do not think that any reasonable doubt exists as to what will be the nature of the legislation on the matters that are mentioned in the Speech.

There is one little matter I would like to deal with while on the subject of the Speech. There is certainly scope for reform in the manner of presenting the Speech. I am not sure whether you in your office, Mr. Speaker, are responsible for the continued existence of this arrangement or not, but I should like to put forward a view which I think is not confined to myself. I think that at the beginning of the session we waste two days in what is little better than useless and meaningless ceremony. The swearing in of members could be carried out by the simple device of getting an elected member to sign a declaration before his returning officer, and that declaration could simply be posted in to you or whoever receives the declarations. That would save one day. As to the reading of the Governor's Speech, I think that that dates back to the time in the British House of Commons when the gentlemen of England despised the arts of reading and writing. I think all of us in this House have sufficient education to be able to read printed documents, and it is not necessary for us and for our friends to sit here for the best part of an hour or more to hear the Speech read, although I have no doubt it was very well read. I see no reason why the Speech should not be gazetted, and the function connected with presenting it to members of this House could be cut out altogether.

Mr. KIRWAN: You should consult the ladies on that matter.

Mr. LLOYD: I am coming to the question of the ladies now. I think the manner in which invitations are issued to the ceremony connected with the opening of Parliament is not consistent with the principles of democracy. The feature of privilege enters into it. If the electors have a right to be present personally at that function, they should be there as a matter of right. As it is now, it is a matter of privilege, and there

are certain very objectionable features connected with it. Tickets of different order or rank are issued; the holders of some are admitted into the House at certain times, others later, and others, who are presumed to be of less importance, are admitted to the galleries only. If it is necessary to have such a function—I do not think the function is necessary at all—but if it is necessary to have it, we should have it either in this Chamber privately with no one present but the Governor and hon. members, or we should hold it in the middle of the Ascot Racecourse and invite the people of Queensland to be present.

Mr. KIRWAN: I object to that. I say Market Square or the new Town Hall, if you go out of this.

Mr. LLOYD: That is not a revolutionary or even an original proposal, because, as most hon. members know, the inaugural ceremony of the Australian Commonwealth was carried out in the middle of Centennial Park, Sydney, and all Australia was invited to be present.

Mr. ROBERTS: They had special seats there for special citizens. You had one if you were there.

Mr. LLOYD: I sat on the fence. (Laughter.) There may be some ambiguity in that statement. I may say I had not entered politics at that time. I have never sat on the fence since.

On looking through the Speech, it is gratifying to see that most of the measures promised are part of one big co-ordinated constructive policy aiming at the better regulation of production, which is the most important work which the present Government have undertaken. I think that is the real reason why the Government gained the confidence of the electors so signally at the last election. The victory was a recognition of sound policy—not so much because great results had already been obtained in that direction, because it is a long, slow process to go through—that we are on the right track and that the Government had done the best possible under the circumstances.

Until we arrive at the better regulation of production, we shall always be faced with the greatest of all social evils—the evil of unemployment. Whenever an election takes place during a time of unemployment, both parties assure the electors that, if they are returned to power, they will abolish unemployment. I admit that very few of the people who make these statements really take them seriously. It is astonishing to find experienced business men, who know that under the present economic system these periods of slackness and unemployment recur as regularly and as certainly as the seasons and are likely to recur so long as the present economic system continues—it is astonishing to find these men assuring the electors that, if they get back to power, they will find work for everyone; and, when asked how they are going to do it, they propose measures which have been tried and have failed over and over again. The present Government are trying to get at the root of the evil, and are trying to introduce some stability in production, especially production in primary industries. The Government have shown a great deal of patient effort, and we can see an indication

Mr. Lloyd.]

that their efforts are beginning to tell. Unemployment is not a question which can be discussed at any length on this occasion. We are here to discuss concrete measures, and it would be very difficult and almost impossible to treat fully the immediate causes of unemployment. My impression is that few of those who write on economics really know much about the subject. We have general statements made about the inflation of credit and its consequences, but I have never found a writer on economics who could take one concrete case of a depression which has followed a period of great activity, and trace the way in which one stage merged into another. I do not, of course, refer to cases where a great war has taken place, or where something in the nature of a social or economic cataclysm has occurred; but we know that those periods occur at times when there is no great disturbance. We all know that the greatest depressions often exist in countries which have all the natural resources to make them prosperous. Tasmania has been, for the last half century at any rate, the State where work has been hardest to get, and yet it is more favourably situated than any other Australian State with regard to its natural resources. The favourite explanation which is given is that over-production has taken place, but over-production on a general scale—that is over-production of the necessaries of life—seldom if ever occurs. There are cases occurring every day of some special commodity being produced in excess of the purchasing power of the people to buy it; but there has never yet been a time when the good and necessary things of life were produced in excess of the demand for them by individuals willing and able to give their labour towards producing them. What we can do in Queensland is limited by the fact that we are not entirely a self-governing State. Without control of the tariff we can never hope to effect a complete solution of the unemployment problem; but we can do a great deal to minimise its evils locally; and we can also do a great deal by demonstrating what can be done in such a way as will be educative to other States, and, I hope, to the Commonwealth generally.

Just as a far-seeing man in business may so carefully watch what really is in demand as to assure for himself and others interested in his business a certain stability, [4 p.m.] so a careful Government may assure for its own State a certain stability in its prosperity; and I think the scheme which the Government introduced during the last Parliament for the organisation of agriculture is going to be the greatest contribution we have yet had to the solution of the unemployed problem as it exists locally. It is gratifying that at last something has been done in the Unemployed Workers Act to alleviate the lot of the individuals who are unemployed, but it is a pity that very inadequate palliative was made the subject of attack during the election. An appeal was made to some of the worst instincts of human nature by attempting to antagonise men in work against the contribution of the very small sum of 3d. a week toward alleviating the troubles of their less fortunate fellow men who are without employment; but it is gratifying to see that it had very little effect, because in the industrial centres right throughout the

[*Mr. Lloyd.*]

State the result of the appeal to the electors was a record of increased confidence in the Government.

Related to the question of unemployment is that of immigration. I think that we all admit that an increase in the white population of Australia is one of our greatest necessities, and, whilst I am not one of those who believe in passing on to the Federal Government anything we can do ourselves, it must be admitted that immigration is, after all, a Federal matter, and that it can never be handled properly by a Government which has not control of the tariff. We know perfectly well that we would stand no chance of getting desirable immigrants from Great Britain at the present time if they knew the exact facts about Australia. Although we may be able to prove to them that the conditions in Queensland are more prosperous than they are in other parts of Australia, at the same time they know perfectly well that the state of the Queensland labour market is always regulated by the state of the labour market elsewhere in Australia. People in Great Britain who have a real knowledge of the state of things in Australia know perfectly well that we have plenty of people here already who would go on the land if there were sufficient inducement to do so. I heard a statement in the House last night that plenty of young men in Queensland were wishing to take up land. There is certainly a rush for good land so soon as it has been opened, but in most cases we find that the people who originally take it up do so with a view to selling out a few years afterwards. A gentleman who was at one time a member of this House, Mr. Bridges, told me on one occasion that the only possible way to make money out of farming was to sell a farm.

Mr. ROBERTS: He has made more money since he left this House than he made in it, and not by selling land either.

Mr. LLOYD: The demand for land in good localities is nearly always due to a desire to acquire the land for speculative purposes. Those individuals on the returned soldier settlements who are pressing so much to have their leasehold turned into freehold make no secret about that. I have had individuals tell me frankly, when I represented a constituency in which there was a returned soldier settlement, that that was their object, and they appealed to me to do my best to get the Government to alter their policy so that they could sell their holdings and get out.

Mr. BRAND: Can they not do that under perpetual lease?

Mr. LLOYD: They can, but the impression seems to be that it is more easily done with freehold. I think we have it on the authority of hon. members opposite that freehold is a much more convenient thing to handle in that way.

Mr. CLAYTON: What about over there?

Mr. LLOYD: One matter which is watched with very keen interest by the few really interested in it is the greater Brisbane scheme, to which I would like to devote a word or two of criticism. The word "criticism" is so often misused that, when most of us hear the word, we take it that something hostile is in view. I am using

the word in the sense of its literal meaning—judgment based on an examination of facts. To criticise a proposal is to discuss its possibilities for good as well as for bad. The better control of the affairs of the metropolis is not entirely a local question. The metropolis is the concern of the whole of Queensland, and not merely of those persons who live in it, although, of course, it is more immediately their affair. It is rather unfortunate that, when everybody seems to be agreed upon a certain matter, very little interest is taken in it. Hardly anyone connected with local government in Brisbane will deny that a greater Brisbane scheme is desirable. Our local authority affairs are in a very complicated state. We have different municipalities, with very arbitrary and artificial boundaries. We have had in many cases to establish joint boards to handle matters which cannot be handled by the separate local authorities. There is the Water and Sewerage Board, the Tramway Trust, the Victoria Bridge Board, and boards to deal with matters of minor interest. So that we have made some progress towards the amalgamation of the different municipalities already. Unfortunately very few persons seem to give very serious attention to the form which the proposed measure is likely to take. The position now, however, is very much easier than it was, say, ten years ago, because the question of the franchise has been settled. Before that was done, in any discussion of a greater Brisbane scheme the real question was invariably obscured by a consideration of the local authority franchise.

At one time I was asked to read a paper on local authority matters before a progress association. Acting on my previous experience, I stipulated that the question of franchise was not to be discussed that night, with the result that there was no discussion at all. In dealing with the question as to whether or not the responsibilities now exercised by the different bodies should be exercised by a central body, the question of the franchise was so much in the minds of those who were present that the question of amalgamation was left out altogether. Now that that matter has been settled, and the tramways have been taken over by the public, it is a very much easier thing to go about the question of effecting a Greater Brisbane scheme. The trouble to me seems to be the boundaries of the various local bodies. If we include everything that affects the metropolis we shall in some cases have to stretch out the boundary as far as 20 miles, and I am afraid that some outer local authorities will be very disinclined to come in at first. I think it would be a good idea if the Government considered some scheme for obtaining the opinion of the people of Brisbane who are most directly affected in this matter. I am making this suggestion in order to stimulate interest in the question. First of all, a draft scheme could be prepared and issued, and every elector living in the areas proposed to be included should be furnished with a copy. I do not mean that it should be an ordinary Bill couched in legal language, but it should be a short readable résumé of the proposal. This could be circulated, and then, after an interval of some months, a conference of elected representatives could be held. Whether the representatives should be elected by the present local authorities or directly

by the people is another matter. I think it would be better if they were elected by the people in the same way as the conference was elected which considered the drafting of the original Commonwealth Constitution Bill. Finally, the Bill should be submitted by referendum to the electors of the area concerned.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The chief trouble is the indebtedness already incurred by the different local authorities.

Mr. LLOYD: Quite right. The position is full of trouble. The debt question is too difficult to enter into now.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is the main difficulty.

Mr. LLOYD: There are other difficulties; it is a most complex question. I think the greatest difficulty is the lack of general interest in the scheme. My proposal to submit the scheme to the people of Brisbane is more for what I think will be the indirect good than the direct good. I think the indirect good in awakening public interest in this question will certainly be worth the trouble and delay in referring it to the people. The Greater Brisbane governing body could do very good work in advising the Government on metropolitan matters. The people in remote corners of the State complain that everything is done in the interest of Queen street; and, when I lived in a remoter part of Queensland than I do now, I thought that there was a great deal in that. Certainly the people who live in the metropolis have easy access to the Government and to the officials, and they have many advantages which they are not slow to make use of. Nevertheless, there seems to be on the part of Governments a rather remarkable misunderstanding of metropolitan questions. One thing in which I think there should be some co-ordination between the joint municipalities of the metropolis and the Government is the suburban railways. If some arrangement could be made by which the Greater Brisbane municipality could take over some of the responsibilities connected with the financing of the suburban railways, and be allowed in return some share in control, I think we would have a very much better system. That brings me to the question of Central Railway Station, which is a most important metropolitan question. I understand that it is the intention at no very distant date to enlarge the track and widen the tunnel, so that there will be four lines running into Central Station. I am afraid that we shall never get satisfaction at the present site. Mr. Crowther told me at the time when the Central Station site was originally discussed that there was an alternative proposal to have the terminus at the Police Barracks.

Mr. KIRWAN: That is where it should have been.

Mr. LLOYD: It is inconceivable to me why that proposal was ever turned down. There would be scarcely room for one platform if we stopped at this point; but, if we resume Market Square and stop the building of the Town Hall—there are more important things than the building of the Town Hall—we would have space there for one of the best railway stations in Australia. In the course

Mr. Lloyd.]

of time it might be necessary to resume right up to George street. We should have a site upon which we could put a perfect Central Station.

Mr. EDWARDS: It would be better if more consideration was given to the people in the country.

Mr. LLOYD: There could be one main platform running parallel to Adelaide street, and the other platforms could run at right angles to that platform, as is the case with the Sydney Central Railway Station. The people who live at a great distance from the city, and who do not travel very much, do not care whether they land at Roma Street or Adelaide street; but to those in the outer suburbs it means a great deal. In dealing with the communication with the outer suburbs I attach great importance to that, because it seems to me one of the best ways of solving the question of overcrowding. Easy communication will invariably lead to an increase of opportunities for workers to leave those parts inside the city and find a better and healthier place outside.

The removal of the penal establishment at St. Helena is another matter which concerns the metropolis rather intimately. From time to time it has been suggested that the prison should be removed from St. Helena, and that a pleasure resort should be established there. There is certainly the question of expense, but I understand that some years ago it was definitely decided to build a prison elsewhere. I hope, if that is done during the period of the present Parliament, that the island will be set aside for the public. At the present time we have no first-class watering place within easy distance of the metropolis.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: What about Sandgate?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Who would keep the place in order?

Mr. LLOYD: I think that could be fixed up all right.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Who would—the local authorities?

Mr. EDWARDS: The Home Secretary.

Mr. MAXWELL: The local authorities.

Mr. LLOYD: If we had a Greater Brisbane municipality, I think the island could be very conveniently handed over to that body, provided they managed it properly, otherwise it could be run as a State enterprise. An island like St. Helena, if made into a public pleasure resort, would return a profit of 50 per cent.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: If you put a public house on it it would.

Mr. MAXWELL: That is the only thing you can make a profit on.

Mr. LLOYD: I do not think it is right at this stage to anticipate the discussion which will take place on the Liquor Act.

There is just one other matter I wish to touch on, and that is in connection with the elections. We have heard a good deal on that subject. It is the discussion that follows every election—as to how the Government managed to get back. It is pretty clear, however, that the Government got back because they enjoyed the confidence of the majority of the electors. The complaint has been made that in the remotest part of the

[Mr. Lloyd.]

State representation is not on a more liberal scale. You will find that in every State in Australia and in the rural districts of every country, including Great Britain and Ireland. In all cases area has to be taken into account in connection with population. The constituencies with the largest numbers of electors are in South-East Queensland, where the population is most dense.

There is a matter in connection with the redistribution scheme that has caused a little inconvenience. That is the trouble caused to the ordinary citizen to find out what electorate he is in. Very often you may be living in a certain electorate bearing the name of a place which may be many miles away from you. A redistribution scheme comes along, Federal or State, and you find through it that you are in another electorate bearing the name of a place 10 miles in another direction. Perhaps we could get out of this difficulty by substituting numbers for names, or if we adopted new names altogether. At the present time the Federal Government seem to have adopted the State electoral districts for their own subdivisions, but it does not follow that they are always going to do so. It sometimes happens that the name of the Federal subdivision is an entirely different name to the name of the State electorate. I think we could get over this difficulty by a very simple device—that is, to compel every owner of occupied land to put up on his land a metal plate showing the names of the State electorate, the Federal subdivision, the municipality, and the ward or subdivision. I think we could go a little further, and, if it is freehold land, we could put up the description of the land.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Why not leasehold, too?

Mr. LLOYD: We could do the same with that, too. If the occupant wanted to file any documents which required that information, it could be got readily. This is not an impracticable scheme.

Mr. EDWARDS: You could put all his troubles on the board, too. (Laughter.)

Mr. KIRWAN: And a hoarding with the troubles of the Country party.

Mr. LLOYD: Such a matter would have to be carried out by the State, and the expense charged against the individual owner. The cost would not come to more than a few shillings, and perhaps a flat rate could be charged, the Government taking the chance of alterations. The public generally and the officers responsible for registration would thus be saved endless trouble.

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

Mr. G. P. BARNES (Warwick): May I congratulate you, Sir, on your elevation to the high and dignified position of Speaker of this House. In all sincerity, so far as the Government side of the House is concerned, I know of no man whom I would prefer to yourself to see in the position you occupy to-day. You happen to be next door to a "townie" of my own, for you are a Warwick boy, and it is pleasing to know your comrades have again indicated their confidence by placing you in the position referred to. (Hear, hear!)

I heartily congratulate the new members on the efforts made by them in the speeches which they have already delivered.

The Speech before the House is the briefest one on record. Still, it contains much which is of interest to all the people of the State of Queensland, and those matters which have to do with the uplift of our land, the helping of the people to develop the country—a country that cannot stand still, or should not stand still, and which will not be allowed to stand still—are going to meet with the very strongest support from all hon. members on this side of the House. If I rightly interpret the sentiments of the men who have been returned to this House, it is that they are bent on shouldering individual responsibility and collectively joining hands in any direction which will be for the permanent benefit of the country. As to matters that may be doubtful to us, that may be suggested, or that may be brought forward, you may depend they will meet with the disapprobation that should come from the Opposition. I have referred to the brevity of the Governor's Speech, and I am not sure that, coming from the source it does, it is any worse on that account—I rather approve of it in that connection—but I want to recall to mind and compare this Governor's Speech with that of 18th August, 1920. You remember that that Speech was very extravagantly worded and was intended for propaganda purposes, and it was used in that particular way. I am not sure, after all, it served the Government party well, although it was their intention that it should act in their favour. I think that that Speech did more harm than good. It was different indeed to the insignificant looking document that was issued this session. Certainly, the very fiery letter of the Premier written to various individuals throughout the State during the election campaign was more effective and did better work than the long Speech delivered here by the Hon. Mr. Lennon in August, 1920.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Did you get one?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: No; I want to know why not. (Laughter.) It is a very unfair thing to distinguish between man and man. As it happens, a co-director of mine—perhaps by inadvertence—received the document which I hold in my hand. It is [4.30 p.m.] very good so far as it goes, but unfortunately, although coming from the Premier, I am inclined to think that there are two statements in it that can be contradicted from beginning to end. (Government dissent.) However, I am not going to say much more regarding that just now.

I agree with many things that are said in the Speech, but particularly do I agree with the third paragraph, which states—

“The Parliament which has just been elected is faced with the task of dealing with many problems of great moment to the people of the State.”

That is perfectly correct. I believe there was never a time in our history when we were face to face with matters of greater importance and which required fuller consideration, deliberation, and decision at the hands of the people than to-day; and never were opportunities greater than to-day to achieve something for our country. Yet some of the matters of the greatest possible moment which should have found a place in the Governor's Speech have been left out.

I maintain that one of the gravest matters that we can take in hand, and must face if we are to occupy and retain our present position, is the matter of immigration. Strange to say, that great question found no place

whatsoever in the Governor's Speech. Yet there has never been a time in the history of Australia more opportune for making such a move than at present. I am aware that in days gone by our attention was given to the matter, and a great deal was done; and we should not have found ourselves where we are to-day but for carrying out such a policy. Now we are having the means laid at our feet to bring people here. Not only are the Commonwealth ready to assist us, but we find that people themselves are ready to nominate their friends from abroad to come to Australia. Above all, there is a great overseas movement ready to land immigrants here. Australia, above all countries, is ready for the helpful hand, and we should show that our disposition is to accept the proffered help. I maintain therefore that it is a bit belated for the Government to pass by one of the greatest questions. Certainly an explanation was forthcoming, but we are not a great deal wiser to-day. We are told that it is the right thing to do, that Australia must be peopled, that we cannot retain it unless we people it—that it will belong to somebody else unless we give due consideration to the question. We are told all these things, but also that we must be very careful and must go cautiously. After an eight years' reign the Government are still going cautiously, and I believe that, unless they are awakened by public feeling, they will go cautiously to the end, and a great opportunity for helping the people of Australia and Queensland will be lost to us. It is evident from the Premier's remarks that his idea at the present moment is that we should fill up the lands of our country with our own people—a very good and right thing to do—but our own people are not making use of the opportunities they possess in that direction. We find that Italians and other aliens are coming from abroad and are stepping into places and making good at every turn. No one will say that similar opportunities are available to our people, and therefore we should hold our hand until our own people indicate that they are satisfied. If we do not give them satisfaction, the policy will be a baneful one, and will not work for good. Our idea is to go ahead, and, whilst we should avoid the landing of people here with no land ready for them and no opportunities available for them, yet we have got to move simultaneously in this direction with the opening up of land and bringing of people here. By the time things are in motion—after all the efforts which are being made and with the land that the Government say they are preparing—we shall be ready for them. I think in connection with this matter one of the sorriest things is the matter of our population; I maintain population is the first thing we want.

Another great thing which the Government have neglected to refer to is the matter of land tenure. We want to know what the tenure will be when all these lands are opened up. Will it be of such a nature that the people will be induced to apply for and settle upon the land?

Another matter that might well have been referred to in the Speech is that of secondary industries. There is nothing whatever to indicate that any helpful hand is going to be given to the people to establish those industries. We are almost bursting ourselves in connection with the establishment of the cotton industry, and every man rejoices in the prospect of that industry becoming a

Mr. G. P. Barnes.]

wonderful success. But are the opportunities available to make it a success? We must also think of the wool industry—are we going to take action in connection with the establishment of these industries in their secondary forms by means of woollen and cotton mills.

It would have been a very fine point if the Government had included in their programme something that has to do with the encouragement and establishment of cotton mills.

At 4.40 p.m.,

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

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Then we would be paving the way to find work for many of the unemployed who are in our midst, and who will continue to be in our midst unless we do something in that direction.

I find that one of the most serious things we have to contemplate in connection with population is that during the eight years of the management of the affairs of this country by the present Government, we have scarcely held our natural increase. Very few people realise the seriousness of the position that we occupy to-day as a State. In 1915 our population was 678,675. Up to 30th September, 1922, the population had increased to 790,522—an increase only of 111,847. The point I wish particularly to emphasise is that our natural increase during that time was 158,000, and, if you deduct the deaths that took place during the same period—52,731—we have a balance of 105,269, which shows that in eight years our population by the addition of people from abroad has only grown by 6,578 persons. Surely if anything at all indicates that we have been asleep and that the Government are not in sympathy with the peopling of this land, it is the figures that I have quoted. Immigration to Queensland is less than it is to any of the other States. In the other States a degree of development and a degree of progress has been going on, and they have been adding to their population. New South Wales, since 1916, has added 234,080 odd to her population; Victoria, 121,359; while Queensland added only 84,152. So you see, while other places are growing, Queensland has been stationary, and what we have received in one way we have lost in another way because people have left the country.

There is no doubt that some of the things that have been stated by the Premier and others need to be combated, and I wish particularly to combat some of the statements made by the Premier yesterday in connection with railway tonnage. We were told yesterday that things were developing, and in that special letter which I referred to a few moments ago, the Premier impressed upon the people to whom he wrote that the advancement taking place in Queensland was greater than that in any other State, and, when speaking yesterday, he still maintained that there were evidences of development in connection with the production that had taken place in Queensland. One of the sorriest records that could possibly be placed before the people is that which emanated only last year from the Commissioner for Railways in Queensland. I question if many members of this House have been seized with the fearful seriousness of the position we occupy in connection with production.

Mr. CARTER: You are a Jeremiah.

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

Mr. G. P. BARNES: No, I am exceedingly sorry about it; but I say you people over yonder are responsible for what has taken place. Since 1914-15 an additional 960 miles of railway have been constructed. One would naturally think that, with an additional 960 miles of railway there would be a very great increase in traffic. But, instead of there being an increase in traffic as a result of the construction of a further 960 miles of railway, the Commissioner tells us there was a decrease of 17.9 per cent. in tonnage. That is not all. The revenue increased by 34 per cent., which, of course, indicates that a very considerable increase had taken place in freights. The Commissioner also shows that the passenger traffic had increased by 11 per cent.; and that is the only increase shown. The Commissioner's report shows also that the expenditure had increased by 100.2 per cent. Can you imagine anything so condemnatory of the administration of a Government as those significant figures? A decrease in tonnage, and that on top of the repeated assertions from the Government that they have been helping production, and that the country has been developed! These figures prove conclusively that the country, so far as production goes, has been on the down grade. If the other States had been in the same plight, we could have understood things, but it is not so in the other States. The Premier in the document which he issued claimed that no State had shown the progress that Queensland had, when, as a matter of fact, New South Wales showed an increase in tonnage of 21 per cent., Victoria an increase of 38 per cent., South Australia an increase of 35 per cent., and Western Australia an increase of 2 per cent. The only State in the Commonwealth which does not record progress through the records of the Commissioner for Railways is the State of Queensland. Who is responsible for that?

Mr. SWAYNE: The Government.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Undoubtedly the Government are responsible. They have discouraged settlement, and there is no doubt that one of the things which deterred settlement in the early stages of the rule of this Government was the way in which the Government exploited the people. They exploited the farmers in directions which we have indicated again and again. They exploited the people in connection with cattle, in connection with meat, and in many other directions, until the people lost heart. I am quite aware that there are other things which had to do possibly with decreased production. One reason, no doubt, was because of the great number of our young lives leaving the country.

