

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 29 AUGUST 1923

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

WEDNESDAY, 29 AUGUST, 1923.

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

QUESTIONS.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN QUEENSLAND GOVERNMENT AND BRITISH-AUSTRALIAN COTTON ASSOCIATION.

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

“1. Are the following particulars correct with respect to the agreement between the Government and the British-Australian Cotton Association:—

(a) That until 31st July, 1926, all seed cotton grown in Queensland cannot be disposed of except by delivery to the British-Australian Cotton Association?

(b) That the British-Australian Cotton Association is appointed the sole agent of the Government for the disposal of raw cotton?

(c) That all such cotton must in the first place be offered for delivery to the British Cotton Growing Association?

“2. Until 31st July, 1926, would a grower of cotton in Queensland be allowed to dispose of cotton grown by himself otherwise than through the British-Australian Cotton Association? Would he be allowed to gin his own seed cotton for sale?

“3. Is there now any undertaking or agreement by which the British-Australian Cotton Association or the British Cotton Growing Association shares with the Government the guarantee of 5½d. per lb. for seed cotton?”

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

“1 to 3. A copy of this agreement, together with all papers in connection therewith, was tabled by me in Parliament on the 31st ultimo, therefore, there is no excuse for the hon. member being in ignorance on this matter.”

NUMBER OF MEN EMPLOYED ON DAWSON IRRIGATION WORKS AT DELUSION CREEK.

Mr. MORGAN (*Murilla*) asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

“1. What was the number of men employed in connection with the Dawson irrigation work at Delusion Creek on 10th May last?

“2. What number of men were employed at the same place on 30th July last?

“3. What was the number of men employed in connection with the Dawson irrigation work at Castle Creek on 10th May last?

“4. What number of men were employed at the same place on 30th July last?”

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

- "1. 40.
- "2. 14.
- "3. 132.
- "4. 153."

LANDS IN TULLY RIVER SUGAR-MILL AREA.

Mr. BRAND (*Burrum*) asked the Treasurer—

- "1. When does he hope to have Crown lands in the Tully River Mill area open for selection?
- "2. Is it his intention to immediately resume the freehold lands comprised in that area?
- "3. Will the settlement of such areas be carried out by individual ballot or allotted in group or community settlement?
- "4. If by the latter, will he allow the member for Burrum an opportunity of nominating twenty (or less) experienced sugar workers, with limited capital and without land, for settlement as a group on farms in that area?"

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

- "1. I am unable to say at present, but every effort is being made to expedite the matter.
- "2. Notice of resumption of lands required for mill and township purposes has been given. It is not the intention of the Government to resume all the freehold lands comprised in the area.
- "3. The scheme of land settlement has not yet been decided upon.
- "4. See No. 3."

PROTECTION TO AUSTRALIAN FIRMS TENDERING
FOR ERECTION OF TULLY RIVER SUGAR-
MILL.

Mr. BRAND asked the Treasurer—

- "1. In view of the necessity of enforcing an embargo on foreign sugar to adequately protect the Queensland sugar industry, will he extend a similar protection to Australian firms tendering for the erection of the Tully River Mill, and, notwithstanding what opinion may express, assure to Australian industries the erection of such mill?
- "2. Is it not a fact that the Government policy follows the principle of preference to Australian industries in anticipating true nation building?"

The TREASURER replied—

- "1. Practical effect has always been given to the Government's policy of preference to Australian manufacturers.
- "2. Yes."

PAPERS.

The following papers were laid on the table, and ordered to be printed:—

Report of the Agent-General of Queensland for the year 1922.

Report by the Director to the Council of Agriculture.

SUPPLY.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT—RESUMPTION OF
COMMITTEE.

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

Mr. NOTT (*Stanley*): In listening to the speeches of hon. members on the other side, and particularly the speech delivered by the hon. member for Bowen, it was very refreshing, especially in the early part of the latter's speech, to hear him voicing patriotic sentiments, but I regret that towards the close of his speech he lapsed somewhat in that direction.

Mr. COLLINS: You ought to be over in East Africa amongst the blacks.

Mr. NOTT: The hon. member will hear about the blacks in East Africa shortly. The hon. member for Maryborough had something to say about Australian sentiment and about investing money in countries where black labour obtains. I think I am as good a Queenslander as any hon. member in this Chamber, and, what is more, perhaps I am a better Britisher than some of them. I have a little money invested, not only in East Africa and Queensland, but also in New Zealand, and consequently I can claim that I am a true Britisher as well as a Queenslander. In regard to being a Queenslander and doing all we can to bring about what Australia has decided upon—a white labour policy—let me say that I have never avoided obtaining union painters to paint my house; I have not used Japanese paint, and I have not had it put on with paint brushes belonging to the Railway Department. (Opposition laughter.) The hon. member for Maryborough and other hon. members know that at one time Australia was a black man's country, and that not very long ago. I do not think it is to the detriment of any Britisher if he does what he can to develop any part of the Dominions, whether it was originally a white or a black man's country. Australia is like some other countries—originally it was a black man's country. It has certainly been developed to a great extent by the assistance of black labour, and that black labour was controlled and utilised under the supervision of many old pioneers. We have the fact that a great deal of the coastline has been brought to its present stage of development with the assistance of black labour.

Mr. HYNES: You would like to have them back again.

Mr. NOTT: Some time ago I had an argument with an individual who claimed that all blacks were the descendants of Ham, and therefore they had no souls. After a fairly warm argument on that point for a little while, I put it to him that if a black man had no soul and the white man had a soul, what was the position of the half-caste? The argument finished there. The sugar industry in Queensland is the best monument to the success of black South Sea Island labour. Every man who is working in the sugar industry and drawing high wages from it to-day should be prepared to take off his hat to the kanakas, because, if there had been no kanakas in that industry, we would not have it as it is to-day.

Mr. HYNES: The sugar industry was not prosperous until the niggers were deported.

Mr. NOTT: That may be so. My experience of working farms over a number of years with kanaka labour and of working sugarcane

Mr. Nott.]

farms with white labour after the kanaka was repatriated was that white labour is much cheaper than black labour. Black labour was not, and never will be cheap labour.

Mr. HYNES: Then why are you putting up a plea for them?

Mr. NOTT: I am not putting up a plea for them. No man has stood by the policy of a White Australia more loyally than the sugar-growers of Queensland. (Government laughter.) I remember noticing in the days when we had a number of kanakas in the Bundaberg district that there were quite a number of albino kanakas, and certainly they had a very weird appearance. I am satisfied that, if the seventy-two members of this House were mixed up with seventy-two South Sea Islanders and a man was selected to draft the white men from the black men, the hon. member for Maryborough would not be the first man drafted out.

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

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member cannot make a reflection of that kind on another member of this House, and I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. NOTT: In deference to you, Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the latter remark. One of the reasons why I, and perhaps a number of others, have looked to South Africa, New Zealand, and other places for the investment of our money is because it is our duty to remember that self-preservation is the first law of nature. Australia was a black country not so very long ago; yet certain hon. members of this House are prepared to give very short shrift to the black men from whom we have taken this country.

Mr. COLLINS: It is the exploitation of labour, whether black, brown, or brindle, that we are opposed to.

Mr. NOTT: I am prepared to give some reasons why money has been taken from Queensland and invested in other countries.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You are not using native labour in Kenya; you are using Indians.

Mr. NOTT: There are no kanakas in East Africa.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You are taking Indians from Asia.

Mr. NOTT: There are quite a number of Indians settled there. Some of the reasons why money has been withdrawn from Queensland and invested in East Africa are because of the repudiation legislation passed by this Government, the introduction of the perpetual lease tenure, and the ever-increasing dictation as to how a man shall run his business or his estate.

Mr. COLLINS: The old slavish mind!

Mr. NOTT: The faulty legislation on the statute-book to-day has had the effect of creating a good deal of general unrest, and there is a lack of trust in the soundness and reliability of Queensland so far as the legislation and credit of the country are concerned—all due to the present Labour Administration. Some time ago several hon. members of the Opposition said that they considered that the Government have had very good opportunities. I consider that since they came into power they have had wonderful opportunities. The leader of the Opposition stressed the assets of Queensland, and also

explained the extent to which development has taken place. During their period of administration the Labour party have had the advantage of high prices and have had some wonderful schemes to handle—for instance, the settlement of soldiers on the land—which should have been great successes. I regret that, owing to mismanagement and cruel neglect, many of the soldiers put on to these land propositions have not had a ghost of a chance of making a success of things.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Have they achieved success in the other States?

Mr. NOTT: The Labour Government also had a wonderful advertisement given by the soldiers who went from Queensland to fight in the world war.

Queensland is a business, just as a commercial house is a business, and it depends on its finance for credit. This Government should have maintained their credit compatible with the resources of the State instead of showing failures in connection with soldier settlement and State enterprises and introducing legislation which jeopardised financial credit such as the Repudiation Act, perpetual leases, proxy voting, and quite a lot of similar legislation which would undermine the credit of this or any other State. This class of legislation was the real cause of driving the present Government from Great Britain to America to obtain their last two loans. The Treasurer and Government members very often mention the delegation, and we have often heard the statement that the "pitch had been queered." I would like to know whether the Treasurer has ever received any written report from the Agent-General giving details of the harmful effects of this delegation, either previous to or during his London visit. I take it that the business of the Agent-General would be to report the fact if any delegation was having a deleterious effect on the financial or any other interests of Queensland whilst the Government were endeavouring to obtain a loan in Great Britain. I have never heard anything to this effect. There will always be a great deal of difficulty in obtaining money, either for use domestically or otherwise, if the taxation in a State is so high that it makes mortgage business by companies unremunerative or impossible, because, naturally, the more money that these companies lend for the development of the State, the credit of the State will increase proportionately.

I would like to mention the position of Great Britain, as illustrating the advantage of having a good credit. In three years Great Britain has reduced her public debt by £400,000,000, and she has nearly halved the national debt, having reduced it from £1,500,000,000 to £800,000,000. She has also paid Japan £20,000,000 and South Africa £25,000,000, and all the time she has been doing this she has not increased the staff in the Treasury Department which handled this huge increase of business. It would be a very wise thing for Queensland if she could get the same efficiency in connection with the handling of departmental affairs. In asking why the Agent-General had not reported to the Premier in regard to the delegation, I would also like to know whether we are getting value, not only for the expenses incurred by the Agent-General, but also for the expense of other representatives sent to other countries, who, I presume, are sent more or less to advertise Queens-

[Mr. Nott.]

land in those countries. It is interesting to know what people in America think of us, as that is the place where we obtained our last loans. In this connection I have a letter from a university man in Georgia, North America. He asks a number of questions, which I would like to read to let hon. members know how little Queensland is known in America. These questions are—

"1. Am I correct in supposing that only white people can go to this country, Australia? No Japs? No Chinese are allowed?"

"2. What kinds of religions are there, and how are they provided for?"

"3. What kinds of schools, and how are they provided for? Are the people very interested in education?"

"4. What kinds of crops are usually grown besides cotton? Do they sell well?"

"5. You mention a guaranteed price for a few years; what is this guarantee price? How much? Do you raise long and short staple?"

"6. Is there a friendly spirit existing between the natives and the settlers? Do they welcome settlers, or had they rather not have them going in? Do they intermarry?"

"7. What are the ways of transportation? Do you have good ways to transport your produce to market?"

"8. Suppose I could land there with a thousand dollars, would your Government help me secure land very cheap? About what would it cost per acre in American money? How much would be the least that you would advise me to start there with, should I go?"

I am quoting these questions to let hon. members know how badly we need some representatives in other parts of the world, in order to let the man in the street know something about the conditions in Queensland, especially when we go to those countries to borrow money.

It is not my intention to occupy the attention of hon. members for any great length of time, but when you, Mr. Kirwan, were speaking, you said it might be inferred that farmers were better off under previous Governments than under a Labour Government.

Mr. HYNES: No! What rot!

Mr. NOTT: I have never claimed that the farmers have been as well off under any Government as they should have been. I want to state, as a member of the Country party, that no Government that we have ever had in Queensland have given that consideration to the farmers that should have been given. When hon. members mention that other Governments have been unsympathetic, they do their best to lump the present Opposition as though they were supporters or had been a part of other Governments; but that is not the case with regard to the Country party. The present Country party has never been in office as a Government in Queensland; but, when the day comes that the Country party has a chance to administer the affairs of Queensland, we shall have a very different tale to tell, not only as compared with the Labour Government, but as compared with other previous Governments, so far as the development of the State is concerned, apart from the cities. You, Mr. Kirwan, described the crowd

at the recent Exhibition, and used it as an illustration that Queensland at the present time was particularly prosperous. I rejoice with you in that, and agree that Queensland is still prosperous, but the prosperity indicated by those crowds, and the prosperity in Queensland generally is not due to Labour administration at all. It simply goes to prove that we have such wonderful natural resources in Queensland that we are able to survive all natural and after-war difficulties, and also the sectional exploitation of Queensland by the present Labour Administration.

There is one other little matter I would like to refer to—that is the Coominya Soldier Settlement. It is not much satisfaction, as a rule, to say, "I told you so;" but, when I first came into the House I stated that the soldier settlement at Coominya would be a failure. What is happening there to-day is a very great calamity so far as Queensland is concerned. I regret that the Government did not use the expert knowledge which they had at their disposal to prevent such a failure as the Coominya Soldier Settlement has been.

Mr. F. A. COOPER (*Bremer*): I rise to say a few words on the Treasurer's Financial Statement for two reasons particularly, the first reason being to try and place the blame on the right shoulders with regard to the establishment of the Coominya Soldier Settlement, referred to by the hon. member for Stanley, and, secondly, to make a short reference to the following paragraph in the Financial Statement. In reference to the Railway Department the Treasurer says—

"I think it can be truthfully said that the Queensland railways in recent years have been as economically managed, as capably administered, and as faithfully served by the employees as any railway system in Australia."

I will deal with that statement later on when I have mentioned the Coominya Soldier Settlement. It is just as well that anyone who is interested should know the actual facts of the case. The Coominya Settlement was urged, first and foremost, by Mr. Guttridge of Coominya. He appealed with all the strength with which it was possible to appeal to have it established, and wrote to the Ipswich Repatriation Committee, who brought the proposal before the Lands Settlement Committee in a letter, from which I will read extracts, because the letter is much too long to give in full—

[4 p.m.]