Mr. COLLINS: What about the slump in metals and beef? Do you hold the Government responsible for that?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: No. Regarding metals, if the Government had seized the great opportunity that their late leader emphasised when he returned from abroad, and had gone on supplying that copper for which he said he could obtain a firm order, the railways would have been helped considerably. This Government have not aided production. This is what the Commissioner for Railways says, and, seeing that there has been no collaboration with him, it should be very pertinent to the discussion which has been taking place in the House—

"If the Queensland rates, fares, and

traffic had increased to the same extent as other railways, comparisons show that our results would have been equally favourable after allowing for increasing our present expenditure in the same ratio as the additional mileage which it is estimated would have been required."

That is how the Commissioner for Railways sums up that exceedingly important matter. In regard to the matter of production, the hon. member for Brisbane contradicted the statement made by the hon. member for Mirani the other night when he stated that under the present Government the acreage under cultivation was decreasing, as shown by figures which he gave. However, I have the statistics before me for the periods with regard to which he quoted. The hon. member quoted 1916 and 1921. I find that there was a decrease in 1921 as compared with 1916 of 31,990 acres, thus showing that the statement of the hon. member for Mirani was perfectly correct and in order. Indeed, if the hon. member for Mirani had gone back another year, he would have found a year still more favourable for the comparison which he made on that occasion, because the production in 1915 was a good many thousand tons ahead of production in 1916. It is due to the hon. member for Mirani that I should make this statement. Not only in that direction but in other directions almost without number there are evidences that we are not developing. We had under crop in 1916, 885,259 acres, whereas in 1921 we had fallen to 804,507 acres. There were employed in farming in 1914, 36,127 persons, and in 1921, 35,946 persons. The only increase that I can find at all favourable to the Government has to do with the increase of dairies. The number of dairies increased from 1914 to 1921 by 3,566. I mention that to show that I am criticising the Government in a fair and dispassionate way.

Referring once more to railway matters, surely the House will take into consideration the fact that, after having expended no less a sum than £11,000,000 on our railways, they are carrying less tonnage than they were eight years ago.

I think that one of the big things which should have been referred to in the Governor's Speech—because I believe there is a clear link between it and production—is that of taxation. Taxation is no doubt at the root of half our trouble, and it has interfered to a very alarming extent with the development of production as well as with the growth of population. That is so self-evident as to be apparent to everyone. In this connection, the Premier last night made reference to and contradicted a statement of the leader of the Opposition with regard to taxation. The statement made by the leader of the Opposition as recorded in "Hansard," because I have checked it, certainly included Federal taxation; but, as all States included Federal taxation, the statement was perfectly clear and correct. The only thing is that the leader of the Opposition overlooked for the time being the fact that the Federal Government had reduced taxation to some extent, which really would decrease the amount levied in the various States to an equal extent. However, we are at a disadvantage when we compare our taxation with that of other States—Victoria in particular. Perhaps I should give the

actual figures which should have been given by the leader of the Opposition. I find that, in Victoria, companies with a taxable profit of £1,000 pay £50; in Western Australia, £71 17s. 8d.; in South Australia, £78 2s. 6d.; in New South Wales, £125; and in Queensland £180. That is on a 20 per cent. profit, and that was the table quoted by the leader of the Opposition. On a 16 per cent. basis and a 12 per cent. basis, of course, there is a disparity again, which, although great, is a little more favourable to Queensland than in the other cases. But, when you come to taxation generally, on a small income of £250, Queensland pays £1 12s. 11d., and Victoria £1 5s. On £300, the respective amounts are £3 10s. 4d. and £1 17s. 6d.; on £400, £7 16s. 3d. and £3 2s. 6d.; and on £500, £12 17s. 9d. and £4 7s. 6d.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Victoria lets off the wealthy man.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I am very glad of that interjection. The hon. gentleman says that Victoria lets off the big man. I say it is right that the big man should pay more than the smaller man; but what are this Government doing? They are singling out the big retired man and allowing him to go scot free with big income from their bonds, while the man putting bone, sinew, life, and blood into the various industries of the State is penalised to the extent, according to the Premier's statement last night, of making good even railway deficits, which, during a term of some eight years, amount to over £10,000,000. What is the effect of that policy? What has it done for our railways? You have only to turn to the records of Parliament to find that during the last four years the Government have doled out £377,000 in relief to the unemployed. We have to remember that, instead of our industries increasing as industries have increased in the South, they have scarcely held their own.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Do you really think that the Government are responsible for these things?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I do.

Mr. FOLEY: I am sorry for you.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I am as sure as I stand here that the policy of the Government as to taxation has discouraged [5 p.m.] enterprise and made for unemployment. I would not make a statement like that unless I could substantiate it.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Do you mean to say that taxation is a governing factor or otherwise in business?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Of course it is—taxation and markets.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: How big is it in your business? It is a small factor.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Here is the actual proof of my statement—that Queensland is at the bottom of the list of all the States in a table showing the number of factories and employees, as compared with the time when this Government took office. She has made less development than any other State.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Manufacturing merely swells the big centres of population.

Mr. (G. P. Barnes.)

Mr. G. P. BARNES: The growth in the numbers of factories and employees therein from 1915 to 1922 is as follows:—

	Factories.	Employees
Victoria ...	1,340	31,042
N. S. Wales ...	1,082	31,871
W. Australia ...	206	3,479
S. Australia (up to 1921) ...	172	4,934
Tasmania ...	97	1,707
Queensland ...	35	169

What further proof is necessary? I say again that it is the administration of the Government which has had an effect upon industry otherwise than in the direction of stimulating it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Do you not think that better conditions and higher wages would have the effect you point out?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Not in the direction you want. I should imagine from what the hon. gentleman said that he wishes to indicate that wages have been higher in Queensland than elsewhere.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Do you mean to say that costs of production are not an item for consideration when you are building a factory—wages and hours costs?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Certainly; and yet this very Government would have landed this State in an expenditure on steel works at a place called Bowen of £5,000,000 of money, when they knew that labour in an outside place like that would demand, and is recognised to deserve, a greater wage than elsewhere.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You are making another case now.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I am meeting the argument of the hon. gentleman. That would have been a baneful thing to do.

Mr. COLLINS: It would have built up the nation.

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

Mr. CARTER (*Port Curtis*): Upon rising to support the motion, I must, first of all, compliment the Government upon both their excellent legislative and administrative achievements of the past eight years and the programme which they have introduced to this House this session. I would also like to congratulate the mover and seconder of this motion—two new members—upon the most excellent speeches they made, and upon giving promise of being very useful members of the Assembly. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the addresses from both sides of the Chamber. I was pleased at the efforts put forward by members supporting the Government, and interested in the remarks of those supporting the other side, but a little disappointed in their tone. They seem to be more interested in apologising for defeat than in endeavouring to offer useful criticism of the measures submitted to this Chamber. I have not heard one useful suggestion from anybody sitting on the other side. Take the remarks of the hon. member who has just resumed his seat. His actions outside are a direct contradiction of his statements in this Chamber. He was, Jeremiah like, crying, "Poor Queensland" from the time he got upon his feet till he sat down—the country was bankrupt; capital was drifting out of the State; everything was wrong! We go down to the

[*Mr. G. P. Barnes.*

Valley, and we find Barnes's Emporium; we go to South Brisbane, and we find Barnes's Flour Mill!

The HOME SECRETARY: He is shifting from the country to the city—to the consumer.

Mr. CARTER: The hon. member is one of those exploiters of the people about whom he professes to be so warm-hearted. Like many other members on that side of the House, the hon. member has always been an exploiter of the primary producers of this State whilst professing to have their interests at heart, and I suppose that if he expressed his inmost thoughts we would find that he had only the same interest for these people that a flea has for the dog upon which he lives. The hon. member has been a Jeremiah from start to finish. I have never heard him make a speech in this House but that it was "Poor Queensland." But I have noticed continual progress by "Poor Queensland," and during the last eight years the most marked progress that the State has ever made.

Mr. EDWARDS: So it should.

Mr. CARTER: And it has. Hon. members have told us that everything is wrong. The people outside know that everything is right, and that they are wrong. The hon. member for Oxley went out of his way to tell us that they might have won the election if they had had an objective. They did not dare to put their objective before the people. If they were to tell the people that they were going to come into this House to strengthen the position of those who fatten and batten on the backs of the industrialists and the primary producers, the stupidest of the workers who vote for them would be gulled no longer. They would not only not be sitting on the Opposition benches, they would not even be sitting in this Chamber. My impression of hon. members opposite is that they do not put their platform or their objective before the people because they profess to be in love with the objective and the platform of the Labour party. They say, "We are really as good as Labour." They are—on the platform, but not inside this House.

Mr. EDWARDS: But your leader opposed them in 1921.

Mr. CARTER: Opposed the Opposition—of course, he did.

Mr. EDWARDS: Opposed the Labour objective.

Mr. CARTER: Our objective is one of those magnificent things that we hope to drift towards continually and rapidly. One cannot expect to carry out all of it at once; it is a goal towards which the people desire to progress. They are going towards it, and as evidence of the fact, one has only to examine the magnificent achievements, administrative and legislative, of this Government during the last eight years. Everyone who stops to think knows that in 1920 hon. members opposite realised, because of the magnificent efforts by the present Government to assist the primary producers, that the primary producers were being drawn towards this Government. Realising that, hon. members opposite proposed to try and snare the votes of those people with a Country party programme. Money was obtained from the same source for the exploitation of the people to run both those parties.

Mr. MOORE: I would like to know where our funds came from. (Government laughter.)

Mr. CARTER: I know where the hon. gentleman's funds came from. How could a candidate for Parliament spend £400 on stamps without someone assisting him?

Mr. MOORE: Who did? Was it the Premier in sending out his letters to the electors?

Mr. CARTER: My opponent did. He is sufficiently careful of money not to throw away £400 of his own money. I am satisfied that someone found the £3,500 that was used in the attempt to bribe an hon. member on this side.

Mr. MOORE: I thought the Government found that money.

Mr. CARTER: The hon. member knows all about it. Hon. members on your left, Sir, tell this House and the people outside that they are their friends, and tell them what they would have done if they had been on the Treasury benches. Let us examine the actions of their confrères in the Commonwealth Parliament. Dr. Earle Page—no doubt, he is quite in accord with Country party members in this Chamber—the leader of the Federal Country party, said that he was going to redress the wrongs of the country people throughout the Commonwealth; but, as soon as he got back to Parliament, he took second place to Captain Bruce, who is at the head of the greatest exploiting section of the Commonwealth. What did Dr. Earle Page do for the primary producers? Let me take one of the most important industries—not only important as a primary producing industry, but important as an industry that is assisting in settling the most necessary portions of the Commonwealth. He immediately turned down a proposal that would have made that industry a secure one. Our Government, by their continued legislation and assistance, have made that industry one worthy of the Commonwealth; yet we have the Country party representatives, after all they professed in December last, going down to the Commonwealth Parliament and joining with the friends of the great sugar corporation—the Colonial Sugar Refining Company—and assisting to jeopardise the interests of those people in the industry, and assisting to make their position insecure, and probably moving in the direction of entirely destroying the industry. That was the action of the Federal Country party members. Our country party friends opposite are their brothers. We find now that the National party is called the United party; but outside they are called the Disunited party. They have also professed a love for the primary producers, and say that they are burning with a desire to put them in a secure position. How many of their confrères in the Southern States have done anything to better their position?

Mr. BRAND: Do you say that Queensland is divided in regard to obtaining a sugar agreement?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CARTER: I say that the Country party in the Federal House and the Nationalists in the Federal House who came from Queensland and who professed to be in sympathy with the sugar-growers, have deceived the sugar-growers.

Mr. BRAND: That is not this side of the House.

Mr. CARTER: The hon. gentleman belongs to that section. He went out of his way to assist the return of Mr. Corser, M.H.R., in the Federal House.

Mr. BRAND: Prove it.

Mr. CARTER: Of course you did.

Mr. CLAYTON: Tell us what the Labour party in the Federal House have done to secure a renewal of the sugar agreement.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Everyone knows what the Labour party have done.

Mr. CARTER: If the Opposition in this Chamber did the same as the Nationalists and the Country party in the other States and in the Commonwealth Parliament have done, they would never have lifted a finger to assist the primary producers. No Bill has been introduced for some considerable time that affords the same measure of assistance and the same possibilities for obtaining unity and security to the primary producers as the Primary Producers' Organisation Act. Has any attempt been made to introduce that measure in the Southern States?

Mr. CLAYTON: It would never have been introduced had it not been for the Country party.

Mr. CARTER: Those two parties in the other States and the Commonwealth have done their best to prevent anything of that kind being done.

Mr. EDWARDS: That was a Country party measure.

Mr. CARTER: Then why do the Federal Country party not do something to bring it into force? Why do they not attempt to legislate in that direction?

Mr. EDWARDS interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I hope hon. members will pay some respect to my call for order. The hon. member for Port Curtis is a new member, and he is entitled to a fair hearing.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and laughter.

Mr. CARTER: I do not mind the interjections, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The hon. member for Nanango does not disturb me in any way. He must make speeches of some kind, if they are only by way of interjections. There are Country party electors who are not favourably disposed towards the Nationalist section of the community, yet we have Country party representatives being returned by the votes of those people, and immediately carrying their allegiance in this House to that section of the community who, in their business affairs, are hostile to the primary producers.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is not true.

Mr. CARTER: It is quite true, and the hon. member knows it perfectly well. I do not think that there is a hair's width of difference between the policy of the so-called United party and the policy of the Country party. Indeed, they are never tired of telling us that there is no difference. I believe the hon. member for Oxley has always contended that there is absolutely no difference. He shifted from one party to another because there was no difference.

Mr. CLAYTON: You might have him over there yet.

Mr. Carter.]

Mr. CARTER: I do not think so. We do not want him. We only want men on whom we can rely entirely. This party is not an aggregation of party misfits and political derelicts. The party on this side consists of men who are tried and trusted—men who have been Labour from the time the Labour movement started. The Opposition is a refuge for party misfits. Anyone who likes to betray the people in Parliament can go across to that side and find a refuge. The hon. member for Oxley spoke about the dignity that should be observed in Parliament. It was like Satan reproving sin. Attached to dignity are consistency and honesty of purpose. When we find the hon. member shifting from one party to another and constantly white-anting one party after another, what dignity is there in that? The only dignity that he understands is such as the dignity assumed by "King Billy" when he puts on a brass plate. (Laughter.)

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Your electorate had to be stuffed to ensure your return.

Mr. CARTER: That is a statement that I desire to deal with. Let me give the hon. gentleman a few figures. In 1920 my opponent was returned with a majority of about 200. When that seat was cut up, I dare say my opponent was very pleased, for there was added to Port Curtis a portion of Musgrave, which had given a majority to Mr. Cattermull of nearly 450 over his opponent, Mr. Armfield, making an apparent majority for my late opponent of 660. On the railway line there were 500 votes recorded, 20 of which went to my opponent. That is to say, 480 were given by the electors there to me. My opponent was beaten by 560 votes. Because of the attitude of hon. members on that side of the House and the close association of my opponent with hon. members on that side, many of the electors who had supported him previously realised they had made a mistake. They had also begun to realise that this was the only Government that could redress their wrongs and improve their conditions. The result was that they changed their allegiance again and came back to me.

Mr. EDWARDS: If he had stuck to the Country party you would not be here.

Mr. CARTER: The hon. member for Nanango sits in a Tory stronghold. It does not follow that he represents the primary producer. We know that the electorate won by the hon. member for Kennedy was also a Tory stronghold. I am satisfied that hon. members on that side know perfectly well that the allegiance of the primary producer is coming over to this side of the House. The primary producers are becoming wise to the position, and to the statements on the platform and in the Press of members on the Opposition side of the Chamber, and are changing their allegiance. I did not need the assistance, as I have shown, of those splendid workers on the Many Peaks Railway line. I would have got in without their assistance, though I am very proud to have had it, because they are all honest working people. Judging from the remarks that fell from the hon. member for Oxley in regard to these people, one would naturally not have been surprised, if they had been returned to the Treasury benches, to find that they would have made it very difficult for those men to get on the electoral roll. He said it was a disgrace for those men to go there.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: They would cut them out of a vote altogether.

[Mr. Carter.

Mr. CARTER: Of course they would. They would no doubt have restored the residential qualification of the old Electoral Act before they could become electors.

Mr. FERRICKS: Worse than that.

Mr. CARTER: The hon. member for Oxley said that it was lacking dignity for that body of strong workers being in the electorate; but, whether that body of electors had been working there or not, I would still have been returned, because, as I have said, the people were desirous of showing their disapproval of the policy of my opponent.

Mr. FERRICKS: The residents of the district could also vote at the polling-booths on those construction works.

Mr. CARTER: Yes; many people in that district could have voted there and must have voted there to bring the number of votes polled there up to 500.

Mr. EDWARDS: Didn't you encourage Mr. Murray to come out in order to improve your chances?

Mr. CARTER: That is another misstatement. Here is a man, unlike the hon. member for Nanango, who enlisted, went to the war, and on his return settled under the Soldiers' Settlement Act at Ubobo.

Mr. EDWARDS: I have served my country, and, if you have ever served it as well, you will do.

Mr. CARTER: Mr. Murray was one of those who left his wife and children to get along as best they could on a soldier's pay, as many other brave people did, and fought in the war. After he took up a soldier's selection at Ubobo he became disgusted with the tactics of the ex-member who sat opposite and came out against him, much the same as Mr. Gorrie came out in opposition to Mr. Higgs in the Federal election in Capricornia. He took up quite a fair attitude. I will say for Mr. Murray that he was a clean, straight scrapper.

Mr. EDWARDS: Why all those tears?

Mr. CARTER: There are no tears; I am simply telling the hon. member some home truths. Mr. Murray came out of his own volition, or was brought out by his own party, who were dissatisfied with the then member.

Mr. EDWARDS: What about Mr. Fletcher? Didn't he fight straight?

Mr. CARTER: If the hon. member fought no cleaner than Mr. Fletcher, he has not much to be proud of.

I want to speak in reference to the primary producers. An effort is being made by the present Government, who have ever been sympathetic to that body, to put them in a strong, satisfactory, and united position.

Mr. BRAND: That is the Country party programme.

Mr. CARTER: An Act has been brought in and is now in operation, and it is moving fast in that direction and is doing its work effectively. It is not before it was time, because we find amongst the primary producers an entire lack of co-ordination. Only the other day we had the spectacle of a member on the other side of the House decrying another primary industry. He spoke of the sugar industry as a "pampered industry." It is time that the primary producers

realised that their interests are wrapped up in every product of the land, whether it be dairy produce, meat, or sugar.

Mr. MOORE: Were not cattle seized by this Government?

Mr. CARTER: The hon. member for Aubigny can say that if he likes. I say that co-ordination on the part of the primary producer is as necessary as co-operation. Only by the Council of Agriculture, where they get every section to come into one council, can we hope to get that sympathetic co-ordination that is necessary for the betterment of the industry. Not until those engaged in the cattle, the sugar, or the dairying industry realise that it is as important to protect their own, and all co-ordinate with that end in view, can they hope for any upliftment in primary production. That is what the Government are aiming at in their legislation, by getting some common-sense method for them to help themselves. During the early part of their administration in 1915, 1916, and 1917, there was a continual howl from the cattle people against the Government. Why? Because the Government stepped in and saved them from the machinations of the meat exploiter.

Mr. MOORE: By seizing their cattle.

Mr. CARTER: I have no doubt that, had the Government left the cattle people to the mercy of the meatworks, they would have got the big prices for meat overseas, and the cattlemen would have had to take what they gave them. These people were entirely at the mercy of the meatworks. There was a howl against the Government assisting them on that occasion and making their position secure, and now there is a howl for the Government to come in and assist them. Nothing will satisfy them. It is like the man who came home shortly after he got married, found his wife sitting up, and beat her for sitting up. The next night he beat her again because he came home and found her in bed. As he said, he intended to beat her, anyhow. That is the position of hon. members on the other side of the House. They said that they would have brought in most of the measures that we have brought in; and, had it happened that by some misfortune they had been returned to the Treasury benches, there is not one measure that has been enacted by this Government which they would have dared to take off the statute-book. They say that they would have brought in the sugar legislation, the Primary Producers' Organisation Bill, and every measure tending to the amelioration and betterment of the conditions of the primary producer; yet they say we are all along driving the people out of the country, and the hon. member for Warwick has just said we are drifting, drifting, drifting down. Everything, he says, is going down. One can only expect one end from what he tells us, and yet we find him investing all his money in Queensland, and we find a big squatter selling out a big profitable property and investing in real estate in Brisbane, and buildings going up everywhere. There is no State in Australia where there is so much building activity as in Queensland at the present time. Yet hon. members tell us things are going to the dogs.

We have heard a great deal from hon. members on the other side of the House about the size of holdings that settlers should have. I am satisfied, so far as grazing areas are concerned, that they should be of con-

siderable extent, and that a man running sheep should have at least 2,000 to 3,000 sheep and sufficient country to carry that number.

But when it comes to agriculture [5.30 p.m.] I am satisfied there are many cases where men are holding too large an area. They should take up smaller areas and would get better results. I am going to read some remarks from the "Courier." The other day I picked up a copy dated 13th July last, and it speaks of a "droughtless land known as Port Curtis." It does not set out to deal with small holdings straight away, but points out what may be done on them—how livings may be earned on the land. Now we are constantly told that the farmer is in bad circumstances, and that these should be remedied; about the income tax, and how it affects the primary producer. The hon. member for Warwick dwelt on this point.

Mr. MORGAN: There are hundreds of them in a bad way now.

Mr. CARTER: The "Courier" says—

"An instance was given of how six years ago two local lads had taken up 10 acres at Benaraby, on the Boyne River, for which they had to pay £1 per acre."

That, I assume, is rent—

"They worked assiduously and during the last three years had been able to average from £400 to £600 per year. Last year they were successful in securing large crops of potatoes, when their returns were from £800 to £1,000. Two crops of potatoes could be grown in one year. They have also planted lucerne and fodder for dairy stock, and marketed cotton and bananas, and are now venturing on citrus growing. Men who worked for these two young farmers made £1 per day digging potatoes."

Then we are told nothing may be made on the land. I have another quotation here—

"An Englishman of progressive ideas had undertaken dairying, even to purchasing good stock. After being in a fair way of progress he died, but his widow, carrying on on the same good lines, was now in a good position."

We are told that these people cannot possibly live without immense areas. My own experience is that many men get excellent agricultural land in too large areas, and that, if they had smaller areas, they could make excellent livings.

Mr. BRAND: What area do you suggest?

Mr. CARTER: About 50 or 60 acres of good arable land would do remarkably well.

Mr. BRAND: Growing what?

At 5.35 p.m.,

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Mr. CARTER: Anything that it is profitable to grow. Of course, if he tried to grow walnuts, he might have some difficulty. I want now to say a word or two about the cotton industry. This has been a great boon to the State of Queensland, and but for this Government, I have no doubt that that industry would never have been fostered as it has been.

Mr. BRAND: You are only surmising that.

Mr. CARTER: I have lived in Queensland for a number of years, and as long as I remember the Tory Press has ridiculed the growing of cotton, saying that it was necessary to have black labour to pick it. The present Government have fostered it with

Mr. Carter.]

success. Great credit is due to that good old cotton pioneer, Daniel Jones, who had been working for thirty years endeavouring to get the farmers of Queensland to take up cotton growing.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. CARTER: But for the progressive and sound ideas of this Government, people would not have been growing cotton in this State to-day.

Mr. MAXWELL: They were eight years in office before they thought of it.

Mr. CARTER: I would like to quote a letter to show how useful the cotton industry has been to small farmers. This is from a grower in the Mount Larcum district. I have similar letters from many farmers in my district pointing out what an immense advantage cotton has been to them. He says—

“By jove! Mr. Carter, this cotton has put a lot of these small farmers on their financial feet. Hickson has nothing on cotton for curing financially crippled cockies.”

The scheme is a sound one. One has only to go round the cotton areas to see the amount that has been spent in cotton ginneries, and to anticipate what will be spent later on oil mills. Practical people are sanguine that cotton can be satisfactorily grown in Queensland. I believe—I do not set myself up as an expert—that we should give ratoon cotton a trial. It has its uses so far as Queensland is concerned. Where our scrub areas are planted with cotton they cannot easily be ploughed out, and there a second-year crop would be available.

There is much ineptitude in regard to the cultivation of cotton. Like every other product, it requires good cultivation. The land cannot be too well tilled. I have often suggested to the people in my district that it would be better to plant 5 acres of well-tilled land than to plant 10 acres indifferently tilled. People in my district are crying out for larger areas of fertile land. I saw one man who had 4 acres of poorly cared for land from which, despite the fact that it was mixed with grass, he had an excellent crop. He could not keep 4 acres clean, yet he wanted a larger area. He is on the same footing as hon. members on the other side of this Chamber who want more than they can handle.

I would like to say a word about timber values and royalties. A great deal has been said on the other side of the House, particularly by the hon. members for Normanby and Cooroora, with regard to timber royalties. The hon. member for Normanby went so far as to say that royalties went up to 20s. per 100 feet, and the hon. member for Cooroora put it at 16s. 6d. Let us get to facts with regard to that. I find that the average royalties—that is the royalties on all timbers from hardwoods down to cabinet timbers, cedar, maple, silky oak, and other timbers—were—

	s.	d.
1914	1	2 6 = 1s. 2½d.
1915	1	3
1916	1	5½
1917	2	2½
1918	2	5
1919	3	1½
1920	3	0½
1920-21	3	7½
1921	4	4½
1922	4	11½

Mr. BRAND: Is that per average 100 feet?

[Mr. Carter.

Mr. CARTER: Yes, an average on all timber; yet we are told—particularly by the hon. member for Normanby, who should know better, because he was a builder—that the royalties were the cause of the excessive cost of building.

Mr. MOORE: So they are.

Mr. CARTER: “So they are”! That is an evidence of what the hon. gentleman knows about most things. The ordinary worker's dwelling of five rooms would contain about 6,400 feet of timber, equal to about 8,000 feet in the log. The cost of royalty on such a building would be £20, and the cost of the timber would be £168. Then hon. members opposite want to quote the royalty on cedar and apply it to the royalty on all timber.

Mr. MOORE: We quoted the royalty on pine.

Mr. CARTER: The royalty on pine does not average 10s. per 100. In my district pine is brought into one sawmill for a considerable distance, and it costs 15s. or 14s. per 100 superficial feet to cut and haul, and it is sold at the mill for 19s. per 100 superficial feet. Then we are told that the royalty on timber is a great factor in the cost of houses. A log containing 1,000 feet would cost the mill about £9 10s., and out of those 1,000 feet the mill would cut 800 superficial feet of timber, which would be worth, on an average, £2 15s. per 100 superficial feet, so that for a log brought into the mill costing £9 10s. the miller would get £22. Yet we are told that the royalty is a great factor in the cost of buildings! Hon. members on the other side should be honest. If they desire to criticise this Government, they should be honest in their criticisms and not allow the mean carping spirit that was engendered by their defeat to be brought into this Chamber to try and deceive the people. The leader of the Opposition knows these figures are correct, and he has not challenged them in any way. How can he rely with any safety on hon. members on his side who get up and talk about a royalty of 30s. and a royalty of 16s. 6d. a hundred?

Mr. MOORE: Pine was sold at 17s.

Mr. CARTER: I know that some timber in the Toowoomba district, close to a railway, the upset price of which was 10s. per 100 at the stump, was put up to auction, and the timber merchant raised the price to 13s. 3d. per 100. That is quite true, but it was the competition amongst these people that increased the price. What would hon. members suggest? That we should give the timber to the millers? Would that make any difference in their charges? We know perfectly well that, if the millers got their timber for nothing, they would send it South, where they would get a better price, rather than sell it here, and we would have a dearth of timber. Hon. members opposite would starve the people of their product in order to sell it somewhere else at a higher profit. If we forgo the royalty on our timbers and hand them to the sawmillers for nothing, the merchants themselves are the very people who would be the first to send the timber South. As a matter of fact, hon. members opposite know perfectly well that the Forestry Department is doing its best to conserve timber and to bring about re-afforestation and to keep our vast but diminishing valuable product from going out altogether.

I would like to say a word or two about my own district. I notice by the programme of this Government and by their legislation and administration in the past they are making an endeavour to establish a great national undertaking in Gladstone, which has been neglected in the past by the supporters of the people on the other side of this House. During the time they were on the Government benches they created artificial ports instead of constructing railways, such as an extension of the Many Peaks line, which would have connected a valuable agricultural area like the Upper Burnett with a beautiful port like Port Curtis, with only 100 miles of railway line. That extension was consistently blocked because it would not suit the merchants here who were in charge of the Treasury benches, because they had interests in Brisbane, Rockhampton, and somewhere else, and wanted to carry these people, or their produce, either down to Brisbane or up to Rockhampton. They allowed a magnificent area of agricultural country like the Upper Burnett to be used for grazing cattle and returning to the Government a revenue of £d. per acre per annum, although the soil is amongst the best in the Commonwealth. That land will grow cotton. There are areas there upon which a man on 50 acres could make an excellent living. I do not say the blocks right through should be cut up into 50 acres, but the very rich agricultural land should be cut up into small areas, and on those areas a good living can be made. The Government, in their wisdom, have assisted this great national undertaking by advancing the interests of the port of Gladstone. We have been successful in obtaining sums of money to build jetties and other harbour improvements that will make this port an asset to the Commonwealth.

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

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowoong*): I have no intention of following on the lines adopted by the hon. member for Port Curtis, because on both sides of the House, on one subject at any rate, there is perfect unanimity. I refer particularly to the question that the hon. member discussed at the opening of his speech—the sugar industry. Irrespective of what the political opinions are of men occupying the Opposition benches, it can be said that members on the Opposition benches stand just as much for Queensland as the members on the other side of the House. I realise that it is absolutely essential in a matter of such great concern to the advancement of this State that politics should be buried altogether, with a view to trying to convert some of the individuals in the South as to the rights of this State of Queensland so far as that industry is concerned. While we find that the whole of the blame seems to be thrown on members who are branded with the United brand or the Country party brand, I would like to say to my friends on the other side of the House that, while they may be loyal to the State of Queensland, it is a very great pity that they cannot convert some of the men belonging to the Labour movement with which they are affiliated—the Australian Labour movement—to their views. I am not going to sit in this House and allow the Government to say that the whole of the

blame attaches to the supporters of the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. COLLINS: Did you not support Colonel Cameron for Brisbane? Of course you did.

Mr. MAXWELL: Yes, and I supported a good man. A meeting was held in Melbourne, under the auspices of the Australian Labour party, on 1st September last year, to protest against the failure of the Federal Government to reduce the price of sugar. At that meeting Mr. Charlton, leader of the Federal Labour party, said the consumers were paying £70,000 more for their sugar than they should do.

Mr. PRASE: You do not know what you are talking about.

Mr. MAXWELL: I venture to say that the leader of the Federal Australian Labour party knows a great deal more of what he is talking about than the hon. member for Herbert. That is what Mr. Charlton said, and I will repeat it—

“The consumers were paying £70,000 a week more for their sugar than they should be if they had decontrol of sugar.”

I have no intention of referring to what my friends on this side have already quoted. There was a meeting called in Melbourne on 9th July last year, under the auspices of the Housewives' Association, of which Mrs. Glencross was president.

Mr. DASH: She is a Nationalist.

Mr. MAXWELL: If the hon. member says so, I must believe it. There are some things that one must accept in Parliament that they would not accept outside, and I accept that. It will be remembered that Mr. Higgs was put out of the meeting because he had the temerity to advocate the claims of the sugar-growers of Queensland.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: He was a rat.

Mr. MAXWELL: If a man changed his opinions, and supported the party which the hon. member follows, he would not be a rat—he would be a convert to the party, and would have seen the light. I want to give this extract from the Melbourne “Age” of 10th July, 1922—

“Mr. Scullin, M.H.R., protested against the scandal of charging 6d. per lb. for sugar. There were two things that stood out plainly—one was that the price should come down; and the other that the pernicious agreement now in operation should cease. It placated all the interests in the industry regardless of the consumers.”

Mr. Scullin is a member of the House of Representatives, and a Labour man. While I give credit to hon. members opposite for their efforts to support the sugar industry, the hon. member for Port Curtis refuses to give the same credit to hon. members on this side.

The PREMIER: Why attack a new member? (Laughter.)

Mr. MAXWELL: The hon. member for Port Curtis said he was an old bird: he is not a new member—he has been here before. I want to show that, while hon. members opposite are sincere in their attitude to the sugar industry, the men with whom they are associated down south are not sincere, and will not allow them to be sincere. Those

Mr. Maxwell.]

people down south are responsible to their electors just the same as hon. members opposite are responsible to theirs.

Mr. COLLINS: Tell us what the Employers' Federation said.

Mr. MAXWELL: I will tell you what our State Government said, as recorded on page 67 of the book entitled "Socialism at Work."

Mr. DASH: Read the minutes of the meeting that sent the delegation home. (Government laughter.)

Mr. MAXWELL: It is all very well for hon. members opposite to mention that, but that cry has worked out. There are other things which are more pertinent, but hon. members opposite do not like chickens coming home to roost. This is one of the chickens that has come home to roost. It is stated in "Socialism at Work," page 67—

"The Government has liberated the industry and protected the whole of the consumers of Australia from being forced to pay famine prices for their sugar at the time when sugar was reasonably plentiful"

I can afford to be generous to these gentlemen. I do not mind if hon. members talk about the Employers' Federation from now to the crack of doom—

"It is true that growers are now receiving below the world's parity for their product, but for very many years the Federal Government had secured for them much above the world's parity. The growers cannot expect to benefit from protection both ways. Ever since federation the people have been paying through the nose for the sugar industry. The people are now getting some cash return back for their money."

That was what the Labour Government said in "Socialism at Work." I mention that to let hon. members opposite know that there are individuals in the South who sit under the same banner as they do. I believe that, if those men associated with the party opposite in the South joined with them, they could force the Federal Government to give them what they wanted in regard to the sugar industry. Let hon. members opposite link up with those men down south in the interests of Queensland and prove their sincerity in the matter. It seems to me that the people down south are merely indulging in political propaganda. It was stated in Victoria the other day that it will not be long before we have another Federal election, and this propaganda is good powder and shot.

Mr. DASH: What name will you give your Federal party next time?

Mr. MAXWELL: I will call them a party of honourable men.

Mr. COLLINS: Call them a party of shiftless men, like the hon. member for Albert.

Mr. MAXWELL: It does not matter what hon. members opposite say in connection with this party. We stand for the interests of Queensland better than they do. I want to remind the hon. member that there were Labour men—I will not say they were better Labour men than the hon. member is, but they were equally as good Labour men as he is—Thomas Glassey, William Kidston, George Jackson, Peter Airey, and other men, who got out of the Labour party. Why they left the party was best known to themselves.

[Mr. Maxwell.

I listened with a great amount of pleasure to the intellectual speech which the hon. member for Kennedy made, and I prophesy that it will not be very long before he will cut the painter. (Laughter.) The Premier made a speech which I think must be somewhat similar to the speech he made when wooing the suffrages of the primary producers. I experienced the privilege of listening to the Premier make a speech like that when I first came into the House in 1920, and I thought there was a lot in what he said, and that a great amount of it was true. Some things that he said were true, but I have a recollection of the hon. gentleman impressing upon us as young members the desirability of linking up with each other for the welfare of Queensland irrespective of party, and he led us to believe that he desired our assistance; but only a couple of days afterwards he put the axe into us. He told us last night of the sins of omission of hon. members on this side of the House. I adhere to any statements which I made during the election campaign, and I will bring forward documentary proof to show my statements were justified. It was stated by the Premier that the language used by our leaders and members during the campaign had a tendency to lower the prestige of hon. members on this side, but I am not going to hon. members opposite to get a testimonial with regard to our prestige. At any rate, I was perfectly satisfied with the attitude taken up by hon. members on this side during the election campaign. I have no intention of holding a post-mortem on the last election. Personally, I have my own beliefs as to the reasons for the non-success of our party.

[7 p.m.]

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: What were they?

Mr. MAXWELL: We were defeated because the Government won fourteen more seats than we did, and I think it is a shame that the Governor's speech does not contain a complimentary reference to the services rendered by the Redistribution Commission. I had no intention of doing what I now propose to do, but, seeing that the Premier has assumed the role of candid friend and quoted some of the literature which he says was used by our organisations, I think it only right to give back a reply in kind and quote some of the literature circulated by the party which fought under his banner. I have practically all their literature here, and I find that this is the class of comment that was made by men on the other side—

"As a parliamentary party, the present Opposition has sunk so low that it hardly deserves a future, and its future will be 'mud.'"

Then again, the Premier, in referring to the present leader of the Opposition, described him as—

"The mildest mannered man that ever cut a throat."

The Premier, in making quotations last night, said that our party were responsible for what had been done by their organisations, and I now return the compliment, and say that the Government are responsible for what their organisations did. Then, in another piece of their literature, they described the Opposition as—

"Old fools who maunder and drivel against the Labour party, and who are incapable of anything else."

Again, they said—

“The Country party is led by a city solicitor. The Nationalist party is led by a produce merchant.”

In this connection what did the hon. member for Ipswich say about some middlemen? Of course he was in congenial company, but I believe he was honest in what he said. It was at a dinner given at Ipswich to the Nambour Chamber of Commerce, at which he supported a toast and is reported to have said—

“He paid a tribute to the early business men. The firm of Cribb and Foote had been the means of placing more people on the land by its assistance to them than the Government of the day.”

There the hon. member at any rate pointed out that these middlemen came to the rescue of the man on the land and gave him great assistance. Here is another election statement—

“If you vote the Nationalist (United party) crowd and the profiteer protection union candidates into the control of your State's Administration, you will soon become the heaviest taxed workers in Australia.”

One man said, “Of course, this is only politics, and you have to take it as it is written.” Last night the Premier attributed to us tactics that he considered to be hitting below the belt.

Mr. CARTER: So they were

Mr. MAXWELL: I would not go to the hon. member for Port Curtis to ask what was below the belt.

Mr. CARTER: Because you would get the truth.

Mr. MAXWELL: The hon. member has been hitting below the belt all night.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You are always crying “Stinking fish.”

Mr. MAXWELL: I am, according to the hon. gentleman, who believes in production for use and not for profit. The pamphlet I am quoting from uses these epithets—

“The lure of the liar or the art of deception.’ ‘News is deliberately faked.’ ‘The glugs of gloom.’ ‘Mournful jeremiads of the money bags.’ ‘Stinking fish propagandists.’ ‘The mugwumps of manumon.’”

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Who said that?

Mr. MAXWELL: It is “authorised” by Mr. Lewis McDonald. Hon. members opposite want us to father what came from our organisation. Let them father what comes from theirs.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Your manifesto was signed by “Charles Taylor” and “W. J. Vowles.”

Mr. MAXWELL: The pamphlet continues—

“Low wages, the slogan of the sweater.’ ‘Capitalism launches the campaign.’ ‘Capitalists’ immediate objective, wage reduction.’”

Mr. KIRWAN: You know that is so.

Mr. MAXWELL: On the question of the reduction of the basic wage I want to quote

the official report of the tenth annual delegate meeting of the Australian Workers' Union (Queensland branch). On page 16. at Noorama wool shed, Mr. Martens moved this resolution —

“That this meeting, realising the reactionary attitude manifested by the State Labour Government in approaching the State Arbitration Court for a reduction of State employees' wages is contradictory of the best interests of the working class, does emphatically condemn such action, and insists that the Australian Workers' Union executive, State and central, take such immediate action as is necessary in preventing a recurrence of same.”

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS interjected.

Mr. MAXWELL: The hon. gentleman is pretty game. Now hon. members opposite were not very game at the Emu Park Convention. There is no use hon. members opposite twisting here. Was it not a fact that at the Emu Park Convention the Premier's resignation was laid on the table and they altered their decision? (Government laughter.)

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: It is all talk.

Mr. MAXWELL: It was all talk at the convention, too. Mr. Martens continues—

“The State Government had made the lamest excuse made by anybody in going to the court for the reduction. Its action was one of the chief factors in the defeat of the Labour candidates at the recent elections. It may be said that those whose wages were reduced had not done much for the Government. This cannot be said, though, of the construction workers, who had stuck to the Government right through. The reduction was miserable and paltry, and those who had asked for the reduction would not like to live on the reduced wage. The argument used by the Government that the court was there, and as the largest employer of labour it was going to it, was the same as used by the capitalist.”

This is the part that hurts—

“That was the view Mr. Edkins adopted when he took their secretary to court over the wages in the pastoral and shearing industry.”

These are the gentlemen who say that we were going to reduce wages! They were the men who were going to increase the wages of the workers. What does the hon. member for Maryborough say in connection with the treatment meted out to the workers there? What do the employees of the State Insurance Department say to the action of the Government in deflating a number of employees in that department?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: What have they got to say?

Mr. MAXWELL: They have to say nothing; they take their gruel and say, “I wish to God the election was next week.” This is some more of the statement made by the Secretary for Agriculture in supporting the candidature of Mr. George Farrell at Rockhampton—

“He went on to point out that there were no half-measures. It was either

Mr. Maxwell.]

the Labour Party, with which they may not altogether agree in everything, or the anti-Labour Party with its profiteers, slums, hungry children, and enslavement of the workers."

The Secretary for Agriculture is intelligent enough to know that this is only a smoke screen and camouflage. He knew that the only object was to bulldoze a number of people in Rockhampton and throughout the length and breadth of Queensland.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: What did your party do in Rockhampton?

MR. MAXWELL: I will leave that for the hon. gentleman to say; but I challenge him to say that this party did anything but advocate the claims and needs of the country.

MR. BRUCE: What did some of them resign from the committee for?

MR. MAXWELL: The hon. member for Kennedy has the same privilege as I have; he had better go there and ask them. The Premier, in his speech last night, referred to a comment appearing in the "Daily Mail." The "Daily Mail" opened its columns to the Premier in order that he might express his views, and I think that every other newspaper has been generous enough to open its columns to anybody who wishes to air his views. I dare say that even the "Daily Standard" would do that. I have not the slightest doubt that this article emanated from some member sitting on the Government benches. I am not going to raise any trouble or dust as to why this party was defeated. It behoves every one of us to support any measure that the Government may bring forward which has for its object the betterment of the people of Queensland as a whole. We have contracted to carry that out, and, if the members on the other side of the House are prepared to bring forward measures that we can agree with—as our leader said the other night—and they are not like some of the measures brought forward at the end of last session, we will support them.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: We are here to carry out our policy, not your policy.

MR. MAXWELL: If the Government are going to bring in legislation that we can support, legislation that is in the best interests of the community, we will be game enough to stand up and say we support them.

MR. BRUCE: There will be no Opposition then.

MR. MAXWELL: I wish to refer to another portion of the Speech delivered by the Premier last night, where he said we had accused the Government party of being Bolsheviks and attempting to Russianise Queensland, and that we went from platform to platform denouncing the Government in consequence of their objective. I noticed when the hon. gentleman was in Melbourne, at a gathering that was rightly given and was due to him by the Labour party there, the leader of the party in Victoria said that Mr. Theodore won the election on the red objective, and he said of course he did. Of course he did not. He and his party dodged the red objective all along the line.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: What is the red objective

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Communism.

[Mr. Maxwell.

MR. MAXWELL: I will tell you what it is. Let me quote from the official report of the ninth Commonwealth Labour Conference—that wonderful conference that was held on Monday, 10th October, 1921. The Premier attended that conference, and you all know what he told them. He told the people that the Labour party were trying to Russianise the State. I will quote what he said—

"Mr. Theodore declared against the proposal for the socialisation of industry. The trouble with the conference was that quite a number of delegates had their minds saturated with ideals and dogmas that did not belong to Australia. He had recognised voices he had heard for years. Mr. Ross was one of those who had been preaching Communism to Labour for years and years in Australia. A conference was called under the aegis of the Australian Labour party, and they found it dominated by these men that Labour never tolerated. Delegates, enamoured with the proletariat in Russia, and the sentiments of the I.W.W., had come along there and translated their ideas into motions and resolutions which had found their place on the agenda paper."

Mr. Ross was one of those who, according to the "Daily Standard," told the Premier and members of the Labour party that they did not know what the socialisation of industry was. I am quoting exactly what the "Standard" has quoted. Mr. Ross said they must proceed with the downfall of capitalism. The Premier told us that this man Ross was trying to Russianise Queensland. Who was Mr. Ross? He was the man in charge of the publicity campaign in connection with the Labour dailies.

MR. BRUCE: A very able man.

MR. MAXWELL: He expends his energy in the wrong channels. I venture to say there are a number of hon. members on the other side of the House who will do what their conferees have done and leave the bad paths that they have followed.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: They would get into bad company.

MR. MAXWELL: I am sorry for the company you are in. If that is not so, how is it that you were not game to follow the Red Objective, and that the "Standard" had to write an article and tell you that you were not game to follow it? When the Premier was in the South he talked the Red Objective. He said their objective was only something to aim for step by step, to be achieved in one year, two years, five years, or perhaps fifty years; it rested with the workers. Exception was taken to it because it was said to be a revolutionary movement.

I do want to give the Secretary for Public Lands credit for having done his best to convert them at the convention, but I cannot understand why the Premier and the Secretary for Public Lands swallowed the proceedings of that convention. The only thing I can attribute their attitude to is that the delegates told them, "You have got to subscribe to the action of the convention or get out of the movement." Mr. Ross said, on page 28 of the report of the Ninth Labour Conference—

"They were in a revolutionary period. Things were in the melting pot and in-

urrection and war were in every country, and there would be similar conditions in this country to cope with the conditions here. This plan of action was thrown upon them to defeat the Bolshevik theory of an armed rising at the declaration of the proletariat. It was not a question of whether there would be a revolution, but whether it was to be a peaceful or bloody revolution. If they wanted to construct a new building for the workers, here was the material."

Yet we had the leader of the Government last night telling us that we went through the length and breadth of Queensland saying that they were the Government who were trying to Russiify Queensland. Out of the mouth of the Premier himself he must stand convicted. Senator Gardiner, the leader of the Labour movement in the Senate, then said—

"The Australian objective they had at the present time was good enough, and there was no need to go to foreign countries to have an objective framed."

I have got a greater faith in the working men of Queensland than hon. members on the other side seem to have. I have this faith in them, that these men are sufficiently intelligent to frame an objective of their own without having to go to Moscow to do it, and without having to send Garden there.

Mr. HYNES: You have just come back from a political Moscow.

Mr. MAXWELL: I would rather come back as I have come back with the men that are here in a minority than get in as the members on the other side have got in. There are men over there who will ruin the Labour Government yet. I venture to prophesy to-night that the time is not far distant when a number of men on that side of the House will settle their fate. How is it possible for the Premier to stand up in this House and make the statement he did last night—that they were not going in for anything that would ruin the State of Queensland—and then be driven subsequently to do it? The deputy leader of the Opposition paid a compliment to the Premier when he said the Premier was leading his party. With all due respect to the hon. member's knowledge, I say that the Premier is driven by the caucus outside. To prove the statement I have made that these gentlemen were dodging the question in connection with the Red Objective although they told the people in Melbourne that they won on the Red Objective, I would quote "Jack Cade," who says this in the "Standard" of 10th November, 1922—

"A cowardly silence on the part of Labour candidates is hardly less dishonest or disastrous to the cause of the workers during the present electoral conflict than that species of belittling the fundamental and revolutionary principles of the Labour movement in which some Labourites in their zeal for vote-snaring too often indulge."

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Who is "Jack Cade"?

Mr. MAXWELL: I venture to say that the hon. gentleman knows who he is, and I venture to say, if hon. members on the other side are not prepared to carry out the

instructions given them officially, then there is only one end. If they are not prepared to carry out their instructions, then there is only ruin before them. I remember hearing of men associated with the I.W.W., and I notice these men are mixed up—and right in the thick of it—with members of the Labour party at the present time. We had men sent to Moscow. What for? It makes one almost ashamed to think that a body of men who are Britishers have to go to Russia for the purpose of trying to ascertain what kind of legislation should be enacted in Australia. I wish to quote the following short extract on socialism from a book entitled "The Unsolved Riddle of Social Justice," by Stephen Leacock—

"In a population of angels a socialistic commonwealth would work to perfection. But until we have the angels we must keep the commonwealth waiting."

I have also another quotation from a work entitled, "What We Want and Where We Are; Facts, Not Phrases," by W. A. Appleton, the Secretary of the General Federation of Trade Unions in Great Britain. Mr. Appleton, in dealing with the Russian origin of the British Labour party, says—

"Moscow is to-day the Mecca of the Communist. Always he turns his eyes towards this political holy of holies, and always reverently accepts the crude 'obiter dicta' of the cruel and ill-formed autocrats who to-day dominate Russia."

Then he goes on—

"While all this gathering together of orderly forces is taking place in the home of the Slav, the Briton is being harried and bullied into situations which must involve him in tragedy more terrible than that enacted in Russia. He is being urged to sacrifice country to communism; to take up the dice the Russian is discarding, and to put to the hazard his own and his children's inheritance. Is he fool enough to do it? Not if he remembers that communism has neither the backing of history, the force of logic, nor the prestige which comes from successful achievement."

I had not intended going further on these lines, but was drawn off the track by the Premier. I would advise the hon. gentleman, before he attempts to clean out the stable of the Opposition, to clean out the stable of his own party.

Mr. HARTLEY (*Fitzroy*): It gives me much pleasure to take this opportunity of saying a few words on the Address in Reply. I congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the message of His Excellency the Governor on being chosen by their constituents to represent them in Parliament, and I further congratulate them upon the manner in which they have spoken.