"Members of my committee, returned soldiers and their representatives, together with some members of the Chamber of Commerce, inspected the land, saw what it was producing, both quality and quantity, and thoroughly discussed the whole question from every point of view, and a unanimous conclusion was arrived at that Coominya was an ideal place for the settlement of soldiers on a properly defined plan. We have the pleasure of enclosing herewith a copy of the 'Queensland Times,' giving a fair report of what transpired at the time of inspection. I may here state that we do not in any way desire to trespass in or on another committee's area, and to avoid this we have communicated with both Esk and Lowood offering to co-operate with them, but, unfortunately, although some weeks have elapsed no reply is forthcoming."

Mr. F. A. Cooper.]

And then they give their reasons for "pushing this matter."

"Our reasons for pushing this matter are the urgent necessity of being prepared for the men who are returning."

And this is a most significant phrase—

"and the splendid opportunity which presents itself at Coominya for a soldiers' settlement."

The letter, which is signed by Mr. Oliver Perry, honorary secretary of the Ipswich Repatriation Committee, then sets out various points as to why the settlement should be established. Here are some of them—

"3rd—The soil is especially suitable for growing citrus fruits and grapes. Water is obtainable at a depth of 5 feet.

"4th—A market is already provided for all grapes that can be produced in the district. Messrs. Banff Bros. offer to take all that can be grown, besides the local and other requirements.

"5th—That Mr. Gutteridge, an old pioneer, is willing to instruct returned men in grape-growing, and Messrs. Banff Bros. also promised supervision and practical demonstrations to the settlers, also to donate cuttings, etc.

"6th—The clearing, ploughing, planting, and fencing could be done at a reasonable cost, and would provide employment immediately. It would cost about £18 to £20 per acre."

Then it goes on to say—

"The return from this land is estimated by competent persons to be—Lemons in full bearing, 100 trees per acre, at £1 per tree, £100. Grapes: This land will yield on an average 12 tons per acre, which sold at 1d. per lb. will amount to £112 per acre.

"Our inspection of the district and the taking of evidence from reliable men like Mr. Gutteridge and Banff Brothers will, we think, convince your committee.

"We strongly urge the above and are of the opinion that the areas should not be less than 20 acres, and that 5 or more acres should be cleared, ploughed, planted, and the whole of each area fenced, thus making semi-ready-made farms, which we feel confident will find many applicants, who would in a short time become good settlers. The area of the settlement should be 1,000 or more acres."

And then it goes on to set out various things that should be done. The "Queensland Times" cutting that accompanies the report contained these remarks, after some introductory sentences—

"The personnel of the party was Mr. J. P. Bottomley (chairman), Alderman O. Perry (secretary), Councillor H. Hallett (chairman of the Moreton Shire Council), Mr. S. M. O'Farrell (of the Repatriation Executive), Alderman G. H. Shillito, Messrs. R. P. Watson, G. R. Wilson, F. G. Woodward, T. J. O'Carroll, F. C. Surman (president of the Returned Sailors and Soldiers' Imperial League of Australia), and several other returned soldiers. Mr. Gutteridge, of Coominya, who met the party, was reported to have said 'that he could show by practical demonstrations the fertility of the district for the cultivation of grapes and

[*Mr. F. A. Cooper.*

citrus fruits. In conjunction with these industries dairying was carried on successfully, the soil being particularly adapted to the growth of artificial grasses." It was further stated that 'the visitors were thoroughly convinced, as a result of their inspection and from the information proffered by Mr. Gutteridge and the Messrs. Banff Brothers, of the adaptability of the locality for grapes and citrus fruit production.' Mr. Niest, an expert wine maker in the employ of Messrs. Banff Brothers, was also reported to have said 'that the Coominya soil compares more than favourably with the other grape-growing localities of the Commonwealth.'

Taking these recommendations into consideration, is it to be wondered at that the Land Settlement Committee, anxious to do something for returned soldiers, keen to do something for returned soldiers, adopted the proposal?

Mr. NORT: Why did they not get the agricultural chemist to analyse the soil, instead of waiting four years?

Mr. F. A. COOPER: The suggestion in the interjection of the hon. member for Stanley is not true, for this reason—that it was on 28th November, 1919, that Mr. Rose made an inspection of this land with Mr. Jones, of the Land Settlement Committee, which is not yet four years ago, and that it is over twelve months ago that the officials of the department did report that the soil was bad. I just want to point out that the Ipswich Chamber of Commerce took a hand in the business and on 27th January, 1920, Mr. G. W. Allen, secretary of the Chamber, wrote to the Land Settlement Committee and urged the expedition of the land settlement scheme at Coominya. He also stated that this settlement was well known to many members of the Chamber of Commerce, and they felt sure it must prove a great success. Those are the opinions of the business men of Ipswich—the men managing the big business concerns in the city, based upon the most expert evidence that could be obtained in the district. They are the very gentlemen who recommended to the committee that it should be made a soldier settlement; but, when the thing proved to be a horrible frost and to have nothing whatever of any kind in it, they tried to unload the responsibility for the whole proposition on to the Government and show that they were to blame.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: They wanted to exploit the soldier settlers.

Mr. NORT: Your party tried to exploit the soldier settlers.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Your type exploited the Indians in East Africa.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: On 14th May, 1920, Messrs. Perry, Bottomley, and Tardent, of the Ipswich Repatriation Committee, called on the officer in charge of the Soldier Settlement Branch and urged that immediate action be taken towards making the area available for soldier settlement, as they wished to advance the proposal in every way. I do not think I need say more, except to remark that the Ipswich business people stood solidly behind the project, and the man who stood behind it more solidly than anybody else was Mr. Bottomley, chairman of the Repatriation Committee at Ipswich, who moved in favour of it on every possible

occasion, and who in 1923 carried the Nationalist flag in Ipswich in opposition to the hon. member for Ipswich. When he was tackled with being partly responsible he indignantly denied it. The "Queensland Times" of the 5th May last reports a meeting at which he did so in these terms—

"Mr. Fleming (a returned soldier at the Ipswich Workshops) proceeded to address the meeting on the question of the position of the men at Coominya, and said Mr. Bottomley was partly responsible for the 'Coominya scandal.' Mr. Bottomley mounted the platform and said this man had told an absurd story, as he would prove if he had more time to deal with the matter. 'Do you think,' he said, 'that Harry Coyne would spend £35,000 on my recommendation?'"

The unfortunate thing about it is that the Land Settlement Committee did spend £35,000 on the recommendation of Mr. Bottomley and other people. Mr. Andrew Wright, who was also a Nationalist candidate in that part of the State, then made this interjection—

"Oh, he is foolish enough, but he did not do it."

Unfortunately it is very difficult for the Land Settlement Committee to know what to do in such a case. They were urged by the responsible business people of the city to take it up, and they took it up genuinely and earnestly, in an endeavour to do something to help the returned soldiers. The thing I have to complain about is that, when they found that it was a mistake, they wanted to get out from under, instead of shouldering their burden and saying, "We misguidedly guided the committee, and we will do our best to defend them." It is for this reason alone that I have dealt with the matter.

Now a word or two about the paragraph in the Financial Statement to which I have already referred—

"I think it can be truthfully said that the Queensland railways in recent years have been as economically managed, as capably administered, and as faithfully served by the employees as any railway system in Australia."

That sentence is particularly guarded. It may mean much or it may mean little. But, whether it means much or whether it means little, I think it my duty, as a representative of a large railway constituency, to take this opportunity of pointing out that, well as the railways of this State may be administered, there is much room for improvement. When I had the honour of addressing the Committee in 1915, I pointed out the necessity for separating the two great branches of the Ipswich Railway Workshops, the iron side from the wood side. I pointed out that the shops were under a man who was competent so far as wrought-iron work was concerned, but did not have the necessary knowledge to make the woodwork section the success it should be. Some of the railway officials rather pooch-pooched the idea, and, being rather sensitive and bashful, and in the habit of bowing to those who have superior knowledge, I gave way, thinking perhaps that I had made a mistake. Recent happenings have convinced me that I did not make a mistake, and have convinced me that in the Ipswich Railway Workshops there is either culpable negligence or absolute ignorance. Those are strong words, but I

hope that the few facts which I shall be able to put before the Committee will convince them of the unsatisfactory state of the woodworking section, at any rate, and that something should be done to remedy the position. Quite recently the Commissioner decided to build two trains.

These trains are known as main line trains, and I believe they are run as what is commonly known as the Sydney mail. I am not going to deal generally with the whole business of the carriage department or the wagon department, but I am going to let these two instances, or practically this one instance, stand to give the general public an idea of what is happening there. It was decided to build these two trains, and, naturally, when you go to build a train, the make-up of a train must be considered. The matter was considered, and it was decided that the trains were to be composed of six second class cars, four first class cars, four composite cars, and two brake vans. That represented sixteen vehicles in all, which were necessary to make up two trains. The quantities for those trains were got out. The timber was got out and allotted, and the whole of the material was worked out in the different quantities. The timber was actually cut, and then it was suddenly decided to alter the make-up of those trains. Then it was decided that the trains were to consist of six second class carriages, four first class carriages, two composite cars, and two parlour cars. Once more the quantities were ordered, the material was prepared, the timber was cut, and the whole thing was ready for erection, when it was decided to make a further alteration by having six second class carriages, two first class carriages, two first class carriages with parlour car ends, two composite cars, and two parlour cars. Again the quantities were got out, materials ordered, and the timber cut. After all this trouble the Ipswich workshops got on a little way with the construction of the vehicles until it came to the erection of the carriages, when it was found that the partition that divides the corridor from the seating part of the carriage was so flimsy that it would not carry the windows that were set therein, and it was then necessary, after all that timber had been cut and had been practically laid ready for erection, to have all this partition altered and made thick enough to carry the windows and resist the weight of an ordinary man up against the partition when walking along the corridor. The seats were all cut and ready to be covered by the trimmers when it was found that they were 2 feet 9 inches in width. The cushioned seats in this Chamber—which we are often told by those outside are very soft and nice to loll upon—are 2 feet wide. Can you imagine what would be the position in a carriage with seats 9 inches wider than the seats here? Why, the hon. member for Carnarvon, with his 6 feet 7 inches in length, would not be able to get his feet on the floor of a carriage with seats 2 feet 9 inches wide. The whole thing is preposterous; it is ridiculous. New South Wales has the widest carriage seats, and they do not exceed 2 feet 2 inches; yet the designers of this carriage designed the seat that was to be 2 feet 9 inches wide. What is the meaning of this?

Mr. GLEDSON: Perhaps they intended it for a double bed.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: If it was the first time in their life that they had designed a railway carriage we could understand it. If

Mr. F. A. Cooper.]

they had never travelled in a railway carriage or knew nothing about it, you might possibly excuse them, but for seats to be designed 2 feet 9 inches in width practically surpasses all comprehension. The timber was cut, the material was all ready. It was ready to be covered, and the trimmers, when they saw the seat, exclaimed, "How, in the name of fortune, are we to get material ordered to cover carriage seats 2 feet 2 inches in width to cover these seats 2 feet 9 inches in width?"

At 4.15 p.m.,

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

Mr. F. A. COOPER: The ceiling of the carriages is strengthened by what is technically known as a hoop stick. That is a curved piece of wood that supports the ceiling. Ordinarily, these pieces of wood are covered with $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch material, and on that is placed the Wunderlich ceiling. For some reason or other it was decided to cover these pieces of wood with material 2 inches thick, and they were to be placed at various distances apart. So carefully had these timbers to be spaced in order to take the Wunderlich ceiling that, instead of the whole work being done by two men in one day, as is ordinarily the case, it took four men a week to do it.

Mr. EDWARDS: If we told you that you would not believe it.

Mr. CARTER: Why should we believe you?

Mr. F. A. COOPER: The design of the carriages was so faulty that in nine cases out of ten the lavatory pipes could not be got down through the undergear. The pipes had to be bent and twisted in such a way as to be practically useless. Everyone knows that the first thing which creates a stoppage in a pipe is a bend, and the lavatory pipes in most of these carriages are so bent that the effect will be the same in every carriage; they will block, and, instead of being a use, they will become a nuisance. One of the greatest troubles of the carriage men in the Ipswich workshops in the repair section is to handle filthy, dirty bogies that come in for repair, and on many occasions they have to handle the filthy, dirty lavatories because of the blockages that are caused by bent pipes; yet, after thirty years or forty years' experience of carriage building, these men have not sufficient competence so to construct the carriage lavatory that the pipe will go straight down through the undergear. This is an old complaint. Carriages come and carriages go, but the same old design goes on—the same old trouble. The plumber has to wriggle the pipe as best he can to get an outlet for the lavatory.

I have dealt with the carriages, and now I will let them go. Let me now deal with the composite cars. These cars have a second class compartment at one end and a first class compartment at the other, and some carriages have been so designed that, when the train is joined up the corridor will be on the wrong side. It is placed on the sunny side, and the people have to sit on the side that might be called the cool side. The people would have to twist and turn to get along to their seats simply because the carriage was designed the wrong end first. They will now have to lift the whole thing off its bogey, take it to pieces, and turn it round the other way and alter the whole design if it is to be made of any use at all. Now let me deal with the parlour cars. These

cars, as hon. members know, are very comfortable, and are fitted with chairs that are very decent in some respects but not in others. It was decided that these cars were to be fitted up with special chairs that were to be obtained from a Brisbane firm. The Coach-makers' Union objected, and said that they could make the chairs, and that they thought they ought to be made in the Ipswich workshops. What was the result? The Railway Department decided that they would not have any chairs at all if they could not buy them outside. They would not get them made at the workshops, with the result that they are going to take the old chairs out of the old parlour cars and put them in the new parlour cars. If that is good enough now, and if they can place those old chairs in the new cars, why did they not know that before they decided to give an order for forty or eighty of those chairs to some local firm? Was it known then that they had those other parlour-car chairs?

Mr. NORT: Do you wonder that the Government made a mess of Coominya?

Mr. F. A. COOPER: The Government did not make a mess of Coominya, as I have already explained. When it comes to men in charge of affairs doing things like that, I am not surprised that the rank and file find it very difficult in the efforts they have been making in the past to do the right thing. I do not know what is going to become of the old parlour cars. I suppose they will be fitted up as ordinary cars and sent out on the line again. If that is so, why go to the trouble of taking the seats out of them and putting them into the new cars? The new parlour cars are much inferior to the parlour cars that are now running in fittings and general appearance. Why go to the trouble of building inferior cars? Not only did they do that, but when the cars were fitted up they were to be finished off with cedar mouldings. One car had the mouldings in position and the material was all cut and polished and ready for erection in the other car. Somebody came and said, "I do not care much about the look of those mouldings; take them out." They were taken out and the whole lot replaced with fumed maple. The Secretary for Public Works is a painter and a competent tradesman, and he knows, as everybody knows, that when a decorator sets out to decorate a room he has some idea of the colour he is going to use and what is going to be the general effect. I put it to him that a carriage builder ought to know what would be the general effect of cedar mouldings upon certain walls, and if cedar mouldings were going to clash with any other colour, he would not have cedar mouldings. Yet we have the designer of these carriages stipulating cedar mouldings, and when they were put in position someone decided that they were a horrible clash and that they had better be taken out. I cannot understand why such things are done up there.