Before I deal with the subject-matter of the Address in Reply, I desire to express my personal appreciation of the fact that you, Sir, appear in this Parliament in the robe and vestments pertaining to your office. I view with pleasure the restoration of the robe of office, though, when a former Speaker did not wear the robe I withheld my objection. But, as a democrat—as a man who thinks that the position and honour of Parliament under the British Constitution is

Mr. Hartley.]

beyond that of any other country—I am glad to see you clothed with the robe of office, which tells me that you, as Speaker of this Parliament in the Dominion of the King overseas, are clothed with the same power and dignity which clothe the Speaker in the great House of Commons in the British Empire, and have the power to protect both the privileges and persons of the people's representatives, which power at times transcends the power of Royalty itself.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HARTLEY: The donning of these robes speaks to me of the great men of the past, who made parliamentary representation what it is; and I hope that, if a time of stress should ever come when you should be called upon to stand in defence of the people's representatives and the people's rights, as the men in olden times were called, that you may be clothed with the same power and authority and dauntless courage, and that the same qualities may be exercised by you, and by any other man who may occupy the chair as Speaker of this Assembly.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HARTLEY: Let me say that, even though we have not passed through the stirring times which the men who made the history of Parliament passed through, we have still with us a former Speaker, whom we may thank in that he realised the great power which was vested in him to stand as the great guardian of the people's representatives in this Chamber. I do not suppose it is beyond the memory of many of us that, at a time when strife ran high and feelings were bitter in this city, a band of soldiers marched to this House and demanded to see some of the people's representatives, in order that they might question them as to their attitude on certain subjects; and it was a Speaker of this House, in the person of the Hon. W. McCormack, who then stood as a power beyond even that of the Crown, for he stated that no man could demand to see a member of this House unless that member wished to see him, and that he would prevent anyone—soldiers or anyone else—attempting to intimidate members of Parliament.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HARTLEY: When they saw him standing there, clothed with the powers which they realised transcended even the powers of King's armies, they were satisfied [7.30 p.m.] that they were wrong and withdrew. I just wish to make these remarks in expression of my appreciation in seeing you, Sir, in the robes of the Speaker.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: They must have been overawed by the robes.

Mr. HARTLEY: They were over-awed—not by the robes, but by the power and authority of which they were the insignia.

With regard to the matter of the election, I regard the return of this party in the great numbers in which we see them as a triumph of honest administration—not faultless administration, but honest administration—honestly put before the people, as opposed to the misrepresentation and the power of the Press. I regard it as a triumph of the platform in explaining to the people what is really taking place as opposed to the mental poisoning which has been going on for the last three

years by a great section of the Press of this country. If hon. members opposite will look round, they must realise that there can be no more abject failure than their campaign, first in the Press of the last three years, and later in the few weeks preceding 12th May.

Mr. KELSO: What are the total figures?

Mr. HARTLEY: The hon. member may be a good accountant; he may be able to prove easily that there should be ten or fifteen more men over there than there are. I do not care 2d. if he can prove that members opposite had a majority of 50,000 votes. The main fact is that under the Constitution of Queensland fourteen more men have been sworn in and are entitled to represent this party in this Parliament than have been returned on the other side. It is no good bothering about splitting hairs and "faking" figures. This is the voice of the people as expressed under the system and rules of elections as we have them to-day. If hon. members opposite can find an honest and better method, let us have it, but do not try to stuff it down my neck that any scheme which the exponents of their party adopt will result in getting absolutely fair representation, for I am quite sure that they would wrest from the ordinary worker the right of having any representation in Parliament at all if they could do so.

I should like to refer now to what has been said about the right of men to represent the people in Parliament and about their ability. I am reminded of expressions to which the hon. member for Oxley gave voice the other night that the great majority of the Opposition were not desirous of occupying the Treasury benches. "In this respect," he said, "we differ from a great many members of the Government, who, if they lost their present jobs, would never be able to earn one-fifth of the incomes they now seek." I am not very much concerned about the opinions of the hon. member for Oxley on that matter. The men who have been returned here have been returned by men who have been associated with them and who have seen their work in various unions, or the Labour movement generally, and they have been chosen to occupy these positions because those men think they are qualified to fill them and earn their salaries. But let us just examine the authority who says this—the hon. member for Oxley. I do not know much about his career, but it seems to me that his greatest successes have been his failures. He promoted the Co-operative Fruitgrowers' Association, which, after a rather troublesome passage of some years, during which he received a very fine salary—

Mr. KERR: He tried to help the fruit-growers, and you are trying to help the farmers to-day and cannot do so.

Mr. HARTLEY: The trouble was that he was receiving about £1,000 per annum for promoting the company that subsequently went into liquidation.

Mr. KERR: And the farmers are insolvent, and you cannot help them.

Mr. HARTLEY: He was the promoter of the Fruitgrowers' Association—he certainly promoted it, and they promoted him outside—and the Fruitgrowers' Association finally completed their liquidation a few weeks ago. His next qualification that I know of was as manager for the Darra cement works, from which, after a rather varied and troublesome

[Mr. Hartley.]

experience with his shareholders, he departed, and it was necessary to raise new capital to get the thing going again.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HARTLEY: Anybody who says that I cannot earn my salary must be a better authority on the question than I am. In that position also the hon. member was a failure. I do not accept as an authority as to whether I can earn my salary or whether any other member of this House can earn his, a man who, as an enlisted man and subsequently as a war loan promoter, received a big remuneration and his parliamentary salary as well.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member's remarks are not relevant to the question before the House.

Mr. HARTLEY: I simply comment on these things on account of the insult which has been gratuitously thrown at members on this side. I was surprised at the hon. member for Warwick making the statement that the taxation of the Government was restricting or discouraging the operations of private enterprise in Queensland. If the hon. member will study the statistics of the day a little more closely, he will not again fall into such an error. I am sure that he must realise that, whatever disadvantages there may have been in the past, in the last few years the State has progressed. There are other factors to be taken into consideration than the number of factories in operation this year and the number of factories last year. If the hon. member will turn up the Queensland "ABC Book of Statistics," he will find that in 1915, when this Government came into power, there were 1,796 factories in Queensland, whilst in 1921 they had increased to 1,810, or by only fourteen. The hands employed in the factories in 1915 numbered 53,362, and in 1921 42,248, or in other words 1,034 fewer than when this Government took office.

Mr. KERR: Come over here.

Mr. HARTLEY: The hon. gentleman does not see the significance of those figures. I dare say when the first factory was put up before the steam engine was invented, the number of hands operating then exceeded by four or five to one the number of operatives in the same industry to-day. Surely hon. members opposite realise that, with the new processes of manufacture, increased efficiency in systems, and up to date machinery, the number of operatives will not be the same.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: That applies to the other States as well.

Mr. HARTLEY: Yes. In spite of the fact that there were 1,034 less factory hands in Queensland in 1921 than in 1915, there was a greater value of output in 1921 than in 1915.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: That is all that saved the country.

Mr. HARTLEY: Do not step away from that. These are things the hon. gentleman should face. He should sincerely weigh them before making any incorrect statements. In making a comparison of output, we know that value plays the most important part. If the hon. gentleman in his warehouse effected a thousand sales one week of a certain value, and then the following week effected two thousand sales at only half the value, he would not be doing good business. The same argument applies in discussing the output of

factories in Queensland. In 1915, with 1,034 more operatives, the output was £25,544,000.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: What does that include?

Mr. HARTLEY: I think it includes everything that you could call a factory—from a pothole in the ground called a mine right up to the latest equipped factory—it includes everything at which men can work. The value of the output from the factories of Queensland in 1921 was £40,334,198, or an excess after six years of Labour administration of £14,789,486. What has the hon. gentleman to say to that?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: We would have been insolvent but for that kind of thing.

Mr. HARTLEY: Of course we would. If we had not been producing more, we would have been insolvent, but under this Government, with fewer hands, we were able to produce a greater value in output; yet it is said that the Government, by their taxation methods, are crippling private enterprise. We see that there is a considerable excess in the value of the output between the years 1915 and 1921.

Mr. EDWARDS: That was because of increased price to the consumer.

Mr. HARTLEY: Nonsense. I will now deal with the wages bill. In 1915, with 1,034 more men employed, the wages bill was £4,226,000, and in 1921, after six years of Labour administration, it was £7,217,000. That shows that, although there were 1,034 less employees in 1921 in the factories of Queensland, they received in wages and salaries £2,991,000 more. Those figures show that under six years of Labour administration there was paid nearly £3,000,000 more in wages, and there was a greater increase in the value of output than under any Barnes-Denham cosmopolitan or "mixed up" Government. They are figures that you cannot get away from.

Mr. KILSO: Give us some Victorian figures.

Mr. HARTLEY: I will give the hon. gentleman some directly. I understand the hon. gentleman is an accountant, and he should dissect those figures and correct them, and prove them wrong if he can. He can read the speeches in "Hansard" which I am sure will be a good mental exercise for him. It will broaden his political outlook.

I will now deal with the questions of exports and imports in Queensland, New South Wales, and Victoria, for the year 1920-21. They are more striking in comparison than the figures relating to the factories. For the year 1920-21 the imports of Queensland amounted to £11,840,000, and the exports £15,171,000, or an excess of exports over imports of £3,331,000, or, in other words, we sent out of the country £3,331,000 more stuff than we bought.

Mr. KERR: That was paid in interest on the public debt in London.

Mr. HARTLEY: It is a good job that we had it to pay. That is why the money interests in London are going to lend us more. They want to chuck money at us now. That is why they are a bit chary about lending money to Victoria and New South Wales. The imports into New South Wales for the same year amounted to £72,466,000, and the exports amounted to £51,714,000, or, in other words, they went to the bad to the extent of £20,752,000. In Victoria they were a good deal worse. The imports for that year were £56,607,000, while the exports were only £34,878,000, showing

Mr. Hartley.]

that they also went to the bad to the extent of £21,729,000. Those figures indicate that they bought over £21,000,000 more worth of goods than they were able to produce and sell. Those figures show a striking example of the prosperity, and soundness of finance, trade, and commerce in Queensland in comparison with the other States.

Mr. KERR: Has the hon. member produced figures relating to interstate trade?

Mr. HARTLEY: No.

Mr. KERR: Your argument is unsound.

Mr. COLLINS: The hon. member's simple mind does not seem to be able to grasp this argument.

Mr. HARTLEY: In 1922 the exports in Queensland exceeded the imports by £8,954,000, or, in other words, we sold that amount more of goods than we bought from outside countries. When you hear these figures quoted, I do not think there will be any necessity to send the hon. member for Oxley home to assist the Premier with regard to arrangements for the flotation of a loan.

I want to congratulate the Secretary for Agriculture, the Premier, and the party generally for the way in which they have successfully established the cotton industry in Queensland. I have heard misleading statements with regard to this question on the platform and from hon. members in this Chamber. Any man who is honest and sincere must admit that the founding of the cotton industry to-day is no haphazard or "wild cat" scheme. The industry is past the experimental stage, and is solidly backed by a guarantee of the price and the ginning and marketing of the product. Not by any wish of Aladdin's lamp or a wave of the magic wand has this industry been brought into Queensland, and rapidly risen to the position of the third industry in the State, and now bids fair to surpass in importance the sugar industry. There has been some trouble with regard to the sugar agreement, but all I wish to say is that this country cannot always subsidise an industry.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HARTLEY: If we have an industry which cannot pay its way, then we must try some other industry which will. Possibly in the cotton industry you have a big adjunct to the sugar industry in connection with the peopling of the far northern portion of this State.

Mr. KERR: What do you think of the ratoon crop?

Mr. HARTLEY: I will tell the hon. member what I think of the ratoon crop as I come to it. I wish now to trace the rise and growth of this industry. In 1916 the Government encouraged the planting and growing of cotton by offering a guaranteed price of 1½d. per lb. They ginned and marketed that cotton, and the grower received 2 7/10d. per lb. In 1917 the advance price per lb. was still 1½d., but the grower realised 3½d. In 1919 the Government increased their guarantee to 2d. per lb., and the grower, after the Government had ginned and marketed the crop for him, cleared 4d. per lb. It was in 1920 that the grower received a guaranteed advance price of 3d. per lb., and actually received 5½d. for his cotton on the market. Subsequently in 1920-21 the Government stabilised the industry by guaranteeing a price of 5½d. per lb. What was the result?

[Mr. Hartley.]

Whereas in 1916 the quantity of cotton grown was practically nil, in 1920 the State produced 57,000 lb. of cotton; in 1921, 840,000 lb.; and in 1922, 3,878,000 lb.; while it is estimated that in 1923 10,000,000 lb. will be produced. That is something that should not be regarded lightly or made the object of a vicious attack for political purposes. I want to say to hon. members opposite, particularly the hon. member for Burnett, that it is not a wise thing, with an industry which we have brought up from its infancy like this one, and practically placed in a sound and robust condition, to attempt to shake the confidence of the people in the State, or of those people who wish to come to the State, by making damaging statements such as he made last night.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HARTLEY: And also by some of the damaging statements that were made by Opposition candidates throughout the election.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HARTLEY: They even went so far as to say that the Government had sold the cotton-grower to the Australian Cotton Growing Association, Limited. Nothing could be more fallacious and misleading than that statement. Far from that being the case, the reverse is the case. The Government have made adequate and proper arrangements for the provision of seed for the crop, for the ginning of the crop, and for its marketing, and right through, so far as I understand the provisions of the agreement and so far as my knowledge goes, in every respect the grower is amply protected. I will just quote some of the terms of the agreement, but first let me show how the Australian Cotton Growing Association, Limited, came to be in the business at all. In 1920, finding that the crop was increasing year after year, the Government, looking ahead, saw that they would have to provide better ginning facilities for the cotton and better machinery for the other operations than they had at that time. Far from condemning the Government for the action that they have taken, the Opposition, as supporting the principles of private enterprise, should rejoice. The Government had actually ordered a cotton-ginning mill when Mr. Crawford Vaughan came into the negotiations. It was the intention of the Government then as there were no prospects on the horizon for providing ginning facilities, to erect a first-class up-to-date cotton gin in Queensland. It was in 1921 that the attention of Mr. Crawford Vaughan was evidently attracted to the possibilities of cotton growing and manufacture in Queensland and he came into the negotiations and offered to put up a cotton-ginning mill. That offer was accepted by the Government through the Secretary for Agriculture, and it is in operation to-day with proper safeguards for the grower as to the conditions pertaining to the marketing of the product. The first principal condition of the agreement was that the company should undertake to expend not less than £150,000 in the erection of the necessary gins and machinery before the 31st July, 1921. Here is the point I want the hon. member for Burnett to notice. The next condition of the agreement was that the Minister on his part undertook to acquire all cotton produced in Queensland and deliver it to a factory of the company. That was a point that was in dispute last

night, when the hon. member for Burnett said the company had the control of the cotton. From that clause alone it is absolutely certain that the Secretary for Agriculture, as agent for the Government, is the absolute sole owner of the cotton. The Government are to pay the Association 1½d. per lb. for all cotton lint produced. The only other mention of payment that I can see in the agreement is that the company are entitled to a commission of 2½ per cent. for the sale of cotton lint. I wonder whether the hon. member for Burnett will say that the terms of that agreement are in any way loose, that they could be evaded, or that the interests of the cotton-grower are not amply protected.

Another important feature of the agreement showing how the grower is protected is the clause precluding the company from buying cotton lint itself. When all the facts are summed up it will be conceded that the Australian Cotton Growing Association are merely acting as agents for the Government in handling the cotton crop of Queensland. The actions of the Government have tended to found solidly the cotton-growing industry, and possibly make Queensland and Australia a rival cotton-growing country to the United States of America.

Mr. KERR: Do you believe in co-operation, or do you believe in letting the people who are handling the crop deal with the whole thing?

Mr. HARTLEY: I believe in socialisation.

Mr. KERR: Not co-operation?

Mr. HARTLEY: I believe in socialisation of industry.

Mr. KERR: You do? You are advocating something entirely different now.

[8 p.m.]

Mr. HARTLEY: You have to go step by step. The Government have no intention of trying to build a complete Socialist State in one week, or one year, or the life of one Parliament. So far as I can foresee the prospects of the future, this work will go on step by step.

If it had not been for the Cotton Growing Association coming into the business with an offer to build these mills, the Government would have nationalised the cotton-ginning industry of the State; but, possibly from financial considerations, they thought it better to let Mr. Crawford Vaughan undertake the organisation.

Mr. KERR: You put your finger right on it; they had regard to the financial considerations.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HARTLEY: We are quite satisfied that we are not in the position to-day to nationalise and buy out every industry with the limited revenue at our disposal. It is a question of going step by step, and we are nationalising those industries which are most important in the interests of the people of Queensland.

The hon. gentleman asked me to touch upon the question of ratoon cotton. I am not going to say that I am an authority on cotton; but, as I understand the position, in the early encouragement of the growing of cotton in 1917 an expert of the Government tendered advice to the growers of cotton that ratoon would be a good crop to grow. That authority was Mr. Daniel Jones. On that advice a number of growers ratooned

their crop. They had ample warning as far back as 1921 that there was a doubt about ratoon cotton, and the previous advice was cancelled by other advice to grow annual crops. The Government made arrangements to take over that cotton to 1922, and made it clear that for the future ratoon cotton would not be accepted under the Government scheme. No cotton-grower in the Central District will dispute that fact.

It is not a question as to whether ratoon cotton is good or not. The question is that the buyer of cotton says straight out that he will not buy ratoon cotton at 5½d. per lb. The Cotton-ginning Association will not have ratoon cotton. That is the reason why the Government, under their agreement, have decided that it must be annual cotton of a certain length of staple. In regard to the Central District the position is clearly understood, and only a very small percentage of the people to-day fail to understand the desirability of establishing a high-grade class of cotton, getting on the market with that standard, and preserving it at any cost.

HON. J. G. APPEL (*Libert*): Permit me to congratulate you, Sir, upon your re-election as the Speaker of this House. To me, personally, you have extended many courtesies, which I very much appreciate. I would, however, be a hypocrite indeed if I congratulated the Premier upon the victory which he won at the recent general election.

The PREMIER: You had an easy time.

HON. J. G. APPEL: Unfortunately, that was my trouble. Suffice it to say, there are so many of the opponents of the Premier who do not realise that he is a most astute politician, that he is a man of conspicuous ability, a man of ruthless determination—a determination so ruthless that it is quite possible for one to say that it was by this ruthless determination that he effected a victory in favour of his party. By a majority of fourteen electorates the Premier now has the administration of the affairs of this State in his hands for the ensuing three years.

The PREMIER: We might go to the country before that.

HON. J. G. APPEL: Possibly. I am glad that the Premier has given some indication of what may happen. (Laughter.) However, the position is as it is. A majority of fourteen electorates have decided in favour of the present leader of the Government—and I think that we must all admit that it was practically a personal victory, owing to the opinion that a majority of the electors held so far as the Premier was concerned. He controls a party thoroughly disciplined. He is a leader in very fact and deed. Now, whether the victory was caused entirely by the votes of those who are supporters of the Labour party, or whether, in addition thereto, a large section of the community accorded their support to the Premier, it is impossible for me to say. Yet I believe it is so. I believe that, outside his own supporters, a considerable section of the community—men engaged in the commercial life of the State—accorded their support to the Premier, as the leader of his party, owing to the disunity and disorganisation of the Opposition, thinking that the Premier was the one man best fitted to lead the Government of the country, owing to his powers of disciplining his own party. He was the man best fitted to control those extreme forces. Hon. members may scoff and

Hon. J. G. Appel.]

laugh at it, but we know the hon. gentleman has controlled them and has disciplined them. A great responsibility rests upon the shoulders of the hon. gentleman, commanding, as he does, such a majority and such a party; controlling, as he does, the destinies of the people of this State and the destinies of the State itself. I can only devoutly hope that he will exercise that power and that authority in such a way that the material interests and the welfare of the whole of the community may be cared for; that each and every section of the community may be equally and justly dealt with, and that, so far as lies in his power, he will do all he can to advance the interests of this great State. (Hear, hear!)

I have never claimed to be what might be termed a distinctly partisan politician.

MR. COLLINS: You declared yourself a State Socialist on one occasion. (Laughter.)

HON. J. G. APPEL: And I am to-day; and the assistance given by the present Administration to the Cotton Association, who have erected ginneries, is an example of State socialism, private capital receiving the assistance of the State to carry out an enterprise for the development of the State, which is an object lesson in State socialism. I confess that I was more than surprised to see that the Premier was entering into such an agreement. I commend him for doing so, and I hope he will enter into many more agreements with large capitalistic associations who are prepared to come to this State and engage in enterprises for the advancement and development of Queensland. I have never been what may be termed a distinctly partisan politician.

MR. COLLINS: You were very partisan during the general strike, when you ran away. (Laughter.)

HON. J. G. APPEL: The hon. member knows all about running away. If you had seen the way he footed it when that special constable armed with a waddy came along, you would have realised so, too. (Laughter.) You would have backed him for the International.

MR. COLLINS: That is a deliberate untruth.

HON. J. G. APPEL: As I stated in the last session of Parliament, I would far prefer to commend the Government for their administration and legislation than condemn them. Personally, my whole conception of the duty of a representative of this Chamber is not to sneer at the Government of this State, but to render those who are controlling the destinies of the State all the assistance he can to do the best they can for the State and for the people. Whether I am a member of the party which controls the Treasury benches, or whether I am sitting in opposition, when the Government bring forward any proposition for the advancement of the State they will receive every commendation and every support that I can give them. I have no time for personal squabbles and recriminations. (Hear, hear!) It is beneath the dignity of this House that hon. members should indulge in personalities. We are here to perform a high duty, and it was indeed a pleasure to me to hear the proposer of the Address in Reply express the opinion which he did as to how the affairs of the House should be conducted and how its dignity should be upheld, and if each and every one of us would strive to carry out such an ideal, I feel sure that it would benefit not

[Hon. J. G. Appel.

alone the people of the State, but would have a beneficial effect upon the way in which we conduct our deliberations in this Chamber.

With other hon. members I desire to commend His Excellency the Governor for the interest which he has taken in the State and in the people of the State, and for the way in which we have had the benefit of his ripe advice and experience. Unquestionably, in many instances, that advice has been beneficial to those who are engaged in our primary industries. To me the interest which His Excellency takes in our school children, above all other matters, should be commended, and in that respect I would earnestly impress upon the Premier, who is also Treasurer, and has control of the funds of the State, the necessity of making adequate provision in his next Budget for the construction of new schools and for the improvement of schools which already exist, because the lack of the necessary funds for the erection of schools has been felt in our country districts, and in many instances has retarded development and settlement. In that connection His Excellency, who has taken such keen interest in the school children, has had an opportunity of seeing how in many instances, owing to the lack of suitable provision having been made, the necessary accommodation has not been provided in places where it should have been. I sincerely hope that the Premier, who claims to be a man who has the interests of the people at heart, and more especially those of the children, will not scout any request which is made by members on this side of the House, and will see that ample provision is made for the erection of new schools and for additional accommodation in old schools where needed. The mover of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply made a reference to the bribery case, and I regret that the Premier has not seen fit to accede to the request which I, as a member of the Opposition, in common with others, have made for a full inquiry into that matter. To my mind it was a most unsavoury subject, and it affected the honour of every individual in this House. An attempt should have been made to discover who was connected with the matter, whether inside or outside of this House, so that adequate punishment might be meted out.

An important matter which is referred to in His Excellency's Speech is the housing of people in the northern part of the State, and more particularly on mining fields.

MR. COLLINS: They were badly housed under your Government.

HON. J. G. APPEL: And it has not improved under yours—I have personally seen the accommodation of many of our people who are living in those distant portions of the State, and I admit that it is disgraceful; but how an alteration is to be made is a problem. In discussing the matter with the men who occupy these tin shanties, I have suggested to them that they should endeavour to secure the same conditions by obtaining loans for the purpose of building workers' dwellings, as is done in the southern part of the State; but their reply was, "If we did so, the possibility is that the field might be abandoned, and all that we have put in would be lost." That is where the problem comes in. Members of the medical profession have told me that, so far as the men are concerned,

it does not matter much, but it is a serious thing for the women. I hope that the Administration will do all they can to solve this problem, so that the men and women who are engaged in our mining industry and in the different parts of the West may have more suitable accommodation. They have not the advantages or the amusements which the dwellers in the city have.

Mr. COLLINS: Can you give us a suggestion?

Hon. J. G. APPEL: I have already said that it is a very difficult problem, but, like all other problems, it is possible of solution. I hope that an attempt will be made to solve it, because, as His Excellency has pointed out, and as those who have seen it know, the present conditions are a disgrace. An improvement should be brought about under any circumstances, not merely for the sake of the men but for the women and children who accompany their husbands to these distant parts of the State, where they are cut off from the conveniences, pleasures, and amusements of the cities.

There are two other matters referred to in the Speech, which are allied with each other—immigration and land settlement.

Mr. COLLINS: If your speech were printed in London it would block immigration.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: The two subjects must march hand in hand. We have a great extent of fertile land available for settlement. To obtain settlers we must make life in our country districts more attractive than it is at the present time. I am glad to see that the Government and their supporters have ceased to object to and oppose immigration. We all know that a section of the community are opposed to immigration, and have always been opposed to it. I remember when I was a school boy, and we had a very sparse population, those who were engaged as workers in the city objected to immigration. But we do not desire nor should any Administration introduce unskilled workers. There should be a wise selection of people with a knowledge of land, and who will go upon the land when they come here. If we are to make a success of land settlement, it is necessary that life should be made more attractive in country districts than it is at present. We find that, owing to its unattractiveness, a large percentage of the sons and daughters of our settlers will not remain upon the land to-day, but drift away to the cities and enter into competition with the people there. It should be the policy of every Administration in formulating a policy of immigration, coupled with land settlement, to remove the difficulties which exist now. We must realise that the only possible solution of the prickly-pear menace is the closer settlement of our lands, without which it will be absolutely impossible to destroy that national curse, which has taken possession of some of the most fertile lands in the State. I can assure the leader of the Government that any proposition which he makes in regard to immigration and closer settlement, and to induce people to remain on the land, will receive my cordial support.