Right at the end of the train is the guard's van, and the peculiar thing about that van is that when it was put in position, when the superstructure was put on the underframe, it was found the doors would not operate. Because of the big carriage over-hang, it was necessary to put knees, or struts, to strengthen the underframe. You would think that a draftsman in designing a carriage would see that those struts did not go where the van door goes. That is where in this case they do go. When they put in

[*Mr. F. A. Cooper.*]

the doors they found that, to make the passage to the door, they would have to cut the very struts. It seems an astonishing thing that a draftsman cannot design an underframe to fit in with the superstructure. I have taken the whole train right from the beginning to the end, and it shows there has been bungling from start to finish. But this is not the only thing that happened to these trains. There is this additional fact concerning them. It was decided that one train should be got out in a tremendous hurry. Repair work was abandoned, and all possible hands concentrated on this one particular train. The train was practically finished and ready to be taken out into the yard, with the exception of the brass catches which are fitted on the windows to let them up and down. These were not procurable. The brass shop did not have the brass fittings necessary. They could not leave the train standing in the carriage-shop, because the space it occupied was required. Consequently, they ran the train out into the yard and exposed it to the weather, but they could not do that without first fitting the windows, because the weather would soon destroy the internal fittings. The position now is that train has been finished for months, and has been left standing out in the yard exposed to all weathers.

At 4.21 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Kirwan, *Brisbane*) resumed the chair.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: Now, when they get those brass fittings, it will be necessary to take out the fifty or sixty windows, put in the brasswork, and finish it off again. I do not know whether I can altogether back up the paragraph of the Treasurer that the works are economically run and capably managed. If that is only a comparative statement—that Queensland stands over the other States in so far as the construction of carriages goes—the other States must be in a particularly bad way. What I have stated has had this effect—that the time of the men in these workshops has been taken up on much useless work, which has delayed carriage repairs, and the repairs of carriages have been neglected for some considerable time. The carriages are not in a good condition at all. I was informed by the Coach-makers' Union that they have never been in such a bad state as they are to-day. Some time ago I wrote to the Secretary for Railways, and drew his attention to the fact that two carriages sent to the workshops for repairs showed by their condition that for some time they must have been a danger to the travelling public, and I urged the Minister to see that no further carriages were allowed to be used in that condition. I received a reply from the secretary to the Commissioner, saying that the men who examined these carriages were examiners—of course they would be—and that they were working under men who were competent leading hands. All I have to say is that if they were working under men who are competent leading hands, and if they allowed these carriages to run in a condition which rendered them unsafe for the travelling public, they either were not doing their duty, or they were not competent to do their duty. The average carriage examiner is trained to know when a wheel is broken, or when a bogey is cracked, or when an axle-box is hot. That is his main business. When a train comes in he goes along the various carriages, and by tapping in certain places

with a hammer, knows by his trained ear and eye whether the wheel is all right, and whether the bogey and axles are in running condition. It is a ridiculous statement for the secretary to the Commissioner to say that the carriage examiner is working under a competent foreman, and therefore everything is all right. There is only one remedy by which this state of affairs can be improved, and that is to separate at once the wood and iron sections of the Ipswich Workshops. I want to see the wood section put under a competent wood man, who is able to examine drawings as they come from the drawing office, and say that the drawings are such that they can be worked to. In many instances, as carriage drawings come from the draftsman, before they can be worked to they have to be altered in some respect or other. The common practice is for the draftsman to come into the carriage shop after the carriage is constructed and alter his drawings. The unfortunate thing is that no benefit accrues, and the same old mistake is repeated time after time. Two vans were built some considerable time ago, and it was pointed out that the tie rod was placed in such a position that the guard in jumping into his van ran the risk of catching his toe between the step and the tie-rod nuts. The unfortunate part was that this proved to be the case. It was reported. At that time there were only two vans with that particular class of tie rod, whereas to-day sixteen are running with it so fitted. The result is that every one of these vans will have to go back to the workshops for alteration. They will have to reverse the van door. The carriage door opens outwards, but the guard, being an athletic sort of individual, has to run to catch the train while it is in motion, and he must have a door which opens inwards. The door of the guard's van opens inwards, and when these alterations are being made a simple reversal will make them open outwards, so each will have to be altered so that the door will open inwards instead of outwards. All that trouble was caused by the want of proper supervision, and the absence of a proper wood man to supervise the woodwork in the Ipswich Workshops. The objection now to separating the two branches is that there will have to be a separate blacksmith's shop, a separate fitting shop, and, in fact, separate shops altogether. That is not so. There is no reason why the present foreman blacksmith cannot supervise the blacksmithing and ironwork, so long as there is a separate section for the carriage department. Here we have had the mail train held up for months, and goodness knows how much longer it will be, because the brass shop has not got ready the brass catches; but if it cannot make a better catch than has been turned out, something might have to be done. These fittings, or some of them, have been turned out in such a way that one is likely to cut his fingers in attempting to use them. They are made with a knife-edge. There appears to be a lack of co-ordination between the various departments. The ironwork department cares very little of what happens in the woodworking section. I can illustrate this by an incident I was told of. A leading hand was standing one day in his shop because he could not get certain material from another shop, when one of the foremen or managers came along and said to him, "What is the matter?" The leading hand replied, "I cannot get material from such-

Mr. F. A. Cooper.]

and such a shop." The reply he received was, "Why worry? Nobody else does." I am sorry to say that such was the result with a man who was trying to do his work, and I say the men in the Ipswich Workshops do try to do their level best. They have battled in season and out of season with the Minister and with the Commissioner for Railways to have some say in the control and management of these shops. They see these things going on day after day, week after week, month after month, and year after year, yet they are expected to give the very best that is in them, and to do all they can to advance the prosperity and earning capacity of the Queensland railways, and they see those in authority at the same time paying so little attention to matters as I have mentioned. I say that this is either due to ignorance, carelessness, or what might be aptly called scientific sabotage. Whatever the reason is, it has to be stopped.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I have borne this matter as long as I can bear it, and I have struggled with the people whom I think I ought to struggle with; but in common decency to my district and the men in the workshops, the big bulk of whom are trying to do a fair and honest thing, I think I am in duty bound to make the statement I am making here now.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I am not expecting the Commissioner for Railways to be able to put his hand on every little thing.

It is a ridiculous thing to expect the Secretary for Railways or the Commissioner to be able to deal with everything that comes along—that they should adjudicate upon the dismissal of a lad porter, and also receive a deputation about some big concern in connection with the Roma Street sheds. These officials must depend upon their officers; they must place reliance upon those under them. I have a little illustration of the way in which these officials act that will astonish hon. members. It will be remembered that in 1921 a number of men were dismissed from the Ipswich workshops, and that it was generally referred

[4.30 p.m.] to as the act of deflation. The Commissioner for Railways, also the Minister, clearly stated that, when a chance offered, some of the deflated men would be replaced but that others would not be reinstated no matter what might happen. It was pointed out very plainly to the unions and to me that certain men could not be reinstated for various reasons. As member for the district, men came to me and said, "There is a reported vacancy in such and such a shop," and even when there was no vacancy at all a man would come to me and ask "What chance is there of my getting back now?" I would go to the Commissioner and say, "There is a reported vacancy in such and such a shop, and such and such a man asks to be reinstated." The Commissioner would say, "There is no vacancy." Yet another man would be appointed. The turned-down man would want an explanation, and at last I went to the Commissioner and said, "You have replied to me in connection with certain men saying that there is no vacancy, yet other men have been appointed. What is the position?" He said, "There are certain men whom we cannot take back for certain

reasons." I said, "Well, write me, Mr. Commissioner, to that effect, and I will send the letter on to these men, and that will be the end of the business." He thought it was a good idea and wrote me, saying, "Such and such a man cannot be reinstated because he ran a 'double book.' Such and such a man cannot be reinstated because he gave more attention to horse racing than anything else. Such and such a man cannot be reinstated because he was a bad time-keeper and was more often away than at work. Such and such a man cannot be reinstated because he was a bad worker. Such and such a man cannot be reinstated because he would not pay any attention and was a shirker." I showed each man the letter, and one of them said to me, "That is satisfactory, anyhow; I know now why I got the bullet and will go elsewhere for a job." I went away North with the Public Works Commission, and when I returned in a month, I met one of these men. I wondered how he was taking the matter. He gave a grin and turned away his face. I thought he was ashamed to face the situation, but was astonished to find that during my absence every one of those men had been reinstated.

Mr. CORSER: You were cut out.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I do not complain about that, but I do complain about the Commissioner for Railways sending down a statement that such a thing could not be done, and then one of his officials coming along and reinstating those men.

Mr. COSTELLO: By the union secretary?

Mr. F. A. COOPER: It was not done by a union secretary; it was done by the officials of the Railway Workshops at Ipswich. They are the men who recommend reinstatement, and who recommended the reinstatement of those men. Again, I wrote with regard to a carriage builder. It was said that this man was one of the worst, and that the Commissioner did not think he could ever give him another job as a carriage builder but might find him a job as a labourer. A little while after the Ipswich Railway Workshops were asked to recommend three carriage builders, and I was astonished to find that this man—the worst of the twelve who were deflated—was one of the three to get a job. I do not know how we are to get efficiency from the lowest ranks of the service when no cohesion exists amongst officers in the upper ranks. I think that the Ipswich Railway Workshops require a thorough rake-over. I am no Methodist, but I do admire the Methodist Church for shifting its ministers around periodically, and I think that if men make tremendous blunders, we ought to shift them round a bit and give others a chance of making good.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: What about applying that to members of Parliament?

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I belong to a party that believes in the shift round. As a matter of fact, every three years we have to go up for examination, to be approved and passed before facing the barrier again, and I congratulate the Country party and the Nationalist party for adopting the same tactics. If the heads of our Railway Workshops and of our departments had to come up every three years and justify their positions for the future as we have to do, I am sure that we should get better results.

[Mr. F. A. Cooper.]

I am not sure that I am keen on fixity of tenure. If I have outlived my usefulness as the member for Breiner, I am prepared to get out, and I will not cry out and say, "I thought I was on the staff and that I was there for life." People in responsible positions should justify their actions by continued competence. These revelations about the two trains and one set of vehicles ought to be sufficient indication as to the gross ignorance and carelessness of the people controlling the Ipswich Workshops at the present time.

Mr. PETERSON (*Normanby*): I trust that the Treasurer's mission to England will be a great success, because any failure on the part of Queensland to make good will only react on the people here and particularly on the workers. Consequently it is our duty to render every possible assistance, if that assistance is required, to ensure the success of the Treasurer's mission.

I desire to make a few remarks concerning the public school vote. I, in common with other hon. members, have been satisfied with the action of the Government in erecting schools when they have been required, and I publicly thanked the Government—whilst I supported them and since I left them—for the attitude they adopted. However, the position now is that, rightly or wrongly, there has been a cessation on the part of the Education Department in the construction of schools. I am not saying this in a critical way but am merely trying to espouse the cause of certain sections in my electorate which are strongly in sympathy with the present Government. It has been the continued policy of the department for the past two years to issue letters to the effect that "The school is approved, and when the finances are in a better position the matter will be reconsidered." One thing that the Government have always taken pride in is that they have tried to place before the people and children of Queensland every facility for education, and I trust that this policy of "go slow," so far as the erection of public schools is concerned, will cease, and that in the current financial year the Secretary for Public Instruction will see the wisdom of applying a certain amount of the vote to provide facilities for the education of our children. When I see the palatial building that is going up at the top of George street and consider that £230,000 is being expended on it, I am disappointed to see some of the people outback asking for school facilities and receiving letters from the department saying, "We approve of the school, but it will have to wait till the sweet bye-and-bye, as no money is available." I hope that that policy will not be continued. I think it should be the effort of hon. members on both sides of the House to encourage settlement by the erection of schools and give the children every opportunity of being educated. In many cases where schools have been approved of in the country the homes of the children attending those schools are miles away and the majority of the children ride to school. Unfortunately the department does not fence the country schools; the children come in with their horses and when it comes to going home time they have to chase all round the country to find their horses. When we have appealed to the department to provide fences round these country schools we are politely

informed that, if the parents are prepared to find a certain part of the cost, the Government will supply the material. That may be all right in its way, but I challenge the Government to show one single instance in the city where the parents have been asked to do that.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I will accept your challenge—Wilston.

Mr. PETERSON: I thank the hon. gentleman for that information.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: You go out to the Wilston school and see what the local people have done there.

Mr. MORGAN: Built sheds.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: They have done quite a number of things. Then the Ascot people have spent over £500 on the school grounds.

Mr. CORSER: They are not farmers or they would not have 500 pence.

Mr. PETERSON: The Minister will agree with me that there is no analogy between the two systems so far as the towns and the country are concerned. At the Wilston school not one child rides to school on a horse.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Why try to sidetrack? You raised the point that people in the metropolitan area did not do anything for their schools and I am telling you what has been done.

Mr. PETERSON: The hon. gentleman has given two illustrations out of over 100 schools. However, I do not want to raise a storm in a teacup. In country electorates where schools are erected the least the Government can do is to put a fence round them so that the children can easily get their horses when school is over. I have always held that, where a Government open up large areas of land to induce settlers to go out in the country, schools should precede settlement. Hon. members may ask why schools should precede settlement. For this reason—that it takes nearly two years to get a school after the required number of children are in the district, and, if a large area is thrown open, surely the Government could afford to spend £300 or £400 in erecting a school where the children can get educational facilities. At Carmilla and other centres in my electorate, during the past three years, quite a number of children have been absolutely bereft of any means of education other than by the postal system, which cannot be claimed to be altogether a success.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: There is a school just about finishing at Kelvin Grove now. What are you talking about?

Mr. PETERSON: I never mentioned Kelvin Grove. I mentioned Carmilla. I sincerely trust a little attention will be given to those electorates which have suffered so severely for the want of schools. I am not pleading for my own particular supporters, but I am pleading for Carmilla and Central Ridgeland, where the people are strong supporters of the Government.