Another matter I would like to mention, which also is connected with land settlement, is water supply—and by that I do not mean great irrigation schemes which would cost a large amount of money and impose a burden upon the land. I refer more particularly to the provision of water at small cost to the settlers on our lands. For

the last two years what has been, perhaps, one of the severest droughts ever experienced in the annals of our State has been devastating the south-eastern districts of Queensland. Over country which practically never before knew the want of water, which never experienced a lack of rain, an acute drought has reigned for the last two years, and, although the coal-field portion has received more or less relief from winter rains, yet this is not universally the case, and there are in the Beaudesert district fertile areas not fronting upon running creeks which have been rendered practically valueless. Subartesian water is available, and I have to thank the Secretary for Agriculture for his courtesy, not alone to myself but to my electors, in making available, as he has always done, the services of Inspector McCarthy, who is a water diviner. As a result of that courtesy, permission has been granted to the inspector to locate water, and by that means the difficulty has been solved, and these dry paddocks have been provided with water. For the information of the House, I would like to elucidate what I call the provision of water at a reasonable cost—that is, within the means of every selector—and not as a part of some costly irrigation scheme. Here I would like to commend Mr. McCarthy for not merely carrying out his official duties, for during the period in which he has had charge of that district he has done all that he could to assist those engaged in its industries. Not only has he located water, but he has also shown the settlers how they could bring it to the surface at a minimum cost. Subartesian water exists at an average depth of 50 feet, and the settlers have managed to tap the supply by means of the hand bore. The total cost of boring that depth, of casing and [8.30 p.m.] of placing a pump in position, amounts to £29 15s. 6d. in ordinary soil and £35 7s. 7d. in sandstone. I would commend such a scheme to the hon. gentleman who controls the destinies of the Department of Agriculture—who, I am thankful to say, has a knowledge of what is required by the man on the land—as something worth including in any settlement proposal, so that water may be provided at reasonable cost in those areas where permanent running water does not exist.

On the question of freehold versus leasehold tenure of land, I can only say that I am a believer in the freehold tenure, but apparently the electors of the State, to the extent of a majority of fourteen members in this Assembly, have decided that they prefer perpetual lease. I have to abide by their verdict. If they do not want freehold, if they choose only perpetual lease, that settles the question so far as I am concerned; but I can only trust that the decision will prove to be a good one, and that it will in no way interfere with the progress of the settlement of our lands.

I am very glad indeed to see that it is proposed to review the over-capitalisation of the soldier settlements. As was pointed out by members of this House, myself amongst the number, when those settlements were formed, the capital value placed upon the land was too great. The crops which it was surmised could be grown on those lands were not such as to justify the value placed upon them; but the decision of the Government, if carried out in the spirit in which I take it it is suggested, may have a beneficial effect

Hon. J. G. Appel.]

on the settlements, although I have no hesitation in saying that it would be better to abandon some of them at once. I said in this House, from my knowledge of the land in one settlement and from the fact that men were prepared to go miles into the ranges where there were no roads rather than settle upon the land which had been selected for it, one in particular was bound to fail. To-day that prophecy has been fulfilled. I refer more particularly to the Beerburum Settlement. To my mind it would be better to abandon the whole thing and let the first cost be the last cost and put those soldiers on land where disaster is not absolutely evident at first sight, and where there is a prospect of success.

The Government, by their agricultural policy, have proposed to assist those persons engaged in primary industries, and have adopted a system of agricultural councils. As I said at the time, although I believe it was absolutely necessary that some action should be taken, it would be far better if the Government had obtained from any control of them. If the machinery for the purpose had been simplified, if all that was necessary to assist in the co-operative movement had been arranged for, and if the management with all the necessary consequential powers had been left entirely in the hands of the primary producers, the end in view would be more effectively and more successfully accomplished than by any direction by officers of the State.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. J. G. APPEL: We agree, of course, that these officers are necessary, and any of us who are connected with the land and who represent primary producers, will admit that the officers of the Department of Agriculture are at all times and upon every occasion prepared to give whatever assistance they can by way of advice or otherwise to all who need it and who are engaged in our primary industries.

A lot may be done by the department in the way of giving advice, but it has often struck me that in many ways our methods are absolutely antiquated. We find in the Southern States, where there is a group of farmers, one plough practically ploughs the whole of the fields for that group. In Queensland we adopt the antiquated method of each man doing his own ploughing. Perhaps he may have only 10 acres or 20 acres, but still we have that divided effort, whereas we might have what I call communal tillage, whereby the whole of the tillage would be effected at very much less cost than at present.

Mr. COLLINS: You will be advocating communism if you are not careful.

HON. J. G. APPEL: I give the hon. member for Bowen credit for being absolutely honest. I know he believes what he says; but, unfortunately, he cannot analyse matters and distinguish between those little things which make the difference between State socialism and communism, or what might be called ordinary socialism, which does not benefit the individual but seeks to destroy him. We seek that socialism whereby the State will assist individuals by giving advice and by supplying capital when necessary in order to bring about a certain end and aim. Wherever that has been done unquestionably it has led to success.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: If the hon. gentleman adopted that policy, there

[Hon. J. G. Appel.

would be a lot more hon. members in opposition than there are to-day. The policy of his party is individualism, pure and simple; he stands for exploitation, if it can be carried out.

HON. J. G. APPEL: So far that is not apparent. I have no sympathy for the middleman. I have been a producer, and I have had some experience of middlemen. I know what they have taken out of me. That is why I urge co-operation.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Do not look so hard at the leader of the Opposition. (Laughter.)

HON. J. G. APPEL: All we ask is that the Government will give us power to co-operate, and that they will assist us in finding markets. We also ask that they give us advice and give us the necessary power to enable us to make the best of our opportunities. If they are going to control us and say, "You have got to do this this way, because we consider it is the proper way," I am afraid that, like some of the soldier settlements, it will end in disaster.

The time allowed to hon. members is not sufficient to deal with many problems which are disclosed in His Excellency's Speech. I have come to the conclusion, from the results of the last general election, that the majority of the electorates prefer a policy, however nebulous or impossible it may be, which appeals to their imagination. And, so long as there are plenty of funds available, and any amount of money for the purpose of obtaining all the pleasures that it is possible for them to obtain, even if disaster is apparent and even if it results in the loss of some of their political privileges, they prefer to adopt that policy rather than a sane and sound policy which will lead to prosperity and conserve the rights and privileges of the whole community. I admit that this is an age when we cannot stand still. We have to go forward and progress. We have to march with the times. We have to realise that old methods and old means have gone and passed. In carrying out these ideals, they should be carried out with prudence, so that, if possible, they may result in success rather than be depreciated by imprudence and incapacity. I can only ask the Premier once more that, with the power which he has and the authority he possesses with his party behind him disciplined to carry out what he desires, in carrying out any policy he will have due regard not only to one section of the community but to the community as a whole, and will deal out even-handed justice to that whole community; and, in dealing out that justice to the whole community he will advance the prosperity not alone of the people of Queensland but of the State itself.

Mr. FOLEY (*Leichhardt*): In rising to support the motion, I would join with most other speakers in congratulating the mover and seconder of the motion. For new members they made exceptionally good speeches, and I think they outshone many of the older hands on this side of the House, and particularly outshone many hon. members opposite. I feel sure that before this session ends both those hon. members will take a very important part in the discussions that will take place from time to time. The leader of the Opposition rose to place the views of the party of which he is leader before this House, and he attempted to criticise the administration of this Government, but he made a very weak attempt

We can only come to the conclusion that the Opposition, after their defeat, have absolutely lost their punch, if they ever had any. The deputy leader of the Opposition made a good start last night, and aroused a little attention when he commenced his speech; but, owing to lack of material to carry on with, most hon. members left the Chamber before he had finished his speech, and therefore we can pay very little attention to the criticism that came from him.

I would like to touch on the land settlement scheme that has been enunciated in the Governor's Speech. I feel confident that the announcement regarding land resumption in various parts of the State will meet with the approval of the many landless people in Queensland and Australia. I also feel certain that the new Secretary for Public Lands is the right man to see that these resumptions are carried out in the best interests of the people of Queensland; and I feel sure that, when the people are eventually settled upon those areas, they will be satisfied with the amount of land that has been apportioned to them. I am satisfied that the Minister will see that the settler is not carrying too high a burden as the result of over-capitalisation. I know that every factor to be considered in the successful settling of people on those resumed lands will be very carefully considered by the present Secretary for Public Lands.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: What does the hon. gentleman consider to be a living area?

MR. FOLEY: I am not in a position to say what is a living area in any part of Queensland. I know that the Minister has done the right thing in establishing what is known as the Closer Settlement Board, so that the members of that board will be able to go into the matter thoroughly and advise the Minister what is a living area in the different districts of Queensland.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: What does the hon. gentleman think of this suggestion—to place settlers on every alternate block and then, if it is found that the blocks are too small, they can be extended on either side?

MR. FOLEY: I do not think that method will meet with approval, or that it would be successful in determining the living area. Of course, if you only settled every alternate block, you would naturally be on the safe side should those who have been settled on a specific area find it was not sufficient. You would then be in a position to enlarge that area at a later date.

MR. EDWARDS: I am sure he would get good advice from the Country party.

MR. FOLEY: That method would not be sound policy on the part of the Government. That is a matter which should be gone into thoroughly by the Advisory Board, which should be constituted by an agricultural expert, one of the best officials to be procured in the Lands Department, and possibly a good official, or an authority on irrigation. The most important factor that the Secretary for Public Lands should take notice of is that in any particular area where this board is carrying out investigations a practical farmer from the area should be secured to collaborate with the board and assist it in reporting to the hon. gentleman.

MR. EDWARDS: Hear, hear! The Country party platform.

MR. FOLEY: I am not expounding the Country party platform.

MR. EDWARDS: That is it.

MR. FOLEY: I am only expounding what I consider to be a common-sense policy to adopt in the settlement of the people on the land.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. EDWARDS: That is the Country party's platform.

MR. FOLEY: I claim that no Secretary for Public Lands can determine the living area in any specified district, because the work he is required to do is such that he cannot give his attention to investigating the problem from every point of view.

MR. EDWARDS: The most common-sense expression made in the House.

MR. FOLEY: There are many benefits in connection with closer settlement which will accrue to the State, such as increased production, increased population, and increased work for our railways. It is apparent to most hon. members of this House that the more work we can create the greater is the chance of reducing the annual deficit on our railways in the various parts of the State. (Hear, hear!) Another important point in connection with this question is that it will bring about a considerable increase in the circulation of capital, and in turn increase work for the labouring population of the State. The most important feature in this matter is that the more people you can settle in Queensland the more you will reduce the per capita financial burden on every individual in the State. Another important factor that will have to be taken into consideration, and one which is receiving the attention of the Secretary for Public Lands, is the question of securing the right type of settlers. As has been pointed out during this debate, many of the types of immigrants arriving here from overseas are absolutely impossible as settlers, if you place them on the scrub land in the northern coastal districts of this State. At the first glance at that dense tropical jungle their hearts would be in their boots. We shall have to get the type of man who is used to roughing it, used to hard work, and possessing the necessary common sense to carry on agricultural pursuits under the instructions of the various instructors appointed by the Government, who will guide him from time to time. (Hear, hear!) It might be all right for many of our immigrants to be settled in places like the Peak Downs, for instance, where the only preliminary work is the sinking of a well and the building of fences. There are no trees on the plains there to fall, or scrub to clear, and they have the best agricultural soil at their command. In the heavier timbered country of this State care will have to be taken by the Closer Settlement Board to get the right type of settler. I understand we have a system in operation at the present time, inaugurated by the Department of Agriculture, under which instructors are sent to the fruit districts throughout the State to instruct the farmers as to the latest and best methods to adopt in carrying on the particular line of primary production that they are following. I think that this will have to be extended, because, from discussions I

Mr. Foley.]

have had with agricultural experts and with many men settled on the land to-day who call themselves farmers, I find, from my humble knowledge of agriculture, that many of these men, or so-called farmers, do not understand the elementary principles of agriculture. It will be necessary therefore for us to enlarge the Department of Agriculture and appoint sufficient agricultural instructors so that the new settlers needing instruction will be guided by the best advice that it is possible for the department to give. I understand that in Denmark practically the bulk of the farmers go through an agricultural educational course. That country lends itself to such a system more than Queensland, because there are periods in the year there when the men are able to leave the farms in charge of the women and attend a college. These colleges are established all over Denmark, and it is the aim and object of every farmer to enter them so that he may obtain the best agricultural education that it is possible to get in the country.

Mr. BURCOCK: Denmark is one of the greatest agricultural countries in the world.

Mr. FOLEY: As the hon. member for Barcoo has reminded me, Denmark is one of the greatest agricultural communities in the civilised world to-day. In addition to the needs I have already enlarged on, some of the new settlers will also need attention on the part of the Primary Producers' Organisation or the Council of Agriculture, who will have to keep in touch with the world's markets to such an extent as to be able to advise the farmers or settlers of this State what to produce and what not to produce. That is a very important factor that will have to be attended to by the Council in the interests of the new settlers of Queensland. The Council can also do a good deal by encouraging co-operation amongst the settlers in every part of the State. I would like to refer at this juncture to what is going on in

Denmark in the way of agriculture. [9 p.m.] Many farmers there are working $1\frac{1}{2}$ acres of land and making a living from it. I think the State by-laws prohibit any individual from holding more than 400 acres of land. That is unknown in Queensland. These men have made a success of agriculture by their knowledge of that particular pursuit, and by co-operating with each other to get the best results from the markets for their products. To give this House some idea of the position of affairs in that country:—Co-operative dairies number 1,203, and their turnover in 1915 was 105,000,000 dollars; butter export societies are numerous, and their turnover was 80,050,000 dollars; co-operative slaughter houses and bacon factories number 44, and their turnover was 72,200,000 dollars; co-operative egg exporting societies number 550, and their turnover was 2,200,000 dollars. There are fifteen societies for the purchase of goods, with 70,000 farmers as members. They have 690 central societies, 1,700 breeding societies—a society unknown in Australia at the present time.

At 9.5 p.m.,

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

Mr. FOLEY: The total turnover of all co-operative societies in that country reaches 250,000,000 dollars a year. That will give hon. members some idea of what the farmers there have done through their own co-opera-

[Mr. Foley.

tion, and what can be done by the farmers of Queensland if they will adopt the co-operative spirit.

We have from time to time heard members of the Opposition harping about the Labour Government having done nothing for the man on the land. The man on the land in Denmark has done all these things for himself without the aid of the Government, although the Government do come in here and there, and assist to a considerable extent. Most of these societies are self-supporting, their funds having been contributed by the farmers of the country. What has been done there can be done by Queensland farmers. To give some further idea of the membership of those societies, their distributive societies have a membership of 244,000; dairy societies, 190,000; bacon societies, 135,000; egg export societies, 45,000; foodstuff societies (Jutland only), 44,000; breeding societies, 23,000; control societies, 16,000. They have in Denmark a co-operative society for practically every branch of the primary industry.

I might refer to the speech of the hon. member for Burke the other night, when he pointed out the need for some movement on the part of the cattlemen of this State, with Government assistance, to handle the surplus cattle in Queensland and give the cattle industry a chance to thrive. He pointed out that it was intended to establish a co-operative canning away in the far North, and that some assistance was needed. I noticed in to-day's Press that the Government have offered some assistance to those would-be co-operators, provided they carry out their part of the contract. There should be something done besides manufacturing the products in the far Northern districts and dumping them on to the markets overseas in the hope that some selling agency will successfully dispose of them to their advantage. This will, to a great extent, hamper those co-operative enterprises. Denmark found, through experience, when exporting products to the English markets to compete against the American packer, and Argentina combines, that they were badly handicapped, and their move in the matter was to establish what is called—in the case of selling bacon—the Danish Bacon Society of London. They established that society as a selling agency, and were so successful with that branch that they can hold their own now with the most powerful combines and trusts of Argentina and the United States of America. I think something along these lines will have to be done in connection with any movement established in Queensland or Australia to distribute any particular commodity that they intend to dispose of in the British Isles—particularly in regard to the distribution of meat.

To wind up my remarks on co-operation I might quote another extract to emphasise the importance of co-operation amongst our primary producers. Harold Faber says, in one of his works dealing with the wonderful system of co-operation in Danish agriculture—

“In the highly developed form in which we find it now it embraces almost every branch of agriculture and agricultural industry and has its ramifications in almost every parish in Denmark. It has built up an organisation so complete that all the threads converge towards one point, from which the joint action of the whole system is in a certain measure controlled.

“The co-operative movement in Danish

agriculture was not started by a band of philanthropists, or even by the landlords, for the purpose of benefiting the practical farmers. It has grown up locally and gradually among the peasants in the villages, and takes its root in the feeling of solidarity, and a sense of the benefits of mutual help."

Having that as a lesson, it is about time the primary producer of this State took heed of these object-lessons from other countries and applied them to Queensland. He would then do a little bit for himself, instead of continually waiting and depending upon the Government to do it for him. I have voiced these sentiments in various parts of the country when discussing the matter with primary producers, and, although many of them recognise that the suggestions are sound, it seems almost impossible for them, apart from the dairying industry, to bring co-operation into being.

We have received a good deal of criticism from hon. members opposite owing to the Government's action in reducing the price of ratoon cotton, and because the Government have practically told the cotton-growers in this State that in future they will not take ratoon cotton at all. I think the Premier, in face of the advice received from the English Cotton Spinners' Association, had no alternative but to adopt the policy he did. The Cotton Spinners' Association are the main buyers of the cotton that will be produced in Queensland, and, after that association intimated that ratoon cotton was not "legal tender" on the British market, it would have been madness on the part of the Queensland Government to have induced the farmers to produce that class of cotton by paying the guaranteed price.

Mr. FRX: Can you tell us any reason why they will not take ratoon cotton?

Mr. FOLEY: I cannot tell.

Mr. FRX: Has it anything to do with keeping the boll weevil out.

Mr. FOLEY: I understand the main reason why the cotton spinners of England and other parts of the world do not desire ratoon cotton is because of the brittle nature of the fibre, which makes it very hard to handle in the process of spinning. One other reason is that the agricultural experts claim that, if plants are allowed to stand over from one year to another, there is a great danger of them harbouring insect pests that will naturally spread and affect the cotton industry of the State. Those are the two main reasons against the growing of ratoon cotton. The second reason I mentioned I do not think stands good, because men who have grown both plant and ratoon cotton in the Peak Downs district have informed me that the usual custom is to cut the plants back after harvesting and burn the refuse, so that the danger of insect pests is practically eliminated. Although I agree with the action of the Government in connection with ratoon cotton, I claim that there is room for investigation, because ratoon cotton can be grown in some parts of this State more successfully than the plant or annual crop. Therefore there is plenty of room for further investigation on the part of the Secretary for Agriculture to ascertain whether a market does not exist in any part of the world for ratoon cotton, and, secondly, to test the known markets by samples of ratoon cotton, not allowing the expert buyers overseas to know

that it is ratoon cotton. Another good move would be to have spinning tests carried out in some of the spinning mills in Britain with Queensland ratoon cotton of average quality, and ascertain in that way whether the allegation that the fibre is too brittle has any truth in it. Some farmers claim that ratoon cotton, as known by the cotton world, came into disrepute on account of the inferior cotton that was ratooned on the almost exhausted cotton lands of America and some other parts of the world, whereas on some of the richer soils of Queensland it is claimed that the difference in fibre between the first or plant cotton and ratoon cotton is practically nil.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: It is good business to produce only the best.

Mr. FOLEY: Yes; but, at the same time, if we can find a profitable market for ratoon cotton, it will be of great advantage, because there are parts of Queensland where in some seasons ratoon cotton can be grown more successfully than the plant crop. Therefore I do not think any harm will be done in making a thorough investigation into the whole business. When one comes to consider the enormous amount of cotton that is consumed every year in the world, we can only come to the conclusion that there must be some market for what is known as ratoon cotton. According to the statistics issued by the National City Bank of New York, the world's consumption of cotton is in the vicinity of 21,000,000 bales, and I believe each bale weighs something like 500 lb. The United States of America produce 11,500,000 bales, and the same authorities contend that in ten years' time it is to be expected that the world's consumption will reach 30,000,000 bales of cotton per year. When one considers the number of cotton mills that exist in the world, he must come to the conclusion that, apart altogether from the question of whether ratoon cotton is inferior or not, some of these mills cannot at times get the best quality cotton that they require for the manufacture of fabrics, and there is the possibility of a market for ratoon cotton, quite apart from Great Britain. Out of the 6,483 cotton mills in the world there are only 2,009 in Great Britain and 1,451 in the United States. The mills in these two countries consume 10,000,000 bales of cotton per year. Then there are the Indian and Canadian mills, which have a consumption of 6,109,141 bales of cotton per year. Then there is France, with 430 mills and a consumption of 1,000,000 bales; Italy, with 480 mills and a consumption of 850,000 bales of cotton every year. The Japanese mills number about 175, and they consumed in 1915 1,500,000 bales of cotton. Therefore there is plenty of room for investigation to ascertain whether there is a favourable market for what is known as ratoon cotton.

Another point I would like to touch upon is the need for educating the cotton farmers of the State with regard to the industry. I find that in my own district methods of cultivation could be greatly improved. Very few men understand anything about the conservation of moisture after the cotton plant is well matured and on its way towards picking, much less the need for conservation of moisture in the soil before planting time arrives. The views of Mr. Wells, one of the experts who has been travelling around the various cotton fields in Queensland, are

Mr. Foley.]

reported thus in the "Daily Mail" of 1st February last—

"One of the things which has struck Mr. W. G. Wells (Government Cotton Specialist) is that cotton-growers of Queensland are not realising the necessity for the proper cultivation of the seed beds and the cultivation of the crops generally. The latter he has found to be true in practically every district that he visited."

That is a statement which needs attention. This expert, who visited practically every cotton district in Queensland, found that scarcely any farmer had a properly prepared seed bed so that a favourable crop could be secured. Further on in this article, Mr. Wells mentions that, quite apart from the dry conditions which prevailed during his visit, the farmers themselves were in many cases doing nothing to conserve the moisture in the soil in order that the cotton plants might get the full benefit of it. He said that he could notice the difference between the crop of the farmer who cultivated his crop thoroughly and those of the men who allowed the weeds to get beyond control. That is one of the most important things we can attend to. We should be sure that we have sufficient experts and experimental farms in connection with our various primary products to carry out experiments in the conservation of moisture and in other necessary ways, the results of which experiments can be handed on to the farmer for his benefit. Only last June many inches of rain fell throughout the Western and Central districts, and I venture to say there was not one farmer there who had his land lying fallow ready to receive that rain, and that not one of them had worked his land to conserve the moisture until planting time arrived, but, instead, was trusting to Providence for rain after planting. If the land was cultivated along those lines, sufficient moisture could have been conserved, the seed would have germinated, and the crop put upon a fair road to success, so that the later rains in December and January would make it a successful crop. That is one of the most important things which can be attended to in order to make cotton-growing a success in Queensland. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*): I will not keep hon. members very long—not because there is not plenty of material to criticise the Government on, but because there are other hon. members who wish to speak, and the time is short, so I will do as much in as short a time as possible to assist in the reformation of the Government. We have gone a long way since 1914. I think I can safely say that during the last three or four years the Government have been assisted a great deal in their reformation by the efforts of the Country party.

I want to take exception to some remarks which fell from the deputy leader of the United party in regard to the reason why this side of the House did not win the election. No doubt he was correct according to his own belief, but, so far as the Country party was concerned, we had a leader whom we were prepared to follow and also a policy, and we are still in that position. We have a policy which we know is good for Queensland, and we are quite prepared to stand behind our leader and, if necessary, to take the reins of Government.

I am very sorry to see the small programme put forward by the Government,

[*Mr. Foley.*

as I expected a great deal more after all the promises they made. I do not see why hon. members opposite should talk about their moderation; it is not long ago since they were extremists.

Mr. COLLINS: No.

Mr. DEACON: I heard the hon. member taking exception to the Speaker wearing his robes. I notice that he said that because he was representing electors who objected, and not because he objected.

Mr. COLLINS: I said that I represented a radical constituency, which the hon. member does not.

Mr. DEACON: I think the Government should have gone a great deal further in their programme. I am not going to depreciate the little good they have done. We have always accepted what we could get from them of a good description. I am going to suggest an extension of their programme in regard to several matters. There are many ways in which it could be improved. I trust that, when the various measures come before us, the Government will accept the help of the Opposition in improving them, as we did on previous occasions; in fact, we gave them a great deal of their good name when they went before the electors. It was practically the measures which we assisted them to make workable on which they went to the country. The most important proposal of the Government is for the development of land settlement. They propose to amend the Main Roads Act, so that the Main Roads Board will not be able to charge half the cost of the roads to new settlers. No body of settlers can afford to pay half the cost of a main road. It is only fair that they should be given good roads in order to be successful. No one expects the settlers to contribute specially towards the cost of the railways, and the main roads should be dealt with in the same way. If I have to stand

[9.30 p.m.] here and speak longer than I intended, the Government must recognise that it is because they are making me stand here in place of three men. (Laughter.)

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: That is a compliment to you.

Mr. DEACON: The trouble is that those other two men had votes, and they are always of more use than talk when any matter comes up affecting the great district I have the honour to represent.

Mr. PEASE: They were a poor lot.

Mr. DEACON: They were not a poor lot. I notice that the Government intend to extend the provisions of the Industrial Arbitration Act, and I assume that the intention is to extend them to the farming industry, which is practically the only important industry which at present is not subject to the Act. So far as I am concerned, and so far as the farmers are concerned, there is no objection to pay to the men who work for them the full value of their services. They do not begrudge them the same wage as other men get in other industries—not a shilling—but, if the community is going to impose an extra tax on the industry, the community must be prepared to stand up and pay for it. In any business any increased cost of wages is added to the price of the article produced; but when you come to primary production that is impossible, because you have to conform to the world's market price, and we have to sell our com-

modities here as cheaply as they can be purchased elsewhere. If the cost is going to be put up, the whole community must be prepared to share the loss on the oversea stuff. For instance, butter is selling in London at 1s. 10d. per lb., and here at 2s. 2d. If the cost of production is to be increased, it is quite possible that if the London market falls to 1s. per lb., we shall have to ask the local people to pay 5s. per lb. An extra price will have to be charged here, because to a certain extent the cost of everything is passed on to the primary producer. It is impossible to avoid that in any industry. If the cost of the things the wheatgrowers require is put up, then they have to recover as much as possible of the extra cost; and I hope that, when the Government are extending the Act, they will do something to provide that the community will, if necessary, bear this extra cost of production. The Labour party started out with a cheap living cry in 1914. In 1923 they have to face a position of dear living—there is no way out of it—for if they do not provide for the extra cost of production then there will be decreased production, and naturally it will follow then that the people will have to pay extra prices whether they like it or not. I hope, too, that when the Bill is being discussed family labour will be protected. Arbitration Court awards have interfered very much with family labour in factories and shops, for instance, and that point should not be forgotten in respect of farming.

There is to be an amendment of the Income Tax Act, and I hope that when it is being dealt with we shall be able to do full justice to the people on the land who are paying two taxes. At present landowners are treated far worse than other people, because, as hon. members know, every man owning more than a certain amount of land pays both land tax and income tax. If he owns land of a capital value of £2,500, he has to pay tax on the income he derives from it and land tax as well, whereas if he has a capital of £100,000 in a brewery he has only to pay on his income.

I hope that when the full Government programme is being considered they will go farther than they have in providing money for education matters. I do not want to reflect in any way on their administration of the Department of Public Instruction, but I do say that it is starved for money. No doubt they will say that is getting more than any similar department in comparison. The costs are higher in Queensland, and it does not matter what other States do, we ought to provide for our own children here. Buildings are wanted all over the State, and they cannot be provided because the department cannot get money for the purpose. We are spending loan money in every direction, but we are spending it very meanly so far as bringing our school buildings up to date is concerned. I hope that the department will get far more liberal treatment during the coming year than in the past. I do not know what other hon. members may think, but I know that there are parts in my electorate where the children are handicapped for want of buildings which it is admitted are required, but which cannot be provided because the department has not sufficient money.

Then we want more money to provide cheaper means of getting our goods to market—either tramways or light railways. They beat everything else, but there is no

mention of them in the Government programme. The farmers can look after their farming, they can look after their markets, but when it comes to taking their produce to market they are up against a big problem, and we see large areas of good land within 12 miles of a railway lying idle because it is impossible to cart the stuff that land might produce and provide freight for the railways.

I hope the Government will look into these things, and I expect we shall find that what they have outlined is not the best they can bring themselves to do. I anticipate that there will probably be some other proposals which are not mentioned in the Speech which will spoil the whole business, but, at any rate, I shall give every measure fair criticism and fair judgment, and assist the Government in every way to make it better.

Mr. FRY (*Kurilpa*): In common with every hon. member of this Chamber, I wish to extend a welcome to the new members and to congratulate them on the excellent speeches they have made. It is to be hoped that they will endeavour during their term in this House to keep their speeches up to the high level on which they have started. I regret that some of the older members thought fit to lower the standard of dignity of this Chamber by indulging in unwarranted personalities of the people's representatives. I take it that, when a gentleman comes into this Chamber as a representative of the people, he comes to put before the Chamber the opinions of his constituents, and I think that those opinions are not personalities. I hope that the high standard that has been set will be maintained throughout this Parliament.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: If the hon. gentleman does, he will be different from what he has been in other sessions.

Mr. FRY: I hope this session will be different from the last.

Mr. COLLINS: You are starting off badly.

Mr. FRY: There is certainly room for improvement on the standard set during the last Parliament.

I do not want to go into the details of what transpired during the elections, but I want to deal with one or two questions arising out of the elections. We know that the factors that were operating had a great influence upon the result, and there was not always just and honest consideration in the attack upon the Opposition. We know that the Government appealed to the passions of the people and in splenetic and vicious words placed before them a false position and characterised it as being truthful. We appealed to the people on the ground of reason, and without going into the question of how many representatives we have in this Chamber, we are quite satisfied that the majority of the people of the State are sound in head, having given us a majority of the votes in the aggregate. When hon. members come here to represent the people they should not take up the best part of their time in indulging in personalities. It has been said that we are anxious to get on to the Treasury benches. I make the confession that I am, and my party is also anxious to get control of the affairs of the State to administer them in the best interests of the people as a whole. I want to refer to a question that I asked the Secretary for Railways to-day. This is the question—

"1. Has the necessary survey been

Mr. Fry.]

made and plans been prepared for the construction of a railway from the present terminus at the Adelaide Steamship Company's wharf in Stanley street (near Victoria Bridge) to the South Brisbane Gas Company's works in Montague road?

"2. If so, will he make known to the House—(a) The route selected; (b) the estimated cost of construction; (c) when the work of construction will be commenced?"

That is a good question, and without any bias against my opponent at the election the Minister gave an evasive reply. Why did he do that? That railway was talked about twenty years ago, and it was decided by the Government of the day and those who were responsible that the industries in the district did not warrant the construction of that line. It is not a new proposal. I am at all times prepared to give the greatest amount of credit that is possible to my opponent, because I consider that every man is deserving of what is coming to him. That railway proposal was put before the electors of Kurilpa during the elections. It was only a dummy railway; there was no business in it. The Government did not intend to lay a sleeper. They did not intend to make a survey, and they did not intend to prepare a plan. It was just a hollow and shameful election promise, in order to deceive the people and get their votes. That is why the Minister gave me an evasive reply. If the Government had been honest in that promise, the Minister would immediately have said whether or not a survey had been made, or a plan had been prepared. He did not do that. He simply gave an evasive reply. Then, we have the question of a dangerous crossing at Woolloongabba. Was that not put up some time ago as a dummy, to be talked about? The Government have not done anything about that. That is a dangerous crossing, where people are risking their lives day and night. Why this hollow mockery and sham on the part of the Government?

I want to deal with the neglect on the part of the Government in a way which probably has not been touched upon. I want to quote two cases in my own electorate. I refer first of all to the police station in Kurilpa. I drew attention to this matter some two or three years ago, and told the Government that the building was becoming dilapidated and required attention. No notice was taken of what I said. What is the position to-day? The borers have gone through the timber, and the white ants have had a real good time. It will now take probably £300 to £400 to put it in order, whereas, when I spoke, it could probably have been repaired for £20 or £30. The question of the West End State School I have drawn attention to time and time again. The school is by no means large enough to accommodate the children who are there. The Government, during the elections, did put up an extra 10 feet, but the position has not been improved. There is a shed where the children have to shelter, and the rain can come through the roof. You can stand under the roof and see daylight through it. If the Government will take notice and spend a few pounds on iron, they will probably save that shed, otherwise it will fall into a state of disrepair, and it will be necessary to build a new shed at an enormous cost.

[Mr. Fry.

I want to refer to some of the Government propaganda during the elections. One circular was headed, "The House that Jack Built." They forgot, when talking about "The House that Jack Built," that the Government had so increased the royalty on timber that an elector had to pay £50 more for his timber. Since 1914 to the present day the royalty on timber has increased from 1s. 6d. to 17s. 6d. per 100 feet, resulting in approximately £70, or, in the mean, £60, to be paid for a worker's dwelling.

Mr. COLLINS: Is the hon. member sure of that?

Mr. ROBERTS: You can safely say that a quarter of the cost of the timber is paid in royalties to the Government.

Mr. FRY: I will give the hon. member the benefit, and say £50. Who pays that £50? The man who has to keep his wife and family, and educate them and clothe them and provide for them, has to pay that money. Probably he has to work and save for years to get that £50. When you talk about "The House that Jack Built," bear in mind that, while Jack is building his house, the Government are killing him with the royalty on timber.

Hon. F. T. BRENNAN: If there were no royalties, the timber combine would still keep up the price of timber.

Mr. FRY: I am not concerned with the timber ring; I am concerned with the interests of the electors and the claims the Government made as the benefactors of the man who was looking for a home. At the same time as they were claiming to be his benefactor, they were bleeding him for royalty. That is a matter of grave consideration to him.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Who owns the timber at the present time?

Mr. FRY: The Government may be saving those forests now, and thus saving them for the people, but, on the hon. gentleman's own logic, this State is indebted to the foresight of past Governments for having preserved these forests for it. If Jack does build his house under this scheme, the Government are robbing him of about £50 at the same time. It is high time that a Forestry Bill was introduced. The Government at the present time are reaping huge profits from the forests and are returning very little of this money to the forests. I have the details here, but I do not want to take up the time of the House by going into the figures; but the fact remains that the Government have reaped thousands and thousands of pounds from the forests and have spent very little on reforestation. I would like to know more about the export duty or border tax which was imposed by the Government on logs exported to other States. Clause 1 of this proclamation, issued on 29th June, 1920, provided for the appropriation by the Government of—

"All logs of hoop pine and bunya pine now on trucks of any State railway within 25 miles of the General Post Office at Brisbane or the General Post Office at Maryborough, or hereafter to come or be on trucks on any such State railway aforesaid."

That proclamation was issued by the Government under the Sugar Acquisition Act. We know that the Government can do many things under that Act, but I wish to draw

particular attention to the fact that in issuing this proclamation the Government were humiliated by being compelled by a private firm in Sydney not only to withdraw it but to return what money they had collected by way of tax and pay the legal expenses of the firm. We have heard nothing about that. This goes to show the desire of the Government to get money by hook or by crook, by fair means or foul, but they were guilty of an act of foolishness or negligence, as they should have known just how far their Acts of Parliament would have permitted them to go. Their action was an attempt to get around the Commonwealth Constitution. It was a distinct violation of that Constitution, and was therefore unconstitutional and illegal. In order that hon. members may see that I have good grounds for making this assertion, I wish to state that I have in my possession a copy of the proceedings in the High Court taken by A. C. Saxton and Sons, Sydney, against the Queensland Government. As I get no reply from the front Government bench, I take it that it is freely acknowledged to be a fact. It just shows that, when forced into such a position, the Government adopt any pretext in order to secure money from any source. They have, as a matter of fact, taxed every source available, and are at their wit's end what to do next.

I wish to draw attention to a pamphlet issued in the course of the elections entitled "Queensland's Deficits." It was an election dodge, and it should be mentioned in reply to the Governor's Speech. The Government puts before this House its policy in that Speech, and it is just as well that we should criticise it in its true form. We find in this pamphlet a list of deficits under previous Governments. I want to point out a few of the inaccuracies which the Government put forward in this pamphlet. It states that during the period 1889-1895 there were accumulated deficits of over £1,000,000. Then it says this—

"Bear this in mind, there were no disasters, and no burdens of war, cyclones, droughts, or epidemics."

As a matter of fact, there was a drought in that period, and there was a great flood which nearly wiped out Brisbane.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Were you in this country then?

Mr. FRY: I am an Australian born, and I am proud of it. What is more, I am the first native of Kurilpa to represent that electorate in this House. That is why I am here, and why the Government cannot shift me.

Hon. F. T. BRENNAN: We will shift you.

Mr. FRY: Yes; but not by fair means. The electors of Kurilpa are very sane people, and they are not to be carried away by any hare-brained schemes, such as the promise to construct that railway.

Hon. F. T. BRENNAN: It won't go on.

Mr. FRY: It was never intended to go on, and here we have confirmation of that from the Assistant Home Secretary, who says it will not go on.

At 10 p.m.,

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

Mr. FRY: Go along into the next year. They stop in 1903, and then they go on again twenty years after. In the meantime I looked up all the Auditor-General's reports,

and then the reason why they stopped twenty years ago was obvious, for in every year after 1903 there were great surpluses. Is that honest? Is it honest for the Government to point out deficits?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Can you tell the connection between the liquor trade and a box of chocolates? (Government laughter.)

Mr. FRY: I did not want to touch on this question, but I am now bound to defend myself. We know very well that the liquor trade was behind the Government in this election.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: A long way behind.

Mr. FRY: I will quote the Government "Whip's" statement to back up my contention. We know that at the Emu Park Convention the hon. member for Queenton said during the debate on the liquor resolution—which was apparently rather stormy at times—

"It was a current rumour that a compact had been entered into between the party and the trade, for reasons which would be to the benefit of both."

(Government dissent.)

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. FRY: In 1911, in "Hansard," vol. cix., page 1427, the Premier made an able speech, and one which was very creditable to him, but talking about the liquor trade he said—

"It has supplied bribes and hush money, and the money to fight political elections, and has fought on every possible occasion and has always come out on top."

I want to know how far behind the Government was the trade. Did they supply bribes? Did they supply hush money? Did they supply political funds? We have it that they supplied huge sums of money to help the Government in the elections. I am going to say, when hon. members opposite talk about bribery, they should clean out their own nest. If the Government had been honest with that case of bribery before the House last year, they would have had a full investigation, but they did not do so, and when they were at the hustings they inferred that we were interested. As a matter of fact, we would have been right behind the Government in having it cleaned up. If the Deputy Premier comes to his feet with such personal interjections, I am going to ask him where his party stands, so far as this thing is concerned. Is it a fact that the Liquor Bill is to be brought in at a price of £25,000? Is it a fact that we are going to have a Liquor Bill limiting the sale of liquor between the hours of 8 a.m. and 8 p.m. for that price?

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: £35,000.

Mr. FRY: Well, £35,000. I say, if it is right to bring in an amendment of the Liquor Bill, then it should not be at the price of any monetary consideration.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Why do you suggest the cost is £25,000?

Mr. FRY: I am asking you to name the cost. It was the "Whip" of the Government party who made a charge. I put up the Premier and his comment as to what is

Mr. Fry.]

done. I ask the hon. gentleman to justify the position. You are skating on thin ice, and, bear in mind that, although you sit up as moralists, you will very soon fall through the ice.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must address the Chair.

Mr. FRY: I did not intend to refer to this matter when I got up, but I was dragged into it by the Secretary for Agriculture.

Mr. HYNES. You must have had your notes ready.

Mr. FRY: Being a very careful man, I am always prepared for any action on the part of the Government. At all times I refrain from attacking any person until I am attacked, but when I am attacked I always reply to the best of my ability.

Now let us come to the question of the socialisation of industry. I do not want to go very far into that matter, but I want to know where the Government stand. We were told by the Premier that his party had not gone "red." The other day he told us that, and we have been waiting to hear members on the Government side explain their position and tell us what they mean by the socialisation of industry. The objective was not talked about during the election, and we asked the reason why. We know that the Secretary for Mines told us in Paddington on 26th April, 1923, that the wages system is inconsistent with the Labour platform.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: What is wrong about that?

Mr. FRY: Do you agree with it?

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. FRY: The hon. gentleman evaded the matter before, and, when I put a plain question to him now, he evades it again. Is he, like the rest, not game to stand up to the "Red Objective"?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: What is the "Red Objective"?

Mr. FRY: I am going to tell you. If it is part of your policy and your platform that there are to be no wages, it must also be part of your policy that there should be no cash. And to follow it out to its logical end, there must be conscription of labour. You cannot compel people to work for nothing, unless you apply some military system of hard-and-fast discipline.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I said the result of labour should go to those who produce, and not to the drones.

Mr. FRY: The producer, whoever he may be, should have the result of his labour; but I want to know who these drones are. I know there are some drones on the other side; but I am not going to indulge in personalities. Take the definition of "socialism" as given in the dictionary supplied to us in Parliament House. It reads—

"Socialism: Any theory of social organisation aiming at the abolition of individual action and the setting up of co-operative action. A system which makes community of property a necessary condition of political improvement."

All these definitions are based upon Karl Marx. These people have read Bellamy's "Looking Backward," and they base all their conclusions on some theory which can-

not stand to-day. If we are going to have the abolition of individual action, and if community of property is a necessary condition of political improvement, and the payment of wages is inconsistent with the Labour platform, we get some definition of the Government's Objective. I am going to connect the Government up with this resolution which was passed at the Trades Hall the other day, at which meeting the Government were represented—

"That this May Day gathering of workers send fraternal greetings to the workers of Russia."

That, first of all, showed that the Government are entirely with the Russian movement. That was at the proceedings in the Trades Hall on the 1st May, and it connects the Government up with Russia. The complete resolution was as follows:—

"That this May Day gathering of Brisbane workers send fraternal greetings to the workers of Russia, and pledges itself to do all in its power to consolidate the results of their glorious revolution."

Then we come to Trotsky, who is the partner in Russia of Lenin. Speaking on the economic situation in an article published in Berlin from "S.W. 48 Friedrich-strasse 225 111 16/1/23," M. Trotsky says—

"To-day we can no longer doubt that in the majority of capitalist countries the proletariat will only come into power after an obstinate, severe, and lasting civil war. In other words, the proletariat of Europe will have to strike at the roots of the enemy's power before conquering State power, not after this conquest."

This is Trotsky, the man who is leading this Russian revolution which this Government have pledged themselves to support. He contends that it will never come into operation until there has been civil war. When Marx wrote his theories, he was under the impression that the wealth of the country would drift into the hands of a few individuals, and that the workers would become disorganised and poorer. In fact, the term he used is to the effect that the rich would become richer and the poor would become poorer. That is not the case to-day, for, when the great war which shook the whole of the universe got into swing, it dislocated the whole of the commercial activities of the world and changed entirely the basis of things. To-day it is not a question of socialisation of industry, but a question of industrial democracy, co-operation, and profit-sharing. The difference between the Government and the Opposition is that the Government are living upon some theory which was propounded in Europe when conditions were deplorable. The late war went a long way to remove that state of things, and to-day the business firms of the world are more and more taking into their management the representatives of the workers, and giving them a share of the profits. The principle which is adopted is that men are paid the basic wage, and they devote themselves wholly to making themselves efficient in order to compete with other firms and businesses in other parts of the world. When dividends are declared, not only do they get the basic wage, but they take also a share of the profits they have helped to make. I know that the worker on a weekly wage can save very little. He has to pay rent, keep his

wife and family, and clothe them, and he has only one thing with which to do it, that is, the capital he possesses in his energy, brain power, and physical ability. The tendency throughout the world is clearly to unite in co-operation the two capitals—the capital of money, machinery, and property, and the capital of the energy, brain power, and the physical ability of the worker. The war has resulted in throwing the rich and the poor into the ranks.

Mr. HYNES: More exploitation goes on in the world to-day than ever.

Mr. FRY: The hon. member may be doing it. He may know; I do not. I want to quote a case that came under my notice in camp in Brisbane here. I was speaking to an officer about the men generally, and he pointed out a man and said, "That man is my boss in civil life." He then was a private in the ranks. That is the sort of thing that went on throughout the world. It taught the true meaning of co-operation, comradeship, and friendship, and the uselessness of the waste which was going on in the world, and it has evolved in the minds of the people something far higher than they had ever conceived before—that is, that they can only eliminate waste and make a true profit by working together for their advancement. It is not, as it was in Marx's time, a question of making as much money as possible; it is a question of realising as much happiness as possible. Men realise that money is only a means of exchange, a means to an end, and that is where the Government and we differ. They say, "Socialisation of industry"; we say, "Industrial democracy, co-operation, and profit sharing." They are living in the past; we live in the present, and time will tell which is right. They know as well as we do that they are not game to talk "socialisation of industry." Not one of them was game to do it during the election. We talked profit sharing. I talked it, and I believe in it, and I believe that the salvation of the working man and woman lies in getting the full results of their labour in co-operation between the two capitals. We want it understood that we do not stand for the reduction of wages, but rather for a higher standard of living, for good wages, and an equitable share of the profit which the employee by his service—his capital—helps to create. Reduction of wages should not be considered until every other avenue has been exploited to save waste, etc.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. EDWARDS (*Nanango*): I wish to congratulate you, Sir, upon your elevation again to the position of Speaker. I consider that your appointment, so far as this House is concerned, is a popular one. I also wish to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply on the tone of their speeches. They are young men, and I hope that they will continue to participate in the debates in the tone in which they have started.

I wish to deal with the scathing criticism which was levelled at the Opposition last night by the Premier, and which was absolutely unwarranted.

Mr. DASH: You have a job.

Mr. EDWARDS: The statement made by the Premier concerning the Opposition would lead one to believe, in the first place, that the Opposition should not under any con-

sideration criticise the faults and shortcomings of the Government. He said that Labour did not speak with two voices. I am going to show that the Premier himself has proved to the people that he, at least, can speak with two voices. He did so at the 1921 Labour Convention, which passed the objective which the Labour party at present is pledged to carry out.

Mr. DASH: What is it?

Mr. EDWARDS: I will read it, and I will read the Premier's remarks, and I will prove that he was absolutely brought into line and whipped into submission by the outside junta which controls him and hon. members opposite.

Mr. DASH: Read the minutes of the Country party meeting as well.

Mr. EDWARDS: This is the resolution—
"That the socialisation of industry, production, distribution, and exchange be the objective of the Australian Labour party."

Mr. HYNES: What is wrong with that?

Mr. EDWARDS: There is nothing wrong with it, so far as the hon. member is concerned.

Mr. HYNES: What does it mean?

Mr. EDWARDS: I will quote the hon. member's own leader to show what it means.

Mr. DASH: The hon. gentleman does not know what it means.

Mr. EDWARDS: If the hon. gentleman understood it, possibly he would get out of the party to which he belongs. When the vote was taken on that resolution, Messrs. Weir, Riordan, and Demaine voted for it, and Messrs. Theodore, McCormack, and McDonald voted against it. That means that the Premier and the present Secretary for Public Lands did not believe in that resolution. Let me quote the Premier's remarks at the time—

"He would like to know how the farmers would get on under the socialisation of industry. They might as well change the name of the party and call it the Communistic party. There was bound to be a split in the movement. It meant a complete departure from the old Labour ideals, and disruption in the movement must follow."

Then he went on to say—

"Must we swallow this communistic programme without a struggle?"

But he had to.

Mr. PEASE: And here we are, and you are over there.

Mr. EDWARDS: He had to swallow them without a struggle.

Mr. PEASE: You fought the election on that, and went down.

Mr. EDWARDS: I like to see the hon. member interjecting, as I know that I am hurting him. In answer to the Premier, the chairman said—

"With the carrying of the resolution the old objective of the Labour party would be wiped out."

Yet the Premier told us last night that it is exactly the same Labour party that has been in existence for thirty years.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. Edwards.]

Mr. EDWARDS: That convention carried the resolution in defiance of the Premier and the then Home Secretary. That objective was tabled at the Eora Park Convention last year, affirmed, and placed at the head of the party's platform as the objective of the State Labour party. That proves beyond doubt that the Premier has been whipped into submission by the outside junta.

The Premier is absolutely wrong and unjustified in saying that the Opposition or even members of the Government party should not point out the defects or disabilities that the people are labouring under. They would not be doing their duty to the electors who sent them here if they came into this House and did not point out the troubles of the people, particularly the troubles that the people in the country districts are labouring under. When those self-satisfied members on the other side of the House delude themselves with the idea that all is well with the producers of this State they will find they are making a very grave mistake. In some of the districts of Queensland settlers who have worked for years on the land are actually starving.

Mr. DASH: You do not say so?

Mr. EDWARDS: Yes, without any hesitation; and yet we are told that, if we bring these matters before the State, we are injuring it.

Mr. DASH: You are an old Jeremiah.

Mr. EDWARDS: We say that the Government should on every occasion possible give attention to the primary producers and assist them to develop the country. This has been preached by the Country party ever since it came into existence. The agricultural policy adopted by the Government was practically taken out of the Country party's platform.

Mr. DASH: The hon. member for Oxley said you had no platform.

Mr. EDWARDS: When the Secretary for Agriculture introduced the Primary Producers' Organisation Bill before the House the Country party set out to make it as good a measure as possible in the interests of the primary producer. They introduced no less than nineteen amendments. Two of these were defeated, but one in particular has since been found by the Secretary for Agriculture so absolutely essential that he has introduced it into the Bill by way of regulation. That proves beyond a doubt that here on this side of the House are the brains of the primary producer. I am not saying this in any cavilling spirit, but to prove that we are prepared at all times to give you assistance in the interests of those people who struggle on the land. Therefore, in any measure coming forward for their amelioration we shall be only too pleased to help the Government in making it as good as it should be in the interests of those people.

Last night, in reference to our railways, the Premier said that no Government could make the railways pay, and he asked the Opposition if, in the event of their being returned to power, they would make them pay either by cutting down the rates of wages or by raising the freights. I say without hesitation that for years the means that could be adopted to make the railways of Queensland pay have been pointed out to the Premier. That is by loading the railways with the products of the State and encouraging and building up the secondary industries. I want to prove that, if that were

[Mr. Edwards.

done, we would not be running three trains on the railways, but we would go back to the old times and run ten or twelve trains a week with profit.

Mr. PEASE: Your crowd killed the sugar industry.

Mr. EDWARDS: That interjection is thrown out just to draw me off the track.

Mr. PEASE: It is very serious.

Mr. EDWARDS: If I had the inconsistency of the hon. member who throws out that accusation, I certainly would not have gone before the primary producers for election. (Government dissent.)

At 10.30 p.m., under the provisions of Standing Order No. 17,

The SPEAKER put the question for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Question put and passed.

PRESENTATION OF ADDRESS IN REPLY.

The PREMIER (Hon. E. G. Theodore, *Chillagoe*): I have to inform the House that His Excellency the Governor will receive Mr. Speaker, the mover and seconder of the Address, and such other members as care to attend, at Government House on Monday at 2.30 p.m.