A great deal of noise has been made about the question of Australian sentiment. We have heard from members on both sides of the Chamber how desirable it is to have an Australian sentiment. As far as I can understand the meaning of an Australian sentiment, it is a belief in things Australian; and, when you believe in things Australian, you desire to build up Australian industries to help Australian workers. In order to bring

Mr. Peterson.]

about that ideal I desire to raise a few questions. I noticed some time ago that the Government called tenders in other parts of the world and in Queensland, too, for certain sugar machinery. They got some tenders from Czecho-Slovakia, England, and Scotland, as well as from New South Wales and Queensland; but up to the present moment we do not know whose tender has been accepted. What I want to get at is this: When these tenders were called each tenderer was given an opportunity of preparing his own specification. The result was that, when the tenders came in, there was a wide divergence between the tenders from Queensland firms and the lowest tender received from England.

MR. PEASE: How do you know that?

MR. PETERSON: I know that they supplied their own specification, and I understand it is to be left to the engineers of the department to pick out which is the best. That is the point I want to get at so far as Australian sentiment is concerned. In the "Telegraph" the other day we noticed that there is a complaint in England that the best tradesmen of England are leaving there because of the low wages prevailing in the engineer shops, yet, when it comes to a question of tendering, because their tenders are lower, no consideration whatever is given to the fact that they are not operating under the same wages award as the Queensland firms are: no consideration is paid to the fact that it is sweated labour in many cases on the other side of the world; but, because they can show that the machinery is going to cost less, the Government invariably accept the lowest tender. Where does the Australian sentiment come in? We all believe in arbitration and must all subscribe to that principle, and so long as we have the Arbitration Court to protect the workers, it should be the duty of the Government to see that the wages paid in other parts of the world are equal to those paid in Queensland or they should not accept tenders from other parts of the world. Take as an example one of the steel railway bridges in Northern Queensland, for which tenders were called and accepted just before the election. I think a Scottish tender was accepted, although Queensland firms had tendered. No consideration was taken of the wages paid over there, and it is well known that you can land goods in the North from England at practically the same freightage on the big boats as from Brisbane to Townsville. If you believe in Australian sentiment, you should protect the workers here and give them an opportunity of getting what work is going, or else force the manufacturers in other parts of the world to pay the higher wages. It should be the aim and ambition of every hon. member to build up a high standard for the worker; but we cannot build up a high standard if we are going to cart our tenders all round the world—to Czecho-Slovakia and those places—in order to compel our manufacturers to submit low tenders. Our manufacturers cannot compete against foreign competition unless you wipe out Arbitration Court awards, and no member of this House is prepared to do that; and the only way to be fair and square to our own people is to give them a preference to the extent of the higher awards which we must stand for. While we cannot speak with any weight on this side of the House, I sincerely trust that hon. members who represent big industrial works will be prepared to see that this work is given to our own people. I do

[*Mr. Peterson.*]

hope that the Australian sentiment which hon. members on the other side so much prate about will be practised at home, and that every facility will be given to Queensland contractors to secure work for Queensland workers who are paid according to Arbitration Court awards.

The Government no doubt can take a great deal of credit for increased land settlement. It is no good one harping and saying that no attempt is being made in this direction. I have to admit that the Government are attempting, in a very big way, to bring about increased land settlement. The difficulty I see in front of the Government at the present time is that we are suffering to-day, not from the want of increased land settlement, but the trouble is because the unfortunate settlers cannot get a fair price for that which they produce. Let us take butter as an example. We find butter is being dumped into Queensland, and no assistance whatever is given to the primary producer to enable him to get a reasonable return for his produce. When it was thought that the primary producer was getting too much, there was ample power to prevent him getting a higher price; but now that butter is being dumped here from the other States no action is taken by the Government to try and protect the dairyman.

Even with regard to canned fruits we find that, under the New South Wales Government, although it may be a so-called Tory Government, the Murrumbidgee Irrigation Trust, which manufactures a huge quantity of canned fruits, is dumping into Queensland a large quantity of canned fruits and selling them at 2d. per lb. less than what they are selling at in New South Wales.

Reverting again to the question of Australian sentiment, whilst we may proudly stand for Australian sentiment sometimes, we should come a little nearer home and try to inculcate a Queensland sentiment. Whilst manufacturers in the South are protected by their Governments by a preference clause, there is no preference whatever given by the Queensland Government to manufacturers here working under their own Arbitration Court awards. Consequently, in the interests of the workers generally, I hope that the Government will try and keep in Queensland as much as possible work which rightly belongs to the workers here.

The next matter I desire to speak about is land settlement. Land settlement cannot be made a success unless we have some provision made for absorbing the products which are grown on the land. The only way you can have success in that direction is by encouraging secondary industries in Queensland. Unfortunately, hon. members opposite will not agree with us when we say that there are practically less new industries developing in Queensland to-day than at any period during the past fifteen years. The argument has been adduced that that is due to increased taxation. Many hon. members have stated that taxation is generally passed back on to the workers. The hon. member for Rockhampton the other night stated that he could not agree with that argument. He said, speaking generally with regard to industries and taxation, that he could not agree with the argument that taxation was passed back on to the workers. I want to show how the hon. member is wrong by quoting the Treasurer's statement to him.

MR. GLEDSON: It does not prove him to be wrong because the Treasurer said it.

Mr. PETERSON: On 24th October, 1912, the following dialogue took place between Mr. Denham, the then Premier and Mr. Theodora (vide "Hansard," page 1244, for that year) with regard to the incidence of taxation:—

"The PREMIER: I do not want to increase taxation.

"Mr. Theodora: You do not want to increase taxation on your own political friends.

"The PREMIER: They are the only ones who are paying it now.

"Mr. Theodora: Everyone in the community is paying because it is being passed on. The consumers are really paying the tax; it is passed on to them."

That is the position in a nutshell, and I thoroughly agree with the Treasurer when he made that statement, which I think he believes in to-day. What has been the result of this high taxation? We have not got the secondary industries in Queensland that we should have had, and, unless we alter our policy of taxation, we cannot hope to establish them. In other words, our policy of taxation is simply giving protection to Southern manufacturers. Because of the taxation here Southern firms can compete with us on equal terms, even taking the shipping charges into consideration. I suggest that, in order to encourage industry to come here and open up avenues of employment and to provide markets for our produce and settle more people here, it should be the policy of the Government to exempt from taxation for at least a period of five years any new enterprise which is prepared to open up in Queensland. The so-called capitalist will not be the only one to benefit. The worker himself will benefit because of the increased avenues of employment, and the producer will have a natural market; and the natural market is one which can be controlled better than the market overseas, over which we have no control at all. Consequently I sincerely trust that the Government will adopt this part of our policy, and I suggest that they should take this into consideration collaterally with the land settlement scheme. As sure as the sun rises in the morning, so sure will any large system of land settlement fail unless you have thousands more people in the cities to consume that which the settlers are producing.

The next matter I wish to speak on is with regard to the restoration of the 5 per cent. reduction imposed on the railway men and public servants. I do not know what other hon. members may think of this matter, but I consider that it is the duty of the Government to restore the amount at the earliest possible moment. It should not be the policy of the Government to continue a reduction of that nature. No matter what previous Governments have done, we must not take any cognisance of it; we must do our duty. I have often thought how impossible it is for many of the workers to live on the wages they are getting under the trying conditions which we have been subjected to during the past few years.

Mr. GLEDSON: What about the workers outside the Government service?

Mr. PETERSON: The workers outside will have to be subject to the Arbitration Court awards just the same as those inside. I think the hon. member will agree that the

public servants are entitled to the restoration of the amount taken away from them, irrespective of what occurs outside. It should be the duty of those outside to see that a fair wage is paid.

The next matter I would like to speak on is the butter question. I make an appeal to the Secretary for Agriculture to do his utmost to try and save the butter situation for the primary producers to-day. I notice in this morning's paper a statement that the Logan and Albert Co-operative Company's butter factory has produced 690,965 lb. of butter less this year than last year. Despite the drought conditions which have operated all over Queensland during the past three years, and despite the diminished output of butter factories, the price of butter is dropping day by day. It is not a fair thing that this should keep going on, and I sincerely urge upon the Secretary for Agriculture to do his utmost—seeing that he had the power to prevent the butter factories from getting a higher price when higher prices were ruling—to see if he cannot provide some means by which to give to these people a fair return for the labour involved in the production of butter. When the report of Mr. Ferry, who was appointed to go thoroughly into the question of butter production, was presented to this Chamber it was stated on page 32 that he had found that from 1915 to 1929 the cost of producing butter had averaged 3s. 2d. per lb. I am not going to argue that butter should be sent up to 3s. 2d. per lb., because consumers have a right to be protected as well as the producers, but I think hon. members will agree that the Council of Agriculture and other schemes for the amelioration of the farmer are of no avail unless the Government take preliminary action. I appeal for the sympathetic support of the Secretary for Agriculture, and I ask him to rise to the occasion and render every possible assistance to these people.

I thank hon. members for the patient hearing they have given me, and I trust that some notice will be taken of what I have said.

Mr. LLOYD (*Kelvin Grove*): I think the Financial Statement is, on the whole, one on which the Government are to be congratulated. Nothing evidences this more than the quality of the criticism which purports to be hostile. The adverse criticism that it has received has been of a most perfunctory and unconvincing nature, and it is quite evident that the gentlemen who are making these adverse criticisms are simply saying what they think is expected of them as members of the Opposition and are not expressing their own personal opinions. There is one argument, however, which has been advanced by the Opposition which needs some comment, and that is the comparison of the present financial position with the financial position which existed during the six years or so which immediately preceded the great war. Those years were the most prosperous ones in the history of Queensland, and it is no particular credit to the Government which held the reins of office at that time that they accumulated some small surpluses. The surpluses that they [5 p.m.] did accumulate were mainly accidents; they were more often than not the results of miscalculations in estimating. They were, moreover, produced at a

Mr. Lloyd.]

time when wealth oozed out of the ground and surpluses tumbled out of the clouds. I think that the Government which held office under those conditions of unsurpassed prosperity should not only have produced some microscopic surpluses, but should also have carried on the public works which were required at that time out of revenue, or, at any rate, should have reduced the national debt by several millions.

Mr. KELSO: You do not do much out of revenue.

Mr. LLOYD: If the hon. member who has interjected has followed the history of Queensland as a public man should, he will know perfectly well that the conditions, not only in Queensland, but also the world over, have during the last eight years been diametrically opposed in nature to what they were during the preceding six years.

Mr. KELSO: Your own side claim that the last eight years have been the most prosperous years that we have ever had. How do you square that with your statement?

Mr. LLOYD: The claim was never made in the sense suggested. That is the reply one must make to the hon. member; any more remarks would be a mere waste of the time of the Committee.

In commenting on some of the details of the Financial Statement, I have something to say on the expenditure of the Government in the relief of destitution. Some hostile criticism has been levelled against the Government because they have spent so much for this purpose. I am one of those Government supporters who consider that it is greatly to the credit of the Government that they are providing for the needs of the destitute.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. LLOYD: One hon. member, who is at present in the Chamber, interjected to another speaker who made remarks somewhat similar to those which I am making, "Why do you not give them work?" The hon. member knows perfectly well that it is not within the power of the State Government—who are without control over the tariff—to solve the unemployment problem. It is only within the power of the Commonwealth Government party, of which hon. members opposite form a section, and for which they are very active workers during a Federal election, to find a solution of the unemployed problem so far as Australia is concerned. We are importing the greater part of our manufactured goods from the other end of the world, although the raw material for many of them, such as woollen goods, is produced, or mainly produced, here and is sent to the other end of the world for manufacture. It is, therefore, to our friends who have control of the Federal administration that we must look for any radical amelioration of the unemployed position. All that it is within the power of the State Government to do at the present time is to provide palliatives. I believe, however, that the scheme of organisation of industry which the Government have initiated will, if followed out in the spirit in which it is conceived, reduce the unemployment evil—locally, at any rate—almost to vanishing point. But before any real permanent remedy can be

[Mr. Lloyd.

provided, a party having more progressive views than the one which at present holds office in the Federal Parliament must gain control of the administration. I hope that our Government will continue their policy of relieving those persons who are really destitute without imposing unnecessary humiliation. The policy which the Government adopted some years ago is being continued with regard to married men with families. That is a most important feature; but at the same time there are some men who have not families and who are equally deserving of consideration. I must say that I do not think the policy of sending a man on to the next town is quite a good one. Certainly, if a man goes into the country he will manage to live somehow, but it is only an indirect form of mendicancy. A man turns up at a farm and asks for work, and the farmer has no work to give him, but he gives him a meal. The man does not actually beg, but the result is the same. I think that the State should accept the responsibility of shielding from destitution without humiliation any capable citizen who is willing to work. I think that mendicancy, of whatever form, is one of the greatest evils—perhaps the most demoralising ill that we have. I believe that a man who is a mendicant is harder to reform—that it is more difficult to get him back in to the path which a self-respecting citizen should follow—than a man who has taken to actual crime. I hope the policy will be followed of giving the necessaries of life to people who are unable to get work. We argue for work as a right.

Mr. KELSO: Some men who want work cannot get it.

Mr. LLOYD: I am not speaking of the class of whom the hon. member interjects—of the men who can get work and do not want it. I am speaking of the men who do want work and cannot get it.

Mr. KELSO: I did not say that.

Mr. LLOYD: I am speaking of men who really want work. I know perfectly well that there are in Queensland—and to a far greater proportion in the other States of Australia—men who are willing to work and cannot get work.

Mr. HYNES: The greater portion of the vote was spent in assisting women and children. Would you make those people work?

Mr. MORGAN: No. That is another vote altogether.

Mr. LLOYD: We adhere to the slogan of work as a right. That is sound in its aim and in its ideal, but I think that we would do better if we stated the problem the other way round and said that we stood for the necessities of life as a right—for work as a contingent obligation. A statement of that kind would make a larger mouthful, but would be more instructive regarding the nature of the problem which we have to solve.

The State enterprises have been subjected to hostile criticism, which has been very much of the same nature as the criticism of the Financial Statement generally. Members who have indulged in it have given the impression that they are saying rather what is expected of them in the part they are playing in this political drama than voicing their own opinions.

Judged from the standpoint of the public, the State enterprises—looking at them in the broadest possible light—have been an unqualified success. They have given to the public necessary commodities at a reasonable rate. They have kept down profiteering to an extent which has never been effected in any other country which was involved in the late war. The hon. member for Warwick said that the State enterprises should be left to the people. They are going to be left to the people. We as the people's representatives are going to retain control of them, and we are going to extend the operations of our State enterprises policy.

Mr. KELSO: More losses.

Mr. LLOYD: Certainly we have had, as is the result in all experimenting, one or two temporary failures; but those failures have proved instructive lessons on the State enterprises policy, and the present Government in their State enterprises have a great and highly successful career before them.

I have read of the great British statesman, Charles James Fox, that he could come into the British House of Commons after being elsewhere all night, just when dawn was breaking, and take part in a debate and reply to speeches he had never heard. Before I came to this Chamber I used to think that was a wonderful thing, and I often wondered whether it was correct. I do not wonder now. Even after an absence of three years from this Chamber, I could come here to-day, and, if I were given the names of some hon. members opposite who had spoken, I could reply to their speeches without ever having heard them. The arguments on repudiation were the same arguments that were heard in the second reading debate on the Land Act Amendment Act four years ago.

I am in the happy position of being able to agree with hon. members opposite on one point. Some of them suggested that it would be a good thing if the departmental reports and the Auditor-General's report were ready before this discussion took place. I entirely agree with that. Not that I attach such a great deal of importance to these departmental reports, for, after all, they are the advertising literature of the permanent officials who run the departments. They are not of such a great value as we are sometimes inclined to think they are; but, such as they are, it would be a good thing if we had them before us. At the same time, we are simply following on in the traditional lines of parliamentary methods. I hope that the Government, after they deal with the more pressing and more urgent matters, will find time to make some reform in our parliamentary methods. For instance, at the close of this discussion, Mr. Chairman, you will be instructed by us to present a report to Mr. Speaker, who will come back and tell us what we have done. I think that we should introduce reform that will eliminate this practice of playing a little game with ourselves, and cut out all unnecessary formality in procedure. We should fix a time when those reports should be sent in, and a time for the sessions of Parliament. We should fix a certain time of the year for certain stages of parliamentary business to be reached. I go even further. I think it would be a very good thing if we could make such alteration in the Constitution that we could have fixed election dates. That has been tried in other countries in the world, and has apparently

proved a success in the United States of America. The present Government seems to have something of the kind in the back of its head, when it reverts to the old election date—that is, in the second quarter of the year. I hope that that is a precursor of some fixed arrangement which will definitely fix the length of sessions and the date of elections. We must realise that during the last eight years—the life of this Government—what almost amounts to a legislative revolution has taken place, and therefore there is no necessity for us to carry on with the obsolete methods that might have suited very well in a House representing only a section of the community which had to haggle with the nobles and the monarch on what were said to be privileges, but which we have established as rights.

Some remarks have been made on the question of education. I was very much impressed by the remarks of the hon. member for Bowen. He showed an uneasiness as to whether during the eight years of the Labour Government in Queensland we had left any significant mark on our educational policy. He gave me the impression that he had been uneasy as to whether we really as a political party had fulfilled our obligations to the great movement which we represent. I am not uncertain on that matter at all. I am quite sure that we have not. During the period of the war there was every reason for our being cautious. Any step that we might have taken would have been absolutely certain to be misrepresented. Five years have elapsed since the conclusion of the war, and I can see no evidence of progress in our general policy of education. I do not mean little administrative details which officials can manage in any case. I can see no signs of bringing the educational policy of this country into touch with the present times. Mr. Hardacre, before his retirement, had the intention of revising the school reading books. That gentleman did me the honour of presenting me with a set of books and asking me to read them through and give him my opinion on them. That was four years ago, but I do not think anything has been done so far. I am not here to make any indefinite statement. I want to say exactly what I consider should be the aim of a political party such as this, and of a community which has adopted the policy of this political party. It is recognised that the duties of the State in education are twofold. First of all, to prepare the children for the duties of citizenship, and secondly to provide equal opportunities. The Government during their eight years of office have secured for the masses rights which have never been exercised in any community in the world before that we have certain knowledge of, I say no community in the world that we have certain knowledge of, because any news that comes from Russia I regard as unreliable because of the obscurity that still envelops that country. Apart from that, the Government of Queensland at the present time are the most democratic Government in the world. We have secured rights for the masses. We have thrust upon them responsibilities such as have never been thrust on the masses of any other country, and we ought to be considering how we are going to prepare the future citizens to exercise those great responsibilities.

It is not only that we do not appear to be doing anything in that direction, but a more

Mr. Lloyd.]

serious feature is that we do not, except for occasional remarks like that which I have quoted as coming from the hon. member for Bowen, seem to be sufficiently concerning ourselves about this very great question. This is not a question to be left to experts. The educational experts are the navigators. I had personal knowledge of a number of officers of the Education Department even when they occupied humbler positions than they do at the present time, and I know them to be capable men who are prepared to take the ship which they navigate on any course which we map out. They will well and conscientiously do their duty to the community. It is for us to direct them, and it is for them to carry out the policy. I do not suggest that we should inflict on the people of Queensland anything in the way of political dogma. So long as we get them to study the products of great thought, I am not concerned about the political convictions of the great thinkers. One of the great things to be laid down to be taught is the duty of the individual towards the State. There are certain text-books on the subject; but the trouble about those text-books is that they lay down generalisations, and do not connect these generalisations with the great facts of history which exist in the world outside our own communities. It is important that the citizen should be taught his own responsibility to his own State. The hon. member for Rockhampton was accused of disloyalty because he laid stress on the fact that the Australian boy should be taught loyalty to Australia. Loyalty is a matter of rather wide interpretation. I expected something in the way of fireworks by this hon. member on this particular matter from a remark I heard made by a member of the Opposition, but reading through the hon. member's speech, I saw nothing there which would suggest anything in the way of disloyalty to any institution or to any tradition. It was simply a statement stressing the need of teaching the responsibility of the Australian citizen to the Australian community. Then we should do what is still more important. The great war shattered many an illusion. It shattered the illusion that many of us had right up to the time that hostilities started—that the people of the world were too enlightened to engage in war. We should do something to prepare the citizens of our own State, at any rate, so that they can do something towards understanding the outside world better and directing our own policy, so that we can do our share towards avoiding such a calamity in the future. It will be a very difficult thing to do. In Australia we are in a singularly isolated position in relation to the outside world. The first thing we should do is to enlighten our children as to what is really happening in the outside world. Our education in that regard is of the narrowest possible nature. When we get a child to look at the outside world, we put him, as it were, into a barrel with holes drilled in it opposite those parts of the map of the world belonging to the British Empire. Then, when we take him out of the barrel, all we do is to show him the British Empire under a magnifying glass, and the rest of the world under the reverse end of a telescope. One of our duties is to try and develop a broader outlook on the world generally. A good deal of the

[*Mr. Lloyd.*]

English history that is taught is quite useless. At the same time we cannot teach much history if we confine ourselves to Australia alone, because the history of Australia has not sufficient range to illustrate the great changes that have taken place in the development of mankind. Australian history really only dates from shortly before 1900. It has hardly any really distinctive Australian features even at the present time. It is necessary for us to go outside of Australia, and we shall have to go back to British history in order to understand our own history; but we should also go outside British history. It is impossible for a child to educate himself or herself in order to exercise his or her rights of citizenship if we confine their knowledge of history to British history. Then there is the question of general culture in education. Connected with that question of general culture we have the question of the other aim which a democratic Government should have, and that is the matter of equal opportunities. In that respect we have a much better record. We have done a great deal to provide wider opportunities for the child of poor parents. The children of poor parents at the present time, after eight years of administration by a Labour Government, has four or five times as many chances of getting into one of the vocations that were previously shut to them before the Government held office. That is to our credit. I have dealt with this subject in an entirely critical spirit. I do not think I have spared the party to which I belong in any, but on the other hand, we can claim that we have done a great deal in the way of providing equal opportunities. At the same time we are wasting a great deal of money. We take children into the secondary schools and teach them languages, not for the sake of acquiring a knowledge of that particular language, but in order that they may overcome the arbitrary barrier that has been raised to keep them out of certain well-paid professions. We have made a mistake in allowing those professions to put up an arbitrary barrier. It is a splendid thing to encourage children to learn languages and English literature, but at the same time those branches of education are of no use if a lad has no other aim than that of going in for a specialised training. There is no reason in such cases to force him to learn anything but what is required for that vocation. We have had artificial barriers created—one of our departments has established these barriers—and the Department of Public Instruction is spending a great deal of money and thought in removing those barriers for the benefit of individuals. It will be much better if those barriers are removed altogether. The public must be protected, certainly, but we should confine the protection to what is absolutely necessary for public safety. We should not allow those professions to erect barriers in order to create a monopoly for a privileged profession rather than for the public good. At least four years ago a political convention which I attended passed a resolution that the education system of Queensland should be overhauled. I do not know what has become of that resolution.

I was the mover of the resolution for passing it on elsewhere, but I have heard nothing of it. If any overhaul has been

made, it has been made in secret. It would be a very good thing if we had [5.30 p.m.] some kind of a public overhaul. I stress the fact that I am not speaking of the professional administration. I believe that to be good and that the men in charge know their work, but our education policy is a thing that we should discuss in public. We should do something to foster in Queensland a movement aiming at education for education's sake.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MORGAN (*Marilla*): I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Bremer on his outspoken remarks in connection with what has happened at the Ipswich Railway Workshops. For some years I have known of such matters in connection with that institution, and I think that the time is now ripe for the place to be overhauled from top to bottom. The taxpayers are not getting full value for the money that is being expended. It would be better for the men in the workshops and for all concerned if a commission of inquiry were appointed for the purpose of finding how matters may be improved in connection with the institution; and not only in connection with the wood-work branch, but in connection with the engineering and other works carried on by the State. Many cases have occurred where work, after construction, has been found to be useless, and I feel sure that between Brisbane and Roma you will find thousands and thousands of pounds worth of work which has been constructed and has been found useless from a railway viewpoint. There seems to be nobody hauled over the coals; nobody seems to care whether the money is expended judiciously or not. When we have members of the Government opening their minds and giving expression to their opinions, as the hon. member for Bremer has done to-day, I think that the Government must take notice of those remarks. Similar remarks coming from the Opposition would simply be termed criticism by men in opposition who look upon it as their duty to criticise the Government. It is a pity that more members sitting behind the Government, knowing as they do that money is being wasted and that the country is not getting full value, do not get up and express their opinions openly and fearlessly, irrespective of whether Ministers like it or not.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Ministers do not object to criticism.

Mr. MORGAN: Then why do not supporters of the Government criticise more? Is it because they are afraid it will be used against them during an election campaign, or that they are afraid to show that the Government are not carrying out their duty properly in connection with the department concerned? Every member is sent here by the electors to do his duty and see that the money obtained from the people by way of taxation is spent in a manner beneficial to the community.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: There is nothing to prevent any hon. member from going to a Minister when circumstances warrant such a procedure.

Mr. MORGAN: I think the proper place to ventilate these grievances is on the floor of the House. These matters affect not only individuals, but the whole of Queensland; they are of State importance.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You confuse criticism with abuse. Opposition members do not criticise; they abuse.

Mr. MORGAN: I think the Minister will recognise the fact that, if "Hansard" were referred to, it would be found that the style of criticism levelled at the present Government by the Opposition is mild compared with that levelled at the late Liberal Administration by the party at present in power.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It is not criticism at all; it is all abuse.

Mr. MORGAN: We do not make a practice of getting up and abusing hon. members on the opposite side of the House. We try to be as effective as possible in our criticism, and I think the Secretary for Public Lands recognises that our duty as the Opposition is to criticise. I have always endeavoured to do so in a manner which I thought both respectful to the person criticised and creditable to myself.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: No one objects to constructive criticism.

Mr. MORGAN: We endeavour to criticise the Government in a fitting manner, to induce the Government to perform certain actions in a way beneficial to the community. I criticise as I think fit when in the House, but outside I am as friendly as possible with members on the other side, notwithstanding heated words that may have been hurled across the Chamber.

The Treasurer has made a special plea to hon. members on this side of the House to say nothing during this session that is likely to be used against him in his position as Treasurer of the State, and which might jeopardise the mission he has to make to England for the purpose of securing a renewal of the loans maturing during the next few years. I feel confident that I speak for every hon. member on this side of the House when I say that I hope the Treasurer will be successful in his mission, and that he will obtain the renewals at the lowest possible rate of interest. Of course, a great deal depends upon the hon. gentleman himself. A great deal depends on what he does in respect to legislation as to whether he obtains the confidence of those in Great Britain who are responsible for the lending of money. One must recognise that, until the Government bring about a better condition of affairs with respect to what is known as the "Repudiation Act," they are not likely to find favour with the money-lenders in Great Britain. The Treasurer has stated that the removal of the limitation with regard to an increase of rent was not repudiation, because that limitation was not in the lease when the land was originally selected. I would point out, however, that subsequently an Act of Parliament was passed which specifically provided that in the case of certain leases the rent could not be increased in any one period to a greater extent than 50 per cent.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Every Act of Parliament repudiates something.

Mr. MORGAN: That Act of Parliament provided definitely that the rents could not be increased by more than 50 per cent.

Mr. Morgan.]

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It was not interfered with until it was made lawful to alter it.

Mr. MORGAN: That is the position taken up by the Treasurer and by the Secretary for Public Lands. When I came to Queensland there was a section in the Land Act which provided that prickly-pear selections could be taken up under what was known as the fifteen years' period; that is five years in which to clear the pear, and a further ten years during which the purchase price could be paid for the land to become freehold. Later on a deputation on behalf of the prickly-pear selectors, who found they could not meet the conditions, which were too stringent, met the Secretary for Public Lands, and he increased the period to twenty years. Subsequently the Labour Government increased the period for the same class of settlers to forty years. But our original leases have never been altered. The original lease says that the land was selected under a fifteen years' period, and, if the Government so desire, according to the Secretary for Public Lands, they can now make us forfeit our selections because we have not cleared the pear within five years or paid the purchase price within fifteen years, in accordance with the original conditions in the lease. If the Government did that, will the Minister say that it would not be repudiation? It would be just as much repudiation as it is repudiation to remove the limitation of 50 per cent. in connection with pastoral rents.