SUPPLY.

CONSTITUTION OF COMMITTEE.

The PREMIER: I beg to move—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.”

Question put and passed.

WAYS AND MEANS.

CONSTITUTION OF COMMITTEE.

The PREMIER: I beg to move—

“That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.”

Question put and passed.

PEST DESTROYERS BILL.

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

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

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

“That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to regulate the sale of insecticides, fungicides, vermin destroyers, and weed destroyers, and for other purposes.”

The fruit section of the Council of Agriculture for some considerable time has been asking that legislation of this character should be placed on the statute-book. At the conference of Ministers at Perth last year we passed resolutions on the question, and various conferences of agricultural chemists have dealt with the matter. Similar legislation is on the statute-books of Victoria, South Australia, and all the States of

America in connection with sheep dip, sprays, and various pear poisons and other mixtures sold, and it is necessary that the farmers should be protected. Tests will be made, the sellers must be registered, and generally the farmers will be protected against paying high prices for stuff that is of no value.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

FIRST READING.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: I beg to present the Bill, and move—

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

Question put and passed.

The second reading of the Bill was made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

TRUST ACCOUNTS BILL.

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

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

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

“That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to provide for the regulation and management of Trust Accounts.”

The Bill provides that certain persons shall be trustees, such as barristers, solicitors, public accountants, conveyancers, and so on. All moneys received by these trustees shall be paid into a bank to a special or general trust account until such time as they are expended or invested in the manner desired by the owner. The Bill also provides that all these trust accounts will be periodically audited by men authorised to do so by the Government. This Bill is urgently required, because, as hon. members know, within the locality of Brisbane alone in recent years there have been no less than three cases in which trust funds have been embezzled aggregating £50,000, and a great deal more money has been embezzled that has not come to light. This Bill will save dozens of people from ruin. Many people have unfortunately already been ruined by the embezzlement of trust funds. The Bill will really be a protection to the professions concerned and also to the general public.

Mr. TAYLOR: Does it refer to companies such as the Queensland Trustees, Limited?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Oh, no; only to individuals.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

FIRST READING.

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

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

Question put and passed.

The second reading of the Bill was made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

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

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

“That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the Workers' Compensation Acts, 1916 to 1921, in certain particulars.”

The Bill which will be founded upon this resolution proposes to alter the definition of “Queensland ship,” to enable workers who are engaged on ships trading in Queensland waters to come under the provisions of the Workers' Compensation Act. If a man is at present engaged on a ship which is trading between two ports in Queensland, and the head office of the company which owns the ship is situated at Adelaide, he is neither entitled to the benefits of the Federal Seamen's Compensation Act nor to the benefit of the Queensland Workers' Compensation Act, because he is outside the scope of both Federal and State Acts. We are now amending the Act by this Bill, so that that worker will come under the provisions of our Act.

Mr. TAYLOR: How will you get the compensation—from the head office?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It is quite easy. It will be assessed on the wages earned by that worker in Queensland. We also propose to modify the definition of “worker” to enable a contractor, who is substantially a worker, but who now is excluded from the provisions of the Act, to come under them. The Bill will also amend the miners' phthisis provisions of the Act, to enable a miner who becomes a victim to the disease, but who has not worked for the 300 days or the 500 days specified in the Act since 1916 to count his mining history from the date he worked in mining prior to 1916. They are merely amendments to enable the department to get over technical difficulties which have arisen.

Mr. ROBERTS: Are many men affected?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: A good many are affected, but I hope that the number will be a decreasing one. I find it difficult to exclude men through technical difficulties, and this Bill will enable me to do what is desirable with the authority of an Act of Parliament.

Mr. ROBERTS (*West Toowoomba*): I would like to point out that it was understood that we would adjourn after the debate on the Address in Reply had been disposed of, and that quite a number of members have not waited in the Chamber in consequence. They will therefore miss any opportunity they might desire to attempt to widen the scope of any of the measures which are being introduced, because at any later stage they will only be able to move amendments to a Bill in the form in which it is placed before them. Having said that, I wish to ask the Minister whether he cannot see his way to make provision with regard to another matter. At present a number of diseases, such as Asiatic cholera, bubonic plague, and diphtheria are industrial diseases in any employment in connection with any hospital or ambulance brigade. We desire to see all workers get the greatest possible benefits, and I would like the Minister to make provision for the inclusion of workers engaged

Mr. T. R. Roberts.]

in undertaking. At present they do not come under the Act, and I think they should be entitled to the benefits of compensation.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It is not necessary to make an amendment of the Act. Section 14 (b) provides that the list may be amended by Order in Council.

Mr. ROBERTS: I hope the Minister will include it. Quite a large number of men are engaged in the undertaking business.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I will certainly give the matter the fullest consideration.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

FIRST READING.

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

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

Question put and passed.

The second reading of the Bill was made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

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

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

“That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the Industrial Arbitration Act of 1916 in certain particulars.”

The main purpose of the Bill is to extend the benefits of industrial arbitration to industries that are now specifically excluded from the provisions of the principal Act. Under the amending Bill we propose to include all classes of workers within the State who desire to come within the ambit of the beneficial protection of the Arbitration Court. We intend, under the Bill, to make provision for the setting up of machinery which will adequately control apprentices, and will give an incentive to a proper policy of apprenticeship being carried on within the State with a view to giving boys here an opportunity of learning skilled trades. There are other amendments which are largely of a machinery character which have been found necessary as the result of several years' operations of the principal Act.

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): The proposed introduction of the Bill is a very great mistake. When the principal Act was before this Chamber, the Government sent it to the Legislative Council on two or three occasions containing provisions including certain callings under its operations. Those callings included fruit-growing, dairying, and one or two others, and on two or three occasions they were excluded by the Legislative Council from the operations of the Act. We know that in the sugar industry and in probably some other industries, the rural workers are brought under the operations of the Act.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Why should they not be?

[*Mr. T. R. Roberts.*]

Mr. TAYLOR: The sugar industry is an industry that we are able to stabilise. We can tell the man who is growing the sugar-cane just what he is going to get for his sugar. Under the last sugar agreement we were able to do that for a number of years. Neither the Minister, nor myself, nor any other man can tell a farmer what he is going to get for his wheat or fruit or anything that he may produce in any particular year. Those particular men have been excluded from the Arbitration Act previously. We have no way of stabilising the prices in these particular industries. I think it is absolutely impossible to stabilise the prices in these industries, because we are producing more in these lines, not only in Queensland, but in Australia to-day, than is being consumed. Sugar comes under a different category to these products so far as the price is concerned.

Mr. HYNES: We had a sugar award before there was a sugar agreement.

Mr. TAYLOR: That may be so, but the sugar industry has now grown to such a tremendous extent that the production is meeting the whole of our requirements, but even at the time the hon. member for Townsville refers to the Colonial Sugar Refining Company were able to tell the growers what they were able to pay him twelve months or two years ahead.

Mr. HYNES: No fear.

Mr. TAYLOR: They made contracts from one to two years ahead, and I am sure that the member for Herbert will bear me out in that statement.

The PREMIER: The Colonial Sugar Refining Company did?

Mr. TAYLOR: Yes, they made contracts on what they were prepared to pay.

The PREMIER: No. What they did was, they bought the raw sugar and made a first payment, and then at the end of the year paid the balance when the sugar was realised.

Mr. TAYLOR: The grower knew what he was going to get twelve months ahead. (Government dissent.) I say that there is no crop that we are growing in Queensland or Australia to-day that we can tell what price it is going to sell at next year. Any member who knows anything at all or who takes any particular notice of the wheat industry of Queensland or Australia knows that we cannot tell the price of the crop next year.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Would you exclude mining from the operations of the Act on those grounds?

Mr. TAYLOR: That is a purely speculative industry.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You don't know what you are going to get for the product.

Mr. TAYLOR: You know what price you are going to get for gold.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Gold mining represents only a small proportion of the industry.

Mr. TAYLOR: We have a tribunal which fixes the prices of these products, and yet here you are proposing to introduce these industries into the scope of this Bill, notwithstanding that the products are largely of a perishable nature and that there is a surplus of production in Queensland and

Australia, and we have to look for outside markets for the consumption of the articles.

Mr. HYNES: The same thing applies to tin and copper.

Mr. TAYLOR: If the Government wish to increase the cost of living, which is pretty high at the present time, they cannot do better than proceed with the Bill. If it was not for the strong army of unpaid labour represented by the farmer, his wife and children, the price of butter in Brisbane to-day would be 5s. per lb.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. TAYLOR: You have to recollect these things. You are also going to make a greater slave than ever of the farmer, his wife, and his children, if you introduce legislation like this. The farmers will not employ labour if they can help it. They are now working the round of the clock, and the Bill will compel them to continue doing so. I hope the Government will think well over this. I am not opposing the Bill because I sit on this side of the House. I certainly approve of the principle of trying to bring as many workers as possible under the scope of the Act, but to bring any of these particular industries I have mentioned under its scope will be one of the greatest mistakes and calamities that have ever befallen this State.

Hon. F. T. BRENNAN: Under the Wheat Pool Act you have got it now.

Mr. DEACON: No.

Mr. TAYLOR: I was drawn off the track a few minutes ago. Anyone who is following the trend of affairs will know that our farmers during the coming season will probably have to sell any surplus wheat they have at from 2s. 6d. to 3s. f.o.b. at the various ports of Australia. Yet it is proposed that they should come under the operations of this Bill. That will be disastrous to them and to Queensland generally, and will increase their slavery. You will make them greater slaves than they are at the present time.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Why didn't you oppose the Wheat Pool Bill?

Mr. G. P. BARNES (*Warwick*): I very strongly oppose the spirited remarks made by the leader of the Opposition in connection with the introduction of this Bill. It is not the first time that this House has been forced to give consideration to this kind of Bill, and that the good sense of the House has seen the wisdom of contesting legislation in connection with bringing the dairying and farming industries under the Arbitration Court.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: What do you think this Bill will do for the worker and those you are talking about?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: It is going to limit production. The burden of the Premier's speech last night, if it had a burden, had to do with production and with settling people on the land. Australia, and Queensland in particular, were pointed out as countries offering rare opportunities for settlement. There should be no attempt to impose conditions of this kind upon an industry that is greatly dependent upon employment. It is a singular thing that, linked up with this idea, is the idea of apprenticeship. I had intended to stress this particular aspect. What is it that has caused the exodus from the Downs?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: What is causing it in Europe?

Mr. G. P. BARNES: I do know that what has killed the agricultural and dairying industries to a very large extent on the Downs—

Mr. FOLEY: The middlemen

Mr. G. P. BARNES: The hon. member knows nothing about it. The sons of the farmers have not been able to carry on, or there has been no inducement for them to remain on the farms of their fathers for this good reason—that they could not under any given circumstances earn a sum at all in keeping with what they could obtain in the cities and elsewhere, and the result is that the young life in the country is making for the cities. What is it that killed apprenticeship? It is this: The boys obtain a man's wages before they are able to earn those wages. They receive an amount altogether in excess of what they should be paid. The fact is that the judges are temperamentally unfitted to arbitrate in cases of this kind. Only this week I had a conversation with a public servant who has been in the service for some thirty years, and his words to me were—

“Here I am only getting some £4 10s. a week. My boy has arrived at the age of twenty-one, and he is earning as much as I am earning, and it is not fair.”

We have to set out to improve the conditions and the positions of the married men. They are the men who should receive attention. Our sympathies should go out to the fathers who have carried the burden of life, and we are now making provision for a rate of pay for the boys which is to the disadvantage of the boys and sometimes to the disadvantage of the girls, too, and which is altogether in advance of what they should receive. We on this side do not care so long as the industry can carry the burden that is placed upon it, but I unhesitatingly say that the dairying and agricultural industries of this State will not, and cannot, bear the burden that will be placed upon them by the passage of this Bill. In the interests of the people on the land I oppose with all my heart and all my strength the introduction of this measure as being inimical to the best interests of the country and the people.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*): I do not think the Government fully understand what this Bill will mean. It is not so much a matter of wages, because we do not hear any growling from agricultural centres about wages. Not a single person in agricultural centres, apart from the sugar districts, decries this measure. I think it will be a very bad thing, and will do harm to the farming industry. How are you going to regulate the hours of work on a farm and limit them to eight hours a day?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: We are not proposing to fix the hours under this Bill.

Mr. DEACON: But the Arbitration Court judge will. They put the wheat industry under the operation of the Arbitration Court award, but it was not thought wise or prudent to apply the award, as it would not work. What is to prevent farm employees coming before the Arbitration Court under this Bill and claiming the basic wage?

The PREMIER: Do you think they are entitled to it?

Mr. DEACON: Entitled to wages, yes; but can you show us how it is going to be done, and how they can be paid the wages?

Mr. Deacon.]

Mr. COLLINS: The farmers used to pay 10s. a week and tucker in my time.

Mr. DEACON: That was what the farmers got. Farmers have to pay according to the market. If the Government say the consumers will have to pay the increase, they should let us know that now, so that we will know where we stand. The Bill will mean that every man who is farming with paid labour will have to get rid of it. There is no possibility of any farmer carrying on his industry under any award. How is dairying going to be worked under an eight-hour day system? You have to milk cows in the morning and also at night. If the Government had more experience of farming they would not be so anxious to bring in this Bill. It is not fair that the Government should include in the scope of the Act farming occupations, and thus increase the cost of production of primary products without making provision to meet the increased cost of production to the farmer. (Government interjections.) I am only pointing out the dangers of the Bill, and I would like to get more information. Is it to be within the power of the Minister to bring farming industries under the operation of the Act by proclamation, or are they to be included by the Bill itself? If the Minister will tell me, I will sit down. It is not only in the interests of the farmer, but in the interests of the working man who uses primary products, that these things should be explained. There is another matter I would like to mention—that of apprenticeship.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will not be in order in discussing that matter on this motion.

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): I think that it is a matter for very great regret to find members on the Government side treating this measure in the way in which they are. They seem to think that it is a big joke.

The PREMIER: What about the Country party members who are not here at all?

Mr. TAYLOR: I think this Bill is anything but a joke. Certain members of the Government have referred to what they call the rapacity of the middlemen and the millers. There are thousands of men who owe the fact of their being on the land to the credits extended to them by the storekeepers, who are called the middlemen of this State.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope the leader of the Opposition will confine his remarks to the resolution before the Committee.

Mr. TAYLOR: I am replying to certain interjections. It was stated that there were a large number of people who were not successful on the land because they had been exploited and "rooked" by the middlemen. The middlemen have been able to place men on the land who have become successful farmers. If hon. members opposite lived for a thousand years, they would not do as much good for the primary producers as has been done by the so-called middlemen of this State.

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

Mr. TAYLOR: I was going to show the difficulties that the primary producers have had to contend with and to say that, if further difficulties are placed in their way,

they are going to be still more hampered in their industry. Take the milling industry, which is dependent on the wheat-growing industry. I am not a miller, but I claim to have a knowledge of that industry second to that of no other man in this Chamber. If ever an industry had to fight for its very existence, that one had in order to get a foothold in this State.

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

Mr. TAYLOR: I am trying to show that this Bill will make it very much more difficult to carry on the agricultural industry in this State. I am trying to point out the difficult position that that industry has been in ever since it started in this State. It has had to compete with the whole of the Commonwealth. Both wheat and flour have been sent from other States to Queensland. The Bill will make it more difficult for that industry to maintain its position in the State.

Hon. F. T. BRENNAN: A higher price is got for wheat in Queensland than in the other States.

Mr. TAYLOR: If the present events are any indication, there is going to be a lower price in the future than we have had for some years.

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

Mr. TAYLOR: I am trying to show what is likely to happen if the Bill becomes law. The Premier during the election campaign, side-tracked the matter when he was asked if it was the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill bringing the rural workers under the operations of the Industrial Arbitration Act. This is the reply the hon. gentleman gave to a direct question put to him on the subject—

"My friend is not asking the question for the purpose of information. He is only trying to embarrass me."

Surely it was a fair question?

Mr. GILLIES: Did a farmer or middleman ask that question?

Mr. TAYLOR: The Premier went on to say—

"I have been too long in the political game to be embarrassed by a noodle."

Then he went on to say that the Labour party believed in arbitration; but it was the Arbitration Court that made the awards. There were other people besides the Labour party who believed in arbitration.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Why are you opposing the Bill?

Mr. TAYLOR: The Premier should then have said that he intended to introduce the Bill at the very first opportunity to bring these workers under the Act.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. TAYLOR: What are you going to do with the dairying industry, where they work seven days a week? Will the workers in the industry be allowed double time for Sundays?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Those are details that can be discussed later on in Committee.

[Mr. Deacon.]

Mr. TAYLOR: I want to know whether in this industry, which works 365 days in the year, double time will be provided for on Sundays?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The clause in the Bill reads—

“The Court in its discretion may determine the maximum and minimum working hours and days in any one week.”

Mr. TAYLOR: We know perfectly well what that will be.

Mr. DASH: What did you say in your policy speech?

Mr. TAYLOR: At the Emu Park Convention Mr. Dunstan said—

“They had every right to ask the Government to include all workers in their first Act of Parliament, because the Government had spent a lot of money in the twelve months so that those employed in agriculture in its various phases got the full reward of their labour.”

They did not get the full reward of their labour by one-half.

Mr. HARTLEY: The middleman gets two-thirds out of him.

Mr. TAYLOR: You get far more out of the farmer than I have ever done. I give the farmer something more than the hon. member does. I can stand up here and say that I play the game.

Mr. HARTLEY: That is what we are complaining of—you play your game.

Mr. TAYLOR: I am not going to play your game.

Mr. HYNES: What about that letter to the Commissioner for Railways?

Mr. TAYLOR: If the Chairman will allow me to explain that matter, I will be very pleased to do so. I know that in the Dalby and Kingaroy districts at the present time thousands of cattle are being killed, boiled down, and fed to the pigs. One man in the Aubigny electorate had fourteen draught horses; eleven of them have died on account of the drought, and here are the [11.30 p.m.] Government bringing in a Bill to impose conditions on these men further to harass them in carrying on their industry. It is a crime and a shame. There is no other State in the Commonwealth in which the primary producers have to fight nature as they have in Queensland.

The PREMIER: If you sit down, we will let you have the Bill in five minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR: I want to give reasons for my opposition to the Bill. I realise that it is serious enough to damage the farming industry from end to end, and that it is one of the most disastrous measures that have ever been brought forward. It will have such a recoil on the workers of Queensland that they will regret the day that they sent this Government into power.

The PREMIER: You are not concerned about the workers.

Mr. TAYLOR: I am concerned very much about them, but the hon. gentleman does not care a rap about them. I hope that the Government will not proceed with the introduction of this measure. They will be well advised to drop it; it is certain that the primary producers are not asking for it. If the Premier, during the course of the elections, had stated from the various platforms

that he intended to bring in this Bill, his party would not have got anything like the number of votes they did get.

Mr. ROBERTS (*East Toowoomba*): I very much regret the way in which the Government are piloting their business through this House. An hour ago we agreed to the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech, and amongst the twenty Bills that were foreshadowed in that Speech it must be admitted that the one which will attract the most attention is the Bill which we are now asked to introduce, and I want to show why leave should not be given to introduce it. I am going to quote two or three statements from the Governor's Speech, which was read to this House at the opening of Parliament, to indicate the position of the various industries to which the proposed amendment in the Arbitration Act will apply. This is what His Excellency said—

“A number of important industries have suffered severely from drought conditions, and, owing to the unremunerative prices which are ruling for certain products in the world's markets, others are labouring under disabilities.”

There is the crux of the position; we do not know what the prices are going to be so far as agricultural products are concerned. Further on His Excellency said—

“The expectation of improved market conditions for the products of our industries; the celerity with which new areas of land are being prepared for settlement; and the prospects of the cotton industry; all indicate for the future a condition of profitable industrial and commercial activity for the State.”

Does the hon. gentleman seriously consider that the introduction of this Bill is going to help to accomplish that? Is Queensland going to develop her agricultural industries under these conditions? I say certainly not, and for that reason I will oppose this Bill at every stage as far as it applies to agriculture. I have in my hand the report of the debate which took place when a similar proposal was introduced in 1915, which gives the statements made by men who represented agricultural districts and who described the conditions and difficulties the man on the land would have to contend with under the provisions of a Bill of this kind. It is most unreasonable for the Government, who are professing to have an agricultural policy, and who are professing to be doing all they can to help agriculture in Queensland, to introduce legislation of this kind. Time and again we are told that similar conditions have not interfered with the sugar industry. If you could fix a definite price for produce in the agricultural industry, such as is done in the sugar industry, you would know you were getting that price for your produce, and there would be no objection; but you cannot control prices so far as agriculture is concerned. For that reason I enter a strong protest against the introduction of this Bill.

Mr. W. COOPER (*Rosewood*): We know that the farmers cannot tell what they will get for their products, but, while the man who works for the farmer will have his wages and hours fixed by the Arbitration Court, the court will take into consideration the question of what wages the farming industry is able to pay in view of all the circumstances. The farmers will have every opportunity of placing their case before the court, and no judge of the court will place a greater burden

Mr. W. Cooper.]

upon the industry than it can bear. The sugar industry has prospered under the award of the Arbitration Court, which fixed the hours and wages in the industry, up to the recent repudiation of the sugar agreement by the Federal Government, and the sugar-growers have been able to pay their employees a fair and reasonable wage. In connection with maize-growing and dairying, for instance, the court will fix a fair living wage which the industry is able to pay to those employed in it. In my experience, the farmer is prepared to pay his employees a fair and living wage.

Mr. ROBERTS: He often pays more out than he gets himself.

Mr. W. COOPER: Admittedly. If he does, he will have the opportunity of laying his case before the Arbitration Court judge, who will fix the hours and rate of pay, and the farmer will have no cause for fear so far as the court is concerned. Hon. members opposite would have no wages fixed at all if they had their way. They would like a condition of things under which the worker was compelled to accept whatever wage they liked to give, without any redress at all. There is no law to make a man hire another unless he likes; but there is a law—the unwritten law of necessity—which compels a man to work whether he likes it or not, and unscrupulous employers have too long been able to take advantage of it and dictate conditions of employment to the unfortunate worker.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*): I would like to know from the Minister whether share farmers are included in the Bill as employees.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The definition of "employer" is as it is in every other industry. There is no mention of a share farmer. The ordinary definition of "employee" will apply.

Mr. DEACON: That means that a share farmer will be included.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I did not say so.

Mr. DEACON: It is included under the State Insurance Act.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is not in order in discussing details.

Mr. DEACON: We want this information as soon as we can get it. That is a matter which should be cleared up. I think it is only fair that the Government should postpone this Bill. It is unfair to go on with it to-night.

This Bill will make a lot of difference to the working men who are not up to the standard, and who are not able to earn the full wages. If a man cannot earn the full wages in an industry, he has got to get out. This is a serious matter. One of the failures of the Industrial Arbitration Act is that it did not provide for the working man who was not able to earn the standard rate of wages. This Bill should not be rushed through at this late hour. There never has been a growl or a strike in the primary producing industry. Probably there will be strikes now that this measure is going to be passed.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Do you think that rural workers should work 355 days in the year?

Mr. DEACON: No. No one has asked them to do that. There is a certain amount

of work that a farmer must do every day. In the ordinary course of farming there are slack days and busy days. With an award that fixes hours and conditions, it will be absolutely impossible to carry on. We want to know who is going to pay the cost.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): The members of the Government seem to think that, as the hour is late, it is the duty of the Opposition to keep silent on the matter; but the Opposition will not do so so long as there is any business before the House that affects the interests of the country so vitally as this matter does. The remarks of the Secretary for Public Works in introducing the Bill invited criticism. The Bill did not have the sanction of the Council of Agriculture.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Is the Council of Agriculture a sort of super-Parliament?

Mr. KERR: No, but it is becoming a Department of Agriculture. If the Government are expending £50,000 a year on the Council of Agriculture to deal with matters affecting the farmers, they should have consulted that body on this matter which so vitally affects them.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Your suggestion is that the Government should be amenable to outside influences?

Mr. KERR: It is useless to try to put words into my mouth. There is no party in this House so amenable to outside influences as the Government party. This Bill seems to be divided into two sections. I regret that division.

Mr. DASH: Are you in favour of arbitration?

Mr. KERR: Yes. The Government should have dissociated the apprenticeship portion of the Bill from the arbitration portion. There should be a separate Bill to handle the apprenticeship question. Such a Bill would have had the support of the Opposition, but we consider its present form detrimental to the country. In the original Bill in 1915 the clause appertaining to rural industries was included, but it was turned down by the Legislative Council; similarly in 1916.

At 12.2 a.m.,

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

Mr. KERR: Another great reason why this resolution should not be agreed to by the Committee is because the Government did not put it before the people when they had the opportunity to do so. The Premier, when he was in the Nanango district, side-tracked this question. It has never been before the people, and although the Government had an opportunity in 1916 of putting the question to the people they failed to take advantage of their opportunity. I know of one farmer in my electorate who has three sons, and the total income earned on the farm is about £6 a week. How on earth is that farmer going to pay his three sons the basic wage of over £4 a week each? He cannot possibly pay it, and the only thing for him to do is to put his sons off the farm. The one man, after three have left, will not produce the same amount, and that will be to the disadvantage of the State. About 2,000 men are travelling from town to town in Queensland looking for employment.

[Mr. W. Cooper.]

The men call on the farmers for some assistance, and perhaps get a day's work here and there, but in future the farmer will not be in a position to give a man a day's work.