I listened very attentively to the hon. member for Brisbane last night when he read extracts from the daily papers of Brisbane showing the progress made in this city in regard to the increase of capital of the various companies. Generally speaking, when a company desires to increase its capital, it does not issue pessimistic reports; it does not state that the company is languishing for the want of money. It rather points out that everything in the garden is beautiful. It gives a most glowing account of the possibilities of the company, because it wants to get more money; yet the hon. member for Brisbane stated that, because those reports appeared in the Press, these companies were flourishing. One has only to walk through the city of Brisbane and suburbs to see that numerous buildings are being erected at the present time, but unfortunately that progress is not common throughout the whole of Queensland. The hon. member did not quote one instance showing that progress was being made in other parts of the State. While I do not wish in any way to prevent progress, I wish to point out that, while financial institutions to-day have any amount of money to lend on bricks and mortar in the city of Brisbane, they have no money to lend for the development of the country portions of Queensland. The financial institutions that would lend money years ago to wire-net your selection or to ringbark or put down bores will not do so to-day. That money is not going into the country for the development of our resources, but is being invested in buildings in the large centres of population. That is one reason why money is plentiful in the city to-day. If you want to build a large place in the city of Brisbane or in one of our large towns, plenty of money is available; but the moment you wish to get money to develop the country districts, you are

[Mr. Morgan.

told by the financial institutions that they are not doing business in that direction. Hon. members must admit that this is not beneficial to the State of Queensland as a whole. We are not making the progress in the country portions of Queensland that we should make, and, instead of spending these hundreds of thousands of pounds in erecting huge buildings in Queen street and in other parts of Brisbane, it would be much better if members representing the country portions of Queensland were able to come to this House and say that that money was being used for the purpose of developing the country, as it would then produce wealth. The fact that you may spend £50,000 or £100,000 on a large building at the corner of Queen street is not going to add to the wealth of the country, because wealth is not got out of buildings such as that. Wealth is obtained from the soil or from our mines, and it is that wealth that is eventually used to build up the large centres of population. The Government are spending a quarter of a million pounds to-day on the erection of a huge structure at the corner of Queen and George streets. For many years the Treasury block has remained uncompleted, and right at the time when there is a boom in Brisbane, when labour is scarce and material is dear, the Government are spending over a quarter of a million in completing that block. When the present boom bursts or when the building boom is over the Government will have no work for the workers, and there will be hundreds of men unemployed. Is that not the time when the Government should say, "This is the time we ought to do this work"? They should do this work when private enterprise is not prepared to go on with large undertakings. Instead of doing that, the Government are going on with that work at the present time, and, owing to the shortage of labour, that building will probably cost £100,000 more to complete than it would cost if it were built at some other time. It is the duty of a Government to find work for the worker when he wants work and is looking for it, and not to enter into these huge building campaigns when there already is plenty of work for that particular class of worker.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: But this is a Queen street Government.

Mr. MORGAN: Then we find that £25,000 is going to be spent on a high school in South Brisbane. I do not object to £25,000 being spent in that direction, provided that the children in the country are given facilities to get primary education, but unfortunately they are not. The Minister told the people in several districts in my electorate that he could not go on with the building of schools because he had no funds, yet we find that £30,000 of the amount placed on last year's Estimates has not been spent; and we are now proposing to spend £25,000 to give secondary education to the children in South Brisbane, while there are many children in country districts in Queensland who are not getting any education at all. The duty of the Government is first to give the children primary education, and, when all our children are obtaining a primary education, we can go further and give them a secondary education. Then we should go still further, and place the cleverest and brainiest of those children in the University to fit them for high positions in life. That is the duty of the Government, but it is not

their duty to give some a University education and others none at all.

Mr. FARRELL: The Government are spending on education £500,000 more than the Liberal Government spent in 1914.

Mr. MORGAN: The hon. member for Rockhampton has been a schoolmaster. I listened attentively to his remarks, and I was pleased to hear him advocating that the children in the country should have better educational facilities than they have at the present time. I am with him in that, because this is one of the matters I have fought for continually, as I believe that money spent on education is money well spent. But the fact that the Government are spending £500,000 more than the previous Government spent in 1914 is not altogether evidence that they are doing so very much more. First of all, our population has increased enormously. Then we have opened up new districts, which necessitate new schools. If you look up the figures for Victoria, you will find that the amount spent on education is very much greater to-day than it was in 1914.

Mr. HARTLEY: It has increased by double the amount with us.

Mr. MORGAN: Just as the pay of school teachers, policemen, and railway employees has increased in Queensland, so have the wages of the different classes of employees increased in every State in Australia, whether there has been a Labour Government in power or not. Had there not been a Labour Government in power in Queensland, the same increase would have taken place, because of the increase in the cost of living. The Arbitration Court has increased wages in proportion to the increased cost of living, and just as the wages are fixed higher by the Arbitration Court for outside workers, so the Government had to do the same for their employees, as no Government could remain in office if they refused to increase the wages of Government employees.

Mr. LLOYD: If you have an increase in the number of pupils, you get higher education relatively and absolutely.

Mr. MORGAN: Most of the other States have had Labour Governments in office, during which time expenditure increased extravagantly, just the same as it has done under Labour rule in this State. In Victoria the average rate of wage is £4 11s. per week, and in Queensland it is £4 13s. 10d.—a difference of 2s. 10d.

Mr. HYNES: You must take the purchasing power into account.

Mr. MORGAN: The percentage of unemployed in Victoria is 5.2 per cent., while in Queensland it is 12.4 per cent. The average rate of wage actually paid per worker in Victoria is £4 6s. 3d., and in Queensland £4 2s. 3d., showing a difference of 4s. in favour of Victoria.

Mr. HARTLEY: Where did you get those figures?

Mr. MORGAN: From the Government Statistician, and they have not been denied. The "Daily Standard," in a leading article on 14th March, 1922, made the following statement:—

"The actual money value of the present high wages is 11 per cent. less than during the pre-war period. . . . As a matter of cold fact, the Australian workers were receiving higher wages ten years ago than at any period since."

The "Daily Standard" states that the effective wage ten years ago was better than it is to-day, and we on this side say that now, because the effective wages are the purchasing value. A man may only be receiving £2 10s. per week, and yet he may be able to keep a wife and family in more comfort and live in a better manner than he could on £4 5s. per week.

Mr. HYNES: You claim that the effective wage is higher in the Tory-governed States than in the Labour-governed States?

Mr. MORGAN: Let me show what the "Railway Advocate," which cannot be said to be a Tory paper, said on 10th February, 1922—

"The basic wage in 1911 was £3 1s. 3d., equal to £4 17s. 4d. in January, 1922. Therefore, the present basic wage is 17s. 4d. per week less than in 1911."

What do hon. members opposite say about that?

Mr. HYNES: Are you in favour of a higher rate of wage being paid to the Queensland worker?

Mr. MORGAN: I am in favour of an effective wage that will give the worker the comforts and necessaries of life, and I say high wages do not do that now, because the cost of everything has gone up. When you increase the wages of the workers by 10 per cent., commodities go up 20 per cent. or 25 per cent., and the high wages are used in buying the necessaries of life at a greater price than would have had to be paid had the wages not been increased. A lot has been said by hon. members opposite

[7 p.m.] during the election campaign and at other periods to the effect that the cost of living in Queensland is lower than in any other State. That cannot be denied, but we must remember that in 1914, before the Labour Government ever had control of this State, the cost of living was lower in Queensland than in any other State. I have figures here to show that from 1914 to 1922 the increase in the cost of living has nevertheless been greater in Queensland than in any other State in Australia, and that is the most important point.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The Federal Government took the control of necessary commodities out of our hands.

Mr. CORSER: The increase would be all the greater but for that.

Mr. MORGAN: The Government cannot deny the accuracy of the figures I am about to give. I take the index numbers for food and groceries in the different States in July, 1914, and in December, 1922, the latest date for which I have been able to get them, and show also the percentage increases—

State.	INDEX NUMBER.		Percentage Increase.
	July, 1914.	December, 1922.	
Queensland . . .	1,082	1,543	51.8
New South Wales . .	1,165	1,737	49.1
Victoria . . .	1,105	1,647	49.0
Tasmania . . .	1,201	1,771	47.5
South Australia . . .	1,247	1,693	35.8
Western Australia . .	1,412	1,753	44.2

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Give us the figures for 1916.

Mr. Morgan.]

Mr. MORGAN: I am giving the figures for the last year of the Liberal Government and for the latest year for which I have been able to get them.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The Federal Government took the control out of our hands.

Mr. CORSER: They had the same control in the other States, so that the comparison is all right.

Mr. MORGAN: Notwithstanding the fact that the cost of living is cheaper in this State than in any other State, we know that the increase in the cost of living has been greater in this State since 1914 than in any other State.

The Government have been for some time subsidising the Mount Morgan Gold Mining Company.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: And the farmers and the graziers.

Mr. MORGAN: They have subsidised that company to the extent of £1,190 per week, which is equal to about £62,000 per annum. They have done that because copper has not been realising the exorbitant price since the termination of the war that was obtained during the war. During the war exorbitant prices were obtained for metals, especially copper. The prices rose to an extent perhaps unknown in the history of this State. The overhead expenses and other costs of the company were affected by the awards of the Arbitration Court, based on the fluctuating price of copper. Owing to a fall in the price of copper the mine could not carry on and meet its liabilities, and the Government came to its aid by granting this subsidy of £62,000. That might be quite justifiable if it is thought that an industry could right itself in the course of a few months, but we find that this subsidy has been paid for some considerable time, and still we find there has been little or no increase in the price of copper. There are troublesome times in Europe, and Germany and France may be at war at any moment. That might have the effect of hardening the price of copper. How long is this subsidy going to last? As the song, "Kathleen Mavourneen" says, "It may be for now, and it may be for ever." What is going to happen. Are we going to continue to subsidise this industry? What sort of treatment is meted out to the farmer who is suffering from the effects of the drought? What is their fate when they approach the Government in order to obtain relief?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: We did the same thing for the farmer.

Mr. MORGAN: There is a sum of £30,000 placed on the Estimates for the relief of the farmer during periods of distress. The Government are lending the farmer a certain amount of money which must be repaid. They are lending just sufficient money to keep the wolf from the door, in just the same way as the Mount Morgan Gold Mining Company got sufficient money to keep the wolf from the door. But we find that the farmer has to repay his money, while in the case of the Mount Morgan Gold Mining Company the money is a gift.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: No. We granted the graziers and farmers last year a concession in freights to the extent of £200,000.

[Mr. Morgan.

Mr. MORGAN: Assistance is given to the farmer in the way of a loan, and the farmer has to sign an undertaking to repay that money within twelve months after the expiration of the period during which the money is lent. In the case of the Mount Morgan Gold Mining Company the money is a gift to which all the people of Queensland are contributing.

Let me now take the case of the grazier. The cattle industry has been down and out for some considerable time. When the industry was flourishing the Government stepped in and said, "We are going to commandeer a certain amount of meat." They did so. They took meat from the cattle-growers of Queensland at 3d. per lb., and sold it through the State butcher shops to supply cheap meat to the people of Brisbane in particular; but the very moment the industry ceased to flourish and the bottom fell out of the industry, the Government did not come to the assistance of the graziers to any great extent. After a while the Government reduced the freight on cattle by 20 per cent., and still later they reduced it by 30 per cent. What did they do during the period when the industry was flourishing? In 1914 the freight on cattle was at a certain rate, but after the industry became flourishing the Government increased that rate by 63 per cent. The Secretary for Railways tells us that he has given the industry a subsidy because he reduced the rate by 30 per cent., but I would impress on him the fact that we are still paying a great deal in excess of the freight ruling in 1914.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The rates are easily the lowest in Australia.

Mr. MORGAN: The Government increased our rates by 63 per cent., and then gave us a reduction of 30 per cent., and now the Minister interjects, "Look at what I have done for the industry."

Mr. HYNES: What has been the increase in Victoria during the same period?

Mr. MORGAN: We appreciate the reduction, but, notwithstanding that fact, it is useless for the Minister to say that we are on the same footing as the Mount Morgan Gold Mining Company, because the Government did not increase the mining rates to the extent of £62,000, nor did they then make a reduction in the freights. The fact remains that the cattle industry is paying a greater freight on cattle now than in 1914, and yet the Government say that they are assisting an industry that is "down and out." It is the second greatest industry in the State, and it should have received more attention than it has done.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: The graziers of Queensland appreciate our action in assisting the industry if you don't. We have a number of letters of appreciation.

Mr. MORGAN: I organised a deputation to the Premier with a view to getting a reduction, and I thank the Premier for the reduction in freight that he conceded, but it is of no use the Secretary for Railways placing us on the same footing as the Mount Morgan Gold Mining Company, who did not have their freights increased by 63 per cent., and then reduced 30 per cent., but received a straight-out subsidy.

Mr. HYNES: You got a better deal from the Labour Government of Queensland than from the Government of any other State.

Mr. MORGAN: I now wish to draw attention to the Chillagoe State Smelters Fund. It is in debt to the extent of £471,645. That is an enormous amount of money. This is a company that was taken over by the Government. I was one of those members who opposed the Government taking over this enterprise. I did not think at the time it would be a profitable investment, because I recognised that the private company which worked the Chillagoe mines had engaged the very best experts for the work and had spent millions of pounds up to the time the Government took over the mine for the purpose of employing a few hundred men. The undertaking has never been a success, and the Government are storing up the copper with a view to disposing of it when the price of that metal improves. It will be beneficial to the whole of Australia and the world if copper did not increase in price, because we use it for telephone wires and in many other directions. If the price of copper goes up, we shall be debarred from purchasing many articles which we use to-day. Australia only produces 10 per cent. of the quantity of copper that is used in the world, and it will be detrimental, not only to Australia, but to the rest of the world, if the price goes up to £95 and £100, as it did during the war. The Government also engaged in the purchase of precious stones, and this brings me now to the Sapphire Trading Account. We find that that account is £21,962 to the bad. I suppose the Government have accumulated somewhere in their strong rooms a very nice collection of precious stones. They may have a monopoly of sapphires, but that it is not any good to feed the people of Queensland who are in a bad position to-day. I do not know the value of the jewels that the Government have to set off against this loss. There is a debit balance of £964,091 in the State Enterprises Fund. Nearly £1,000,000 to the bad, on which we are paying interest! The "Douglas Mawson" Fund shows a debit balance of £14,140, and I would like to know if the "Douglas Mawson" was insured, or if there has been a total loss of that amount.

These examples indicate that almost every State enterprise that the Government have undertaken so far has been a failure.

Mr. RIORDAN: The "Douglas Mawson" was not taken up as a State enterprise, but to feed the people in the Gulf.

Mr. MORGAN: The Government paid several thousands more for the "Douglas Mawson" than a private person would have paid. That has been proved.

Mr. RIORDAN: The statement was not right, and it was never proved.

Mr. MORGAN: The statement was made in this Chamber, and the Government were not game to appoint a Royal Commission when we asked them to do so. We had the hon. member for Bowen lamenting as a calamity that the State iron and steel works had not been gone on with. If the delegation was responsible for those works not being constructed, I think we are fortunate and we have something to thank them for.

Mr. COLLINS: A fine specimen of Australian sentiment.

Mr. MORGAN: In my opinion we can pay too dearly for our enterprises. The time may be ripe later to establish iron and steel works in Bowen or in some other part of Queensland. I am not against their

establishment, but I think the time was inopportune. Their establishment two or three years ago would have cost us £3,000,000, and what would have been the result?

Mr. COLLINS: There would have been an iron and steel works, of course.

Mr. MORGAN: Had the Government established the works at the time suggested, there would have been a loss of £1,000,000 on the cost of construction alone. There is a time for all things. If the time is ripe for the construction of an iron and steel works, let us construct them; but we do not want to construct when everything is up to the clouds. We want to wait till the prices are at bedrock. The same remarks apply to the cattle industry. The Government put their millions into that industry when it was booming, with the result that to-day they are suffering huge losses. They bought at the wrong time. If the iron and steel works can be proved to be a success, I will support their establishment. If the Government enter into any enterprise at all, it should be some enterprise which has not already been established in Queensland. In going in for cattle stations they were not increasing the number of cattle in Queensland; they were not improving the breed of stock; they were not employing more labour, and they were not opening up more land for settlement. All they did was to take over existing stations that were already carrying cattle, that were already employing labour, and that were already helping to develop Queensland. Therefore the Government did no good, and they lost a considerable sum of money by taking over the State stations. To establish State iron and steel works, if private enterprise would not do so, is quite a different thing altogether and it may be justified. But I think the hon. member for Bowen will recognise that it was a good thing that the iron and steel works were not established two or three years ago.

Mr. COLLINS: The member for Bowen does not recognise any such thing. He recognises that it was a very bad thing.

Mr. MORGAN: Take the irrigation works. Look at the deplorable amount of money spent in connection with the Inkerman irrigation scheme over and above the estimated cost. It was estimated that the Inkerman irrigation scheme would cost £130,000, and up to the present it has cost over £300,000, and the cost may run into half a million before it is completed. We are supposed to have experts attached to the department, but that is all the reliance we can place on their estimate. The cost is going to be so great that, if the farmers have to pay interest and redemption on that expenditure, the cost of the water will be so great that every man on that settlement will be compelled to leave his holding.

Mr. COLLINS: Talk about something you understand.

Mr. MORGAN: I guarantee that within the next two years we shall see the hon. member for Bowen coming to this House supporting a measure to reduce the capital value of the Inkerman irrigation scheme by one-half.

Mr. COLLINS: Not by one-half. We have already promised that no burden will be placed on the farmers that they cannot carry.

Mr. MORGAN: We are spending on those irrigation works something like half a million of money, and the member for the district

Mr. Morgan.]

knows quite well that the farmers cannot afford to pay interest on that amount of money. The result will be that the whole of Queensland will have to contribute to make that irrigation scheme a success; and allow the farmers to obtain water at a cost that will enable them to grow produce on their land and sell it at a profit.

Mr. COLLINS: What would it grow without irrigation?

Mr. MORGAN: It may not grow anything without irrigation, but the point is that you can pay too dearly for your whistle. If it is going to cost us 1s. to grow a cabbage which is only worth 6d. in the market, then we lose 6d. on that cabbage.

Mr. COLLINS: Do you know that you cannot buy a 160-acre farm in the Inkerman irrigation area for less than £5,000 or £6,000?

Mr. MORGAN: If that is true, then the farmers will not be justified in asking the Government to write off half the capital cost. If it can be shown that that land has increased in value to that extent by the irrigation works, then I for one will vote against the writing down of the capital cost; but, if it can be shown that the farmers cannot produce profitably owing to the cost of water, I shall be in favour of wiping off some of the debt. If they are getting benefit for money expended, it is only right that they should recoup the Consolidated Revenue for the money expended. I also noticed in the Press to-day figures showing the amount of unemployment for the last two quarters in the different States. This is what the paragraph says—

“This represents an average of 7.1 per cent. unemployment for the whole of the States. The greatest percentage was recorded in New South Wales (8.3), followed in the order named by Queensland (7.3), Western Australia (6.2), Victoria (5.7), and Tasmania (4.9).”

We have to recognise that Queensland has just gone through an election. Owing to the election numerous railways were commenced in different parts of the State, and men were employed because the Government did not want to have any unemployed during that particular period. They started railway work in my electorate and in the Central district, and they started work in the electorate of the hon. member for Toowoomba—work which was not necessary—in order to absorb the unemployed during the election campaign and to enable the hon. member for Toowoomba to win his election.

Hon. T. F. BRENNAN: The hon. member for Toowoomba says it was very necessary.

Mr. MORGAN: These figures show that during the first six months of the year Queensland had the second largest number of unemployed in the whole of the State of Australia.

Mr. HYNES: From what source did you get those figures?

Mr. MORGAN: This is how it is put in the Press—

“Information as to the prevalence of unemployed was received from 431 trade unions with a membership of 378,161, of which 26,931 were unemployed.”

The information was obtained from unions.

Mr. HYNES: They might have found employment in some other industries.

Mr. MORGAN: Whether we quote from “Knibbs,” or give figures compiled by

[Mr. Morgan.

union secretaries, hon. members opposite, if the figures do not suit them, say, “They may have been obtained in this way or in that way.” The figures I have previously given show that the percentage of unemployed in Queensland up to the end of last year represented 12.4 per cent., while in Victoria it was only 5.2 per cent. In Queensland it is double what it is in Victoria and the other States. During the last six months, as work was provided for the sake of winning the elections, the unemployment in Queensland naturally lessened to a great extent; but notwithstanding that fact, we find that Queensland during that period had the second largest number of unemployed in the whole of Australia. That proves that under a Labour Government the workers do no better than they do under other Governments.

Mr. HYNES: The worker is the best judge of that, and that is why we are on the Treasury benches.

Mr. MORGAN: There are many reasons why you are on the Treasury benches with which the worker has nothing whatever to do.

Mr. HYNES: What are they?

Mr. CORSER: Juggling the electorates for a start, and misrepresentation, hunting up jobs, and all sorts of things.

Mr. MORGAN: I want to deal with one or two other matters before I conclude. The Treasurer is breaking the promises which he made to the people of the State during the last election. He told the people in his election addresses that, if the Labour party were returned to power, there would be an exemption of £300 in connection with the income tax. He also told the people that there would be an exemption of £50 for each child and others dependent upon the taxpayer.

Mr. WEIR: Where did you get that information?

Mr. MORGAN: I saw it in the Premier's speeches.

Mr. WEIR: You did not see anything of the kind.

Mr. MORGAN: We find that the Treasurer already is not going as far as he said he would go. I remember the time when it was first suggested that a deduction [7.30 p.m.] tion should be given for each child under the age of fourteen years or other person dependent on the taxpayer. I moved a motion that a deduction of, I think, £14 or £15 should be given, but the Labour Government turned it down. On division they voted against it. Later they adopted my suggestion, but we want them to go still further. I think during the election every party—I do not think there was any difference between them—promised the electors that the exemption would be raised to £300 and the deduction for each child or other dependent to £50.

I want to point out that, whilst it may be necessary to develop all the resources of the State, there is one industry to which the Government should pay particular attention—that is, the woolgrowing industry. As has already been stated by one hon. member opposite, if not by more, it has proved the salvation of Queensland, if not of Australia. After the 1902 drought other industries were responsible for pulling the State out of financial difficulties, and this time there is no doubt that the woolgrowing industry has

saved Queensland from a very embarrassing financial position. Yet the Government are not doing all they can to encourage it. Because it is a paying industry they are doing all they can to tax it out of existence. That is wrong. I admit that it can stand a good deal of taxation, but it should not be taxed to the extent it is; there is a danger of not encouraging it as we ought. Every acre of land you take away from woolgrowing and put into agriculture means the doing of an injury to the State and to the people who take up that land. It would be criminal for the Government to take away land now growing wool with a view to making it grow cereals or some other crop. It is producing more wealth by growing wool than it could produce under the plough. I am not against the Government taking land and opening it up in areas smaller than those in which it is at present held so that small farmers can go on to it; but if the Government are going to take land in the Maranoa and Goondiwindi districts and open it up for the use of the plough, they will be doing an injury to Queensland.

Mr. CONROY: What area do you favour?

Mr. MORGAN: Some of that land would enable a man to run 2,000 sheep on 5,000 acres. Five thousand acres, in my opinion, would be small enough, and some of it may have to be cut up in larger areas. We should work upon the basis of giving to the sheep farmer an area sufficient to enable him to carry, year in and year out, for a period of perhaps ten years, 2,000 sheep. That number of sheep would give him a living and enable him to save and keep his family as well as the city man. If the Government will do that with the land of which I speak, they will be doing good work.

Mr. CONROY: You favour 5,000 acres?

Mr. MORGAN: I favour whatever area is necessary to carry 2,000 sheep. On some of that land 5,000 acres would carry 2,000 sheep.

Mr. CONROY: Right alongside the railway line.

Mr. MORGAN: I am not bothering about that. A sheep farmer will make just as much 50 miles from a railway as he will make right alongside a railway, because a load of wool is worth hundreds of pounds, and the cost of carting it to market is in comparison nothing at all. Wheat, on the other hand, can only be carried profitably 10 or 12 miles. A ton of wheat may be worth £5, but a ton of wool is worth £100. What is £2 for cartage in comparison with the value of a ton of wool? But £2 for cartage of a ton of wheat which will realise only £5 would make wheatgrowing unprofitable. In cotton and woolgrowing it is not necessary to be near a railway. You can grow wool and cotton equally as well and make just as much out of them 50 miles from a railway as you can close to a railway.

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

Mr. FERRICKS (*South Brisbane*): The hon. member who has just resumed his seat made some reference to the supposed promise of the Government to raise the income tax exemption to £300. I notice from the Financial Statement that it is proposed to increase the exemption to £250—that is, by £50, so that it is well on the way towards £300. In reply to an interjection by the hon. member for Townsville, the hon. member for Burnett said that one of the reasons why we are on

this side of the House is to be found in the alleged juggling of the electorates. I think the most eloquent reply that can be made to that suggestion is a comparison of the voting at the 1920 and 1923 elections in two city electorates, Maree and South Brisbane, neither of which has had its boundaries altered by the redistribution. In 1920 the Labour majority in Maree was 131, and in South Brisbane 171. I admit that there was not much to come and go upon in either of the electorates. In 1923 the Labour majorities had increased to 331 and 372 respectively—showing a general advantage had accrued to Labour during the intervening three years. I contend that there is every justification for the assertion that the improvement shown here indicates that the general swing at the last election was in favour of the Government, and that that is the real reason why they are still on this side of the House.

The hon. member for Normanby this afternoon was on sound ground when he advocated the sympathetic consideration of local industries; but he was scarcely correct in saying that the Government took no steps to give any preference to them, because, to my knowledge, that preference is extended. For the North Johnstone Bridge work, the British tender was about £9,000, including freight, Customs duty of 38½ per cent., insurance, and other incidental charges. The lowest Queensland tender was £12,000, which came from an institution in the electorate of South Brisbane, whilst the Government dock of New South Wales tendered about £12 in excess of the South Brisbane tender. I made inquiries from the Premier, who pointed out to me—and it was afterwards confirmed by letter—that it was the policy of the Government to allow, in addition to the 38½ per cent. Customs duty—which the Government did not claim was their protection—a preference of 15 per cent. in favour of local tenderers, which meant a total advantage of 53½ per cent. A brief calculation will show the hon. member for Normanby that the difference between the South Brisbane and the British tender amounted to 33 per cent.; and, whilst I agree with him that greater consideration might be given to local industries and that the margin could be increased, I do not contend that any Government is justified in extending it to 32 per cent. or 33 per cent., even though the industry which would be benefited may be in South Brisbane.

To show the bona fides of the Government in this regard, tenders were afterwards called for the construction of the Burnett Bridge, and the lowest tender on that occasion again came from a British firm. It was a tender for £20,000. The next tender to that was from an Adelaide firm, which was £2,000 odd in excess of the British tender, and the next tender was a Queensland tender of £4,000 odd in excess of the British tender. The Government had in the case of the other works conceded the 15 per cent. margin to the South Brisbane foundry, and in this case they again gave that concession to the Queensland firm—the Maryborough foundry. Not only did the Government do that, but they gave the Queensland institution the option of fulfilling that work and carrying it out at the Adelaide firm's figure, which was 10 per cent. in excess of the British tender, showing that the Government give preference to Australian industry, and preference to Queensland industry in particular. That, I say, is a right policy, only I think the 15

Mr. Ferricks.]

per cent. could be extended even to 20 per cent. or 25 per cent.

Mr. ROBERTS: Are the local tenderers allowed the 3½ per cent. Customs concession, and then the 15 per cent. by the Queensland Government in addition?

Mr. FERRICKS: Yes. Wages in Australia are higher and materials are cheaper on the other side of the world. That is why I advocate the extension of the 15 per cent. margin. I do not take into consideration that the hours of labour are forty-eight in England and forty-four in Australia, because I have always contended, and I contend now, that a reduction of hours of labour brings about an equal, if not a greater, output. That has been the experience in the agricultural industry, particularly with men even at the apparently easy occupation of chipping sugar-cane, who used to work ten and eleven hours a day. When they were restricted to an eight-hour day by legislation, it was found that they did the same work in those eight hours that they had previously done in the ten or eleven hours. That must appeal to hon. members opposite. The men engaged in comparatively light occupations have a long day in front of them. They get fatigued, not only at the end of the first day, but at the commencement of the other days, owing to the excessive hours worked at their occupation. The Government should give further consideration, as we have advocated, to the question of extending that margin to a greater extent, because we find that, apart from the cost of wages and materials, there is this further consideration to be measured, that in the bigger works of the older countries they have not only the best materials at a lesser price, but they have the advantage in standardisation, etc., in connection with the work that they turn out, which are of very great advantage to them in bringing about a considerable reduction in the cost of their output.

Mr. KELSO: Some people are slow with a forty-four-hour week.

Mr. FERRICKS: If the hon. gentleman has followed any occupation in Queensland, he will realise that in years gone by men did not work in those days, but absolutely slaved. I know the time when I was working underground at 10s. per day, and I have heard the hon. member for Bowen speak of days long before mine. That slavery was no good for the men, and it was no good for the nation. I hope that we shall never see our youngsters undergoing what we had to undergo in those days.

Mr. KELSO: I am talking about the present time.

Mr. FERRICKS: There is another thing in connection with encouragement for local industries—which the leader of the Opposition touched upon—which shows what great difficulties are encountered when attempts are made to launch a new industry in Queensland. There is a man living in the Buranda electorate who came from New Zealand after thirty-five years' experience in brushmaking. Coming through Sydney—this is where some of the responsibility must be taken by hon. members opposite—he stated his business intentions to the warehousemen, and they advised him strongly against coming to Queensland. They told him that Queensland had a socialistic, repudiatory, confiscatory Government in power—that the

conditions of labour both in hours and wages were intolerable, and that the best thing he could do was to open in Sydney. However, he said he would see for himself, and came to Brisbane. Rather liking sunny Queensland after the chilly, bleak weather of New Zealand, in his own words, he said, "He would give it a 'go.'" He started in the Buranda electorate, and was going along very well. The houses with which he had come into contact in Sydney were taking his product. There was one line which was a speciality, which they were taking from him at 6s. an article, and were making a good profit by retailing it at 15s. in Sydney. They were taking all that he could make. I am reminded by the quotation by the hon. member for Maryborough yesterday of the preference by many people who shouted patriotism during the war for the German boats which are now coming to Australia. The Sydney importers found that they were in a position, owing to the low currency in Germany which permitted of dumping, even in spite of the anti-dumping legislation, to import brushware and other articles into Australia far cheaper than they could get them from this man in Brisbane. So they promptly demanded—they did not ask him, it was a demand—that he should supply that 6s. article at 3s., notwithstanding that the material—as he showed me from his books—put into that article cost about 2s. 8½d. He decided that it could not be done. He pays higher wages than are provided in the awards. He has no complaint to make regarding the hours or wages or hands. There was no alternative for him but to put out local canvassers, in order to create a demand in Brisbane. He put out a few canvassers at the commencement. At the present time he has about twenty out, and they are earning good money. That man is retailing the article I have mentioned, and it can even be delivered to hon. members' doors if they like at 12s. 6d. each. The hostility of the importing crew does not stop there, because pressure has been brought to bear on some people who are supplying that man with raw materials; and they have been given to understand that it is not altogether a good thing that these industries should be encouraged in our midst. Those are the difficulties which confront people or institutions who endeavour to build up new industries in Queensland. I know of another concrete, glaring instance which has some relation to a Government Department. The hon. member for Normanby was quite right in saying that the Government should give all encouragement to those industries. This case affects a Government Department, but I have not yet made representation to that department—I think I should do that before I dilate upon it here. It just goes to show that it is through no fault of the Government or this party that there is a difficulty in opening new industries in Queensland. There is no doubt that all that opposition comes from vested interest.

Let me now deal with the Budget itself. The Premier must have felt gratified with the reception generally given to his Financial Statement delivered by him in his capacity as Treasurer. The leader of the Opposition delivered a very sympathetic reply. The deputy leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Oxley, was very mildly critical of the Treasurer's Statement. Even the "Courier" seemed to have lost its customary screech when it was mildly condemning the issue of

[Mr. Ferricks,

the Budget. Taking the position all round, the Treasurer should feel very gratified at the reception given to his Budget. I know the deputy leader of the Opposition will plead guilty to the soft impeachment that hardly enough provision has been made with regard to sinking funds for our loans. While not desiring to anticipate the views of the hon. member on the matter, we know that the old system was to pay into the Public Debt Reduction Fund any surpluses from the Treasury whenever they occurred. That is not very effective, but is rather unsatisfactory as a whole, because a fund of that kind is generally at the whim of any necessitous Treasurer. Even if a Treasurer does not avail himself of it, the interest of that fund does not always go to increase the Sinking Fund. On those lines a sinking fund is a slow process; still it is something. The time will come when Queensland will tackle in earnest the creation of a sinking fund in connection with our public debt. If the Treasurer remains in Queensland politics and is the head of this Government, there is no doubt but that he will carry this idea into effect. But at present it is not a sound policy to go in for anything of such a serious nature. I am pleased to see that the Commonwealth Government have made a commencement, but they have only created a sinking fund in regard to liquidating the cost of the war. It is only right that the people of this generation should set about repairing the financial wastage brought about by the war. It will take them a long time to do it. Our public debt, however, has been built up by a totally different process. It has been created by the development of the State and the building of railways and other assets. As time goes on these assets will require renewing or replacing, and the time will arrive to establish a sinking fund in earnest. For some years, while we are proceeding with our big policy of railway construction—extending main lines like the North Coast sections, which are not linked up nor revenue-producing—and with our big land schemes, which are for the purpose of increasing settlement and population, it will be too big a question for our State to tackle; but it will be tackled eventually.

Mr. KELSO: You know that provision is made for a sinking fund in the Government Loans Redemption and Conversion Bill.

Mr. FERRICKS: No, but there is attached to it a provision to establish a $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. sinking fund.

Mr. KELSO: It is provided for in the Bill.

Mr. FERRICKS: Yes, for a $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. sinking fund—it is, perhaps, not a sinking fund, but rather a loan redemption fund. I agree with the hon. member for Maryborough, who said that he anticipated no difficulty in the Treasurer securing the conversion of the loans falling due.

Mr. ROBERTS: Who said that?

Mr. FERRICKS: The hon. member for Maryborough.

Mr. ROBERTS: He is no authority on the question.

Mr. FERRICKS: I do not want to make any comparison between the hon. member for East Toowoomba and the hon. member for Maryborough, because I know in whose favour my decision would go. The Treasurer referred to the fact that, when he was last in England, the financiers there endeavoured

to interfere with the self-governing rights of Queensland. The deputy leader of the Opposition took up the attitude that it is quite right for those people in Great Britain who possess the money to say whether they will lend it to Queensland or not. That is a sentiment with which we all agree. We say that they may loan their money or they may keep it, but they have no justification whatever for making an offer of money on loan conditional on the State legislating in accordance with their views, as seen through their spectacles. If they make an offer conditional on such a thing being done or on such a thing not being done, then I say it is interfering with our self-governing rights.

Mr. GLEDSON: The hon. member for Toowoong has said no delegation has started yet.

Mr. FERRICKS: I anticipate no difficulty on the part of the Treasurer, even though the deputy leader of the Opposition said that it was the business of the people who have the money whether they loan it or not. Of course, it is their business whether they give it or not. It was their business on the last occasion, and they did not give it. The Treasurer was very careful to dissociate the British financier from the British Government. I want to speak quite apart from the Government in this regard. The British Government always likes its pound of flesh when dealing with any of the Dominions or States. I can give no better illustration than that of the Commonwealth in this regard. During the currency of the war the Commonwealth built up a big national debt, which now amounts to £412,000,000, but £364,000,000 of that debt is war expenditure. Of that debt the sum of £127,000,000 was borrowed in Great Britain. That loan was piled up by the following means:—When the Australian soldiers went to the front the Australian Government paid them from the day they left, clothed them and fed them as no other soldier was clothed and fed, and looked after their transport; but it may come as a surprise to hon. members to hear that all the time that the Australian soldiers occupied dug-outs in France, the Australian people, through the British Government, had to pay to France and Belgium rent for those dug-outs. That is how this sum of £127,000,000 was piled up. I made that statement repeatedly in the presence of the Minister for Defence. Australia is still paying interest on that money, and hon. members will remember the time when Mr. Watt visited London with a view to funding that debt. Mr. Watt's mission was to fund the remainder of the £127,000,000, which was a matter of £92,000,000. Mr. Watt took the huff on account of some interference by Mr. Hughes, the then Prime Minister, and returned to Australia. By doing so he missed what, in my opinion, was the chance of his life. The trend of Australian opinion showed that when he returned to Australia, Mr. Hughes was waning in power, and the time was ripe for a change, even amongst the friends of Mr. Hughes. If Mr. Watt had seized that opportunity, he undoubtedly would have been in the position now occupied by Mr. Bruce, whose most ardent admirers admit that he is only a chance Prime Minister. It will be admitted that Mr. Watt went into the corner and sulked. He did not prove himself the big man he was pictured to be, and he belied the pugnacious outline

Mr. Ferricks.]

of his jaw and proved himself not to be a fighter. Senator E. D. Millen proceeded to England in his stead, and he succeeded in funding the remaining £92,000,000 of that debt. As a result Australia has now got to pay interest at the rate of 6 per cent. on those £92,000,000; 5 per cent. is to go to the payment of interest and the extra 1 per cent. is to be applied to a sinking fund to wipe out the £92,000,000 over a period of thirty-five years, which will end in 1956. Not long after that Great Britain, after making this agreement with Senator E. D. Millen, funded her own loans with America, and the rate of interest was 3½ per cent.

[8 p.m.]

Mr. TAYLOR: A big fall had taken place in the interval.

Mr. FERRICKS: Yes, but the big fall has not yet come to Australia. The money that Great Britain obtained from America is now charged to Australia at the rate of 5 per cent., meaning an added interest to the Australian people of about £135,000 every year. If Mr. Bruce has a scintilla of regard to the interests of Australia, he will not only demand a reduction of that interest from 5 per cent. to 3½ per cent., making 4½ per cent. including the Sinking Fund, but he will also demand a refund of the excess payments.

Hon. members opposite have expressed pleasure, in which I join, at the decision of the respective Governments in Australia to bring about the cessation of the practice of issuing tax-free loans. Even our Press agrees that the system of tax-free loans is not right.

Mr. SIZER: I raised that question myself four years ago, and I suggested that the Government should stop the practice.

Mr. FERRICKS: I will go back a little more than four years. I admit that there has been a big change of public opinion on this question and that there has been a big change in the attitude of Labour. Eight years ago our present Attorney-General, Mr. Mullan, in the 1915 Federal Parliament, moved an amendment protesting against the interest on the Commonwealth loans being free from income tax.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FERRICKS: He pointed out rightly, conclusively, and irrefutably that freedom from income tax of the interest on these loans benefited only the large investors.

Mr. SIZER: That was my argument.

Mr. TAYLOR: It did not take America long to find that out.

Mr. FERRICKS: It went on a good while in Australia, but the big investor, owing to the incidence of income taxation and the higher rates which applied to the interest added to his income, saw that the matter was of serious moment to him but was of no concern to the small investor. Mr. Mullan pointed that out at the time in the Senate. There were thirty-one members out of thirty-six present at the time, and out of the thirty-one only four supported the motion, including Mr. Mullan. The four who supported the motion eight years ago were described as Bolsheviks, disloyalists, traitors, and God knows what.

Mr. TAYLOR: We did not know what a Bolshevik was eight years ago.

Mr. FERRICKS: Sinn Feiners, then. (Laughter.) Nevertheless this system was

[Mr. Ferricks.

maintained for the first six war loans until a debt of £138,000,000 had accumulated. The last war loan under those conditions was in 1918, when it was contended by those advocating the system in their own interests that, if they did not get an exemption from income tax, a higher rate of interest would be demanded. Those who opposed this freedom from income taxation pointed out that it was altogether unfair that these wealthy people who had been urging men to go to the war and make the great sacrifice should refuse to lend money at 4½ per cent. unless it was built up to 5½ per cent. or 6 per cent. They succeeded in getting £138,000,000 of their money planted there safely screened, and, when they were safely placed, they calmly turned round and advocated this policy.

Mr. SIZER: When one of the Loan Bills passed through the House I moved an amendment to prevent this Government doing the same thing.

Mr. FERRICKS: The Commonwealth Government had been borrowing all the money by that system, and it would have been disastrous for the Queensland Government to float a loan except under the same conditions as the Commonwealth. Altogether in State and Commonwealth loans there is invested the sum of £350,000,000, the interest of which is free of taxation. The Federal Treasurer estimates that the income tax that is lost amounts to about £2,000,000 per annum. In my opinion, the Federal Treasurer is excessively modest in putting down the sum of £2,000,000, considering that the huge bulk of the interest is paid to the large depositors. Anyhow, I—like the hon. member for Sandgate—am pleased to see that the perniciousness of this principle has been recognised, even eight years after the question was raised by the present Attorney-General.

I feel regretful that the Treasurer has not been in a position to give the House some indication of what is transpiring in regard to the agreement between the Commonwealth and the States on financial matters. I know, of course, that after the Premiers' Conference it was given out by the Prime Minister that an arrangement had been come to. We know that the Premiers' Conference at best, as it has operated during the last ten years, amounts to nothing more than a fungus that has attached itself to Australian national life. It is a super-tribunal which sets out lines to be followed by the State and Commonwealth Parliaments. While the State Parliaments have not much cause to complain, it is an entirely different matter from the Commonwealth point of view. However, if anything has been achieved this year, it will be the first achievement of a Premiers' Conference. It has been given out that the Commonwealth Government intend to vacate the field of income taxation. I think they can well afford to do that. With the Customs revenue of about £32,000,000 they have all the taxation—indirect unfortunately—that they can reasonably expect to have. They could well have gone further and have handed over to the States company taxation too. However, it is something to see that this much has been done. In my opinion, that has not been done without a purpose.

It is quite interesting to review the history of the financial relations between the States and the Commonwealth over a period of years, and I have always been strongly of

the opinion that, when the Commonwealth went into taxation, it did so with a purpose. I am of the opinion also that Mr. Fisher, who was then Prime Minister, never had great sympathy with the entry of the Commonwealth Parliament into the field of taxation. Mr. Fisher had a great leaning to what he was pleased to call "The rights of the States." Whatever faults Mr. Hughes may have, nobody can deny the fact that he is a "whole hogger" Federalist. In my opinion the Commonwealth Government entered the field of income taxation so that they would have something to hand to the State Governments when they were abolishing the per capita arrangement. The per capita arrangement had continued for a number of years with more or less success, but it appeared to me that the then Australian Prime Minister did not have any sympathy with the idea of the Commonwealth entering that field of taxation.

Mr. KELSO: Do you favour a retention of the per capita system?

Mr. FERRICKS: No. I think the hon. member must realise that the per capita system was all right in respect of the allowance made by the Commonwealth.

Mr. TAYLOR: Why do you say the Commonwealth entered the field of income taxation with the object of providing something to take the place of the per capita basis if the then Prime Minister was not in sympathy with it?

Mr. FERRICKS: Strange to say, the