The Bill will reduce agricultural production. We know that many farming employees who are receiving less than the basic wage are compensated with other privileges and by being treated as members of the employer's family. I sincerely hope that the Minister will withdraw the Bill and bring in a comprehensive measure dealing with the whole question of apprenticeship. Under this measure the farmers will have to appoint representatives to appear for them in the Arbitration Court, which will entail great expense. I cannot support the Bill.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*): I wish to protest against what I might term political trickery on the part of the Premier, who is responsible for going on with the Bill to-night. The other day he asked the Opposition to assist him in letting the people of the world know that Queensland was not in the bad financial position it was said to be; yet he now brings on a measure of this sort, which is going to cause disaster to the farming industry. I am surprised at a practical farmer like the Secretary for Agriculture going on with the measure at this time, although I feel sure that he is not a willing party to it.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: You do not suggest that there was any compact?

Mr. MORGAN: I do not suggest that there was any compact at all, but some of the Government's own men went away, and likewise some of ours left for the country districts for the week-end. Would it not have been fair for the Premier to suggest to the leader of the Opposition that he was going to bring this Bill on to-night? The leader of the Opposition has been ignored and slighted; yet later on the Premier will come across and "smooch" to him and ask him not to do this and not to do that, and we shall be silly enough to agree. The Government expect the Opposition to play the gentlemanly game, but they do not understand the meaning of fair play. It is trickery of the worst description; it is political treachery. I have been a sport all my life, and have been prepared to take what was coming to me; but the Premier always wants a horseshoe in his glove, even when dealing with his own side. I am not surprised at the Premier, but I am surprised at the Secretary for Mines and the Secretary for Agriculture allowing him to act to automatically. They are British subjects, but perhaps the Premier has not been reared as a British subject.

At 12.20 a.m.,

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*) called attention to the state of the Committee.

Quorum formed.

Mr. MORGAN: We are proposing to encourage wheatgrowing in Queensland so that we shall have sufficient wheat for our own requirements, which we have not got at the present time. There is no award covering those engaged in that industry. That class of worker is specifically excluded from the operations of the principal Act.

Hon. F. T. BRENNAN: The farmers have been paying the award rates right through.

Mr. MORGAN: At present the Arbitration Court has no power to make an award for persons engaged in mixed farming,

dairying, wheatgrowing, or any like industry. An attempt was made at one time to bring the prickly-pear cutters under the operations of the Act. I appeared for the prickly-pear selectors on that occasion, and I argued before the President of the Arbitration Court that the Act would not permit him to make an award for those employees, and he said that he could make an award for the prickly-pear cutters on the small grazing farms, but where the land was used for agricultural purposes he could not. In New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia, where they grow the bulk of the wheat produced in Australia, they are not working under any award, and they are able to pay ploughmen and other men engaged in that industry just what they can get their services for, whilst we in Queensland will probably have to pay £4 5s. a week to our employees. Under those circumstances we shall not be able to compete successfully with those States.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Do you think that the rural worker should have to work 365 days in the year?

Mr. MORGAN: He works no longer than the man in the street. Cabled reports in the newspapers forecast a fall in the price of wheat owing to favourable seasons in the wheat-growing countries of the world, and the large amount of exportable surpluses which will be available. Wheat will probably fall to 3s. 6d. per bushel, and, as the wheat farmers of Queensland do not produce sufficient wheat for home consumption, they will not be able to compete with the Southern States, which, in addition to not being saddled with an Arbitration Court award, have the advantage of more up-to-date machinery.

The HOME SECRETARY: What wages do you think he should get?

Mr. MORGAN: I do not think that the Arbitration Court would award him less than the sugar rates. It costs the same to plough an acre of ground for wheat as for sugar or cotton, yet the return from the acre of wheat will probably be £5 or £6 as against from £40 to £60 for the acre of sugar and from £20 to £30 for the acre of cotton. It will not be possible under those circumstances to allow the court to fix the wages and conditions for the employees of the wheatgrower at the level of the employees in either the sugar or the cotton industry.

Our wheat industry is not a pampered industry, for we have to compete with the world, as Australia produces more wheat than we can consume. If we [12.30 p.m.] produced more sugar than we could consume, we would have to compete with the world. We cannot pamper an industry that produces more than we can consume. If we must pay our men £4 5s. a week to work on a dairy—

Hon. F. T. BRENNAN: They get it now.

Mr. MORGAN: Then why introduce the Bill? It is only meddling and tinkering on the part of the Government.

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

Mr. VOWLES (*Dalby*): I am very sorry that such an important and contentious matter has been brought forward at such a late hour. As a member of the Country party, I am very much concerned about legislation such as this, because it affects the fortunes of the people who sent me to Parliament to care for their interests. During all

Mr. Vowles.]

the years I have been in opposition, on every occasion that legislation of this kind has been suggested, I have resisted the imposition of a condition such as is proposed under this Bill on the producing members of the community. When Parliament was differently constituted, the other Chamber resisted these impositions on two occasions. Later on, after the abolition of the second Chamber, when the Wheat Pool Bill was before us, an attempt was made to introduce into that legislation a condition which was not in the original agreement which was made between myself, as the representative of the farmers on the Downs, and the Secretary for Agriculture. When I met the Secretary for Agriculture and the Premier in the office of the Secretary for Agriculture, it was never suggested that the Government should bring into existence a principle which had on two occasions been rejected. The conditions in the agricultural industry at present are so bad that many of the farmers were never in a worse position.

This Chamber passed the Wheat Pool Bill without inserting in it the objectionable provision which we are now asked to agree to; but certain representatives of industrial unions in Brisbane insisted, through Mr. Dunstan in the Upper House, on the clause being inserted, and it was inserted. In February, 1922, the Premier, in dealing with the objective of the Labour party, made certain references to farmers, and said he would like to know how they would get on under the socialisation of industry. The happenings at the Emu Park Convention lost the Government thousands of votes in the farming districts, and the Premier, at Nanango, found it necessary to quibble on the point of the inclusion of rural workers in the Industrial Arbitration Act. It was demanded at the Convention that the rural workers should be included in the first Act passed by the new Parliament, and reference was made to the expenditure by the Government of a large amount of money on the Council of Agriculture. That was used really by the Government for political propaganda and to help Government candidates at the election; yet the Premier seemed to expect that the Opposition would agree on the voices to the desirableness of doing something which was undesirable, and that when every hon. member expected that we would merely finish the Address in Reply before settling down to solid work next week. Now that the Council of Agriculture are an elective body they will carry on on different lines.

The bell indicated that the hon. member had exhausted the time allowed under the Standing Orders.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*): I must protest against the introduction of a measure of this sort. Fifty per cent. of the farmers in my electorate have come to me and asked me to sign a paper so that they can obtain relief from the Government to enable them to carry on. I have had a man employed for some time on my place, where he has practically nothing to do and has a comfortable home, but I would not be able to keep him on if I had to pay him £4 5s. a week. When the Premier came back after his trip North he not only allowed the farmers fodder for their stock, but he allowed them 15s. a week for the maintenance of their families in order to carry them over the bad times. I came to Queensland at the same time as a number of

wheatgrowers who came from South Australia to grow wheat on the most economical methods. A neighbour of mine sowed 1,000 acres of wheat for a number of years, spent £7,000 on his property, and walked off it with his swag on his back. The attitude of the Government is unreasonable in the face of their declaration that they want to get increased production. The Government can not justify their action in bringing in such a measure. Neither the farmers nor the dairymen can stand any extra impost. I am chairman of a shire council, and I am in a position to know the financial position of a great many of the farmers. Time after time I have had requests for 10s. or 15s. from farmers to purchase food for their families. This legislation is brought about by an outside body which has no right to dictate to Parliament. As the Local Producers' Associations have to suggest any legislation for the good of the industry, I would like to know if any one of them has suggested that the provisions of the Arbitration Court should be applied to the industry. Already the Local Producers' Associations are becoming restive, because they believe they should have some say in matters affecting the industry in their district.

Mr. COLLINS: The Arbitration Court has not ruined any of the industries it covers.

Mr. MOORE: Although none of those industries have been ruined, they are on a totally different plane to the agricultural industry. How are the people [1 a.m.] who are suffering from the drought going to recover if an award rate is put on them?

I do not know how far this Bill is going with regard to hours, but I strongly object to it generally, as it means ruination to the farmer. It would be a different matter if the Government gave this industry similar protection to that given to the sugar industry. Are they prepared to give a special agreement?

We know that to-day Victoria has 14,000,000 bushels of wheat which they have not been able to sell because there is no market for it. Queensland, fortunately for the farmers, does not grow sufficient wheat for local requirements; but do the Government know that in an ordinary season that that is going to be the position? Do they want us to compete with other countries of the world, or do they want production to remain stagnant in Queensland? If we can get protection such as the sugar industry got whereby we shall get sufficient for our produce to enable us to pay the wages fixed by the Arbitration Court, then there is nothing more to be said. But we have to sell our produce overseas, and I cannot see how the industry is going to carry on under the conditions imposed by this Bill. I cannot understand the Government bringing in such a Bill. To my mind it is suicidal. They say they want to settle people on the land, but no settlers will come from overseas to settle on our land under conditions such as those proposed. The Bill will lead to stagnation and more unemployment, as the farmers do not get sufficient money to enable them to pay the Arbitration Court wages. If the industry cannot pay the wages, are we to close it up?

The bell indicated that the hon. member had exhausted the time allowed under the Standing Orders

[*Mr. Vowles.*

Mr. BELL (*Fassfern*): I am going to oppose the introduction of this Bill, and I do not think I can congratulate the Government on their sporting principles in bringing in such a resolution at this hour of the sitting. I do not think the Government members can understand the rural industries, because a Bill such as this will place a very heavy burden on the agricultural industry, which is already suffering under great disabilities. We know that at the present time there is a considerable drift to the cities, and this Bill is going to accentuate that drift.

The Government should have taken a referendum of the people on this question. Those engaged in the rural industries are quite prepared to pay reasonable rates of wages, and there is no need to include the employees in the provisions of this Bill. The rural industries are of a seasonal nature, and it is impossible to regulate the hours of labour therein. It is often necessary to work more than eight hours a day. A farmer is generally assisted by the members of his family to carry on his work, and very often his children have to milk the cows before they go to school and after they return. Surely the farmer is entitled to some reward for his labour!

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*): While the primary producers may be sleeping at the present time, the Government have spent £68 on motor-cars to bring their supporters back to pass this resolution. Hon. members opposite twit hon. members on this side with being out for low wages; but during the election campaign they said that the worker included the man who owned a farm and who was a producer. We as representatives of that section of the workers should see that they have some remuneration for their work. Our producers are working hard for ten and twelve hours a day, but hon. members opposite want to deprive them of proper remuneration for the work they do on their farms. The hon. member for Bowen wants to take away from the producer the full reward for his labour. Why do hon. members opposite wish to create these conditions for the worker? They are advocating them at the dictation of the Australian Workers' Union at the Emu Park Convention. Mr. Dunstan, of the Australian Workers' Union, said at the Emu Park Convention that, now that the primary producers were receiving a full return for their labour, now that they had spent a lot of money in organizing the farmer, it was only right that they should pay a fair wage to the workers employed on the farms. The farmers are not getting a full return for their labour: if they were there would be justification for the Bill. What have the Government done to improve the conditions of the dairy farmer or the maize-grower, who are down and out owing to the low prices ruling to-day? Those people who are waiting to go on the land in the Upper Burnett, while they are trying to establish their farms will be brought under the Arbitration Court, the judges of which may be dictated to by members of the front Government bench.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. W. Forgan Smith, *Markay*): I rise to a point of order. I claim that it is highly disorderly to make any reflection on the members of the judiciary. The hon. member has stated that the court may be dictated to

by members of the front Government bench. I ask that the imputation be withdrawn.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member for Burnett made a remark reflecting on the judiciary, I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. CORSER: I have nothing to withdraw.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member to resume his seat.

[1.30 a.m.]

Mr. BRAND (*Burrum*): Before this motion is put, I desire to say something.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS having crossed the floor and spoken to the Temporary Chairman,

Mr. CORSER (addressing the Minister): You are dictating to the Chairman. (Interruption.)

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: I understood the hon. member for Burnett to make a reflection on the judges of the Arbitration Court, and, that being so, I must ask him to withdraw.

Mr. MORGAN: Mr. Dunstan, why do you allow yourself to be dictated to by the Minister? Why do you not do your duty?

Mr. CORSER: If I made any reflection, I would certainly withdraw; but I did not, and I am certainly not going to withdraw or be dictated to by the Minister, through you.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: I heard the hon. member's remarks, and they were disorderly and he must withdraw; and, if he refuses to withdraw, I shall have no other course than to name him.

Mr. CORSER: I am not going to be dictated to, through the Chair, by any hon. member on the other side.

Mr. TAYLOR: Mr. Dunstan, before you take the extreme course you have mentioned, I should like to say that it is perfectly clear that you should have asked the hon. member for Burnett to withdraw before the hon. member for Burrum got up to speak, and not have allowed any hon. member to say what he was to do. You would have been on solid ground if you had done it before the hon. member for Burrum began to speak. You are taking a course which is unfair and unparliamentary.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I made no suggestion at all. I merely asked a question.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Burnett refuses to obey the Chair, and the only course open to me is to name him to the House.

Mr. CORSER: My unfortunate duty is to stand on my individual rights as a private member, and refuse to be dictated to by the Minister, through you.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: There was no dictation at all.

Mr. CORSER: You have no right to dictate to the Chairman.

Mr. BRAND: I would like to know whether I am in order in speaking to the question?

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MORGAN (addressing the Secretary for Public Works): You ought to be ashamed of yourself, humiliating the Chairman.

Mr. Corser.]

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: You should be ashamed of yourself.

Mr. CORSER: If you may dictate to the Chairman, you may dictate to the court.

Mr. COLLINS (to Mr. Corser): In your own remarks you made a deliberate misstatement.

Mr. MORGAN (to the Secretary for Public Works): You ought to be ashamed of yourself—bullying the Chair.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I merely asked a question. You should be ashamed of yourselves—a gang like you.

Mr. CORSER: If you can dictate to the Chairman, you can dictate to the court.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I did not dictate.

Mr. BRAND: You did, deliberately.

Mr. VOWLES: Look at the Minister's face!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: If my face were as ugly as yours, I would go and hide it.

The House resumed.

SUSPENSION OF MEMBER.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN said: Mr. Speaker, I have to name the hon. member for Burnett for having wilfully disregarded the order of the Chair.

The SPEAKER: The Temporary Chairman has reported the hon. member for Burnett for wilfully disregarding the order of the Chair.

The PREMIER: I beg to move—

“That the hon. member for Burnett be suspended from the service of the House for the remainder of the sitting.”

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): I think it is customary, before a motion of that kind is put—

The SPEAKER: Order! I would ask the hon. member for Burnett if he is prepared to apologise to the Chair—

Mr. CORSER: The Secretary for Public Works ought to apologise.

Question—That the hon. member for Burnett be suspended from the service of the House for the remainder of the sitting—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 30.

Mr. Brennan	Mr. Kirwan
„ Carter	„ Land
„ Collins	„ Lacombe
„ Cooper, F. A.	„ McCormack
„ Cooper, W.	„ McLachlan
„ Coyne	„ Mullan
„ Dash	„ Payne
„ Dunstan	„ Pease
„ Foley	„ Pollock
„ Gilday	„ Ryan
„ Gillies	„ Smith
„ Hartley	„ Stopford
„ Huxham	„ Theodore
„ Hynes	„ Wilson
„ Jones	„ Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Foley and Mr. Hartley.

NOES, 12.

Mr. Barnes, G. P.	Mr. Kerr
„ Bell	„ Moore
„ Brand	„ Morgan
„ Corser	„ Roberts
„ Deacon	„ Taylor
„ Fry	„ Vowles

Tellers: Mr. Deacon and Mr. Morgan.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. CORSER thereupon withdrew from the Chamber.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

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

Question—That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to further amend the Industrial Arbitration Act of 1916 in certain particulars—again stated.

Mr. BRAND (*Burrum*): I think we all regret the incident that has just taken place.

The PREMIER: I beg to move—

“That the question be now put.”

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

AYES, 30.

Mr. Bertram	Mr. Jones
„ Brennan	„ Land
„ Carter	„ Lacombe
„ Collins	„ McCormack
„ Cooper, F. A.	„ McLachlan
„ Cooper, W.	„ Mullan
„ Coyne	„ Payne
„ Dash	„ Pease
„ Dunstan	„ Pollock
„ Foley	„ Ryan
„ Gilday	„ Smith
„ Gillies	„ Stopford
„ Hartley	„ Theodore
„ Huxham	„ Wilson
„ Hynes	„ Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Foley and Mr. Hartley.

NOES, 11.

Mr. Barnes, G. P.	Mr. Moore
„ Bell	„ Morgan
„ Brand	„ Roberts
„ Deacon	„ Taylor
„ Fry	„ Vowles
„ Kerr	

Tellers: Mr. Brand and Mr. Kerr.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 30.

Mr. Bertram	Mr. Jones
„ Brennan	„ Land
„ Carter	„ Lacombe
„ Collins	„ McCormack
„ Cooper, F. A.	„ McLachlan
„ Cooper, W.	„ Mullan
„ Coyne	„ Payne
„ Dash	„ Pease
„ Dunstan	„ Pollock
„ Foley	„ Ryan
„ Gilday	„ Smith
„ Gillies	„ Stopford
„ Hartley	„ Theodore
„ Huxham	„ Wilson
„ Hynes	„ Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Foley and Mr. Hartley.

NOES, 10.

Mr. Barnes, G. P.	Mr. Moore
„ Bell	„ Morgan
„ Brand	„ Roberts
„ Deacon	„ Taylor
„ Kerr	„ Vowles

Tellers: Mr. Brand and Mr. Kerr.

Resolved in the affirmative.

REPORT STAGE.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Mr. Kirwan, I beg to move—

“That you do now leave the chair and report that the Committee have come to a resolution.”

2 a.m.,

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): Mr. Kirwan, I do not see any reason why you should leave the chair. Certain things have happened in this Chamber to-night.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. TAYLOR: I am trying to give some reasons why you should not leave the chair. When an hon. member was speaking on this

side the Secretary for Public Works got up and went to the Temporary Chairman and made some remark or request to him, and the Temporary Chairman immediately took action against the hon. member for Burnett. I certainly think the Minister did something entirely unparliamentary.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The leader of the Opposition will realise that that is not the question before the Committee. The question is—"That I do now leave the chair and report that the Committee have come to a resolution."

Mr. TAYLOR: Mr. Kirwan—

The PREMIER: I beg to move—

"That the question be now put."

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

AYES, 30.

Mr. Bertram	Mr. Jones
" Brennan	" Land
" Carter	" Larcombe
" Collins	" McCormack
" Cooper, F. A.	" McLachlan
" Cooper, W.	" Mullan
" Coyne	" Payne
" Dash	" Pease
" Dunstan	" Pollock
" Foley	" Ryan
" Gilday	" Smith
" Gillies	" Stopford
" Hartley	" Theodore
" Huxham	" Wilson
" Hynes	" Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Foley and Mr. Hartley.

NOES, 10.

Mr. Barnes, G. P.	Mr. Moore
" Bell	" Morgan
" Brand	" Roberts
" Deacon	" Taylor
" Kerr	" Vowles

Tellers: Mr. Brand and Mr. Kerr.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the Chairman do now leave the chair and report that the Committee have come to a resolution—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 30.

Mr. Bertram	Mr. Jones
" Brennan	" Land
" Carter	" Larcombe
" Collins	" McCormack
" Cooper, F. A.	" McLachlan
" Cooper, W.	" Mullan
" Coyne	" Payne
" Dash	" Pease
" Dunstan	" Pollock
" Foley	" Ryan
" Gilday	" Smith
" Gillies	" Stopford
" Hartley	" Theodore
" Huxham	" Wilson
" Hynes	" Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Foley and Mr. Hartley.

NOES, 10.

Mr. Barnes, G. P.	Mr. Moore
" Bell	" Morgan
" Brand	" Roberts
" Deacon	" Taylor
" Kerr	" Vowles

Tellers: Mr. Brand and Mr. Kerr.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The House resumed.

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

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move—

"That the resolution be now agreed to by the House."

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): I do not think that we should agree to this resolution. I have not heard any good reasons advanced as to why we should agree to the resolution. We do not think the carrying of this resolution will be in the best interests of Queensland, and we will oppose it all we can.

The PREMIER: I beg to move—

"That the question be now put."

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

AYES, 30.

Mr. Brennan	Mr. Kirwan
" Carter	" Land
" Collins	" Larcombe
" Cooper, F. A.	" McCormack
" Cooper, W.	" McLachlan
" Coyne	" Mullan
" Dash	" Payne
" Dunstan	" Pease
" Foley	" Pollock
" Gilday	" Ryan
" Gillies	" Smith
" Hartley	" Stopford
" Huxham	" Theodore
" Hynes	" Wilson
" Jones	" Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. F. A. Cooper and Mr. Hynes.

NOES, 10.

Mr. Barnes, G. P.	Mr. Moore
" Bell	" Morgan
" Brand	" Roberts
" Deacon	" Taylor
" Kerr	" Vowles

Tellers: Mr. Bell and Mr. Deacon.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the resolution be now agreed to—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 30.

Mr. Brennan	Mr. Kirwan
" Carter	" Land
" Collins	" Larcombe
" Cooper, F. A.	" McCormack
" Cooper, W.	" McLachlan
" Coyne	" Mullan
" Dash	" Payne
" Dunstan	" Pease
" Foley	" Pollock
" Gilday	" Ryan
" Gillies	" Smith
" Hartley	" Stopford
" Huxham	" Theodore
" Hynes	" Wilson
" Jones	" Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Hartley and Mr. Ryan.

NOES, 9.

Mr. Barnes, G. P.	Mr. Morgan
" Bell	" Roberts
" Deacon	" Taylor
" Kerr	" Vowles
" Moore	

Tellers: Mr. Bell and Mr. Deacon.

Resolved in the affirmative.

FIRST READING.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I beg to present the Bill, and move—

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

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): Having in view what has taken place in this Chamber to-night—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. W. McCormack, *Cairns*): Mr. Speaker, is not the motion for the first reading of a Bill purely formal?

The SPEAKER: On the point of order raised by the Secretary for Public Lands, I must rule the hon. member for Windsor out of order.

Question—That the Bill be now read a first time—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 30.	
Mr. Brennan	Mr. Kirwan
„ Carter	„ Land
„ Collins	„ Larcombe
„ Cooper, F. A.	„ McCormack
„ Cooper, W.	„ McLachlan
„ Coyne	„ Mullan
„ Dash	„ Payne
„ Dunstan	„ Pease
„ Foley	„ Pollock
„ Gilday	„ Ryan
„ Gillies	„ Smith
„ Hartley	„ Stopford
„ Huxham	„ Theodore
„ Hynes	„ Wilson
„ Jones	„ Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Collins and Mr. Hartley.

NOES, 9.	
Mr. Barnes, G. P.	Mr. Morgan
„ Bell	„ Roberts
„ Deacon	„ Taylor
„ Kerr	„ Vowles
„ Moore	

Tellers: Mr. Bell and Mr. Deacon.

Resolved in the affirmative.

PRINTING OF BILL.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I beg to move—

“That the Bill be printed.”

Mr. TAYLOR: Instead of printing the Bill in the ordinary way, it would be very much better to have it printed in red with a black border all round.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the hon. member knows that on this motion no debate can take place.

[2.30 a.m.]

Question—That the Bill be printed—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 30.	
Mr. Brennan	Mr. Kirwan
„ Carter	„ Land
„ Collins	„ Larcombe
„ Cooper, F. A.	„ McCormack
„ Cooper, W.	„ McLachlan
„ Coyne	„ Mullan
„ Dash	„ Payne
„ Dunstan	„ Pease
„ Foley	„ Pollock
„ Gilday	„ Ryan
„ Gillies	„ Smith
„ Hartley	„ Stopford
„ Huxham	„ Theodore
„ Hynes	„ Wilson
„ Jones	„ Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Dash and Mr. Hynes.

NOES, 9.	
Mr. Barnes, G. P.	Mr. Morgan
„ Bell	„ Roberts
„ Deacon	„ Taylor
„ Kerr	„ Vowles
„ Moore	

Tellers: Mr. Kerr and Mr. Morgan.

Resolved in the affirmative.

MOTION APPOINTING DATE FOR SECOND READING.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I beg to move—

“That the second reading of the Bill be made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.”

[*Hon. W. Forgan Smith.*]

Question—That the second reading of the Bill be made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 30.	
Mr. Brennan	Mr. Kirwan
„ Carter	„ Land
„ Collins	„ Larcombe
„ Cooper, F. A.	„ McCormack
„ Cooper, W.	„ McLachlan
„ Coyne	„ Mullan
„ Dash	„ Payne
„ Dunstan	„ Pease
„ Foley	„ Pollock
„ Gilday	„ Ryan
„ Gillies	„ Smith
„ Hartley	„ Stopford
„ Huxham	„ Theodore
„ Hynes	„ Wilson
„ Jones	„ Winstanley

Tellers: Mr. Collins and Mr. Hartley.

NOES, 9.	
Mr. Barnes, G. P.	Mr. Morgan
„ Bell	„ Roberts
„ Deacon	„ Taylor
„ Kerr	„ Vowles
„ Moore	

Tellers: Mr. Bell and Mr. Deacon.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The House adjourned at 2.36 a.m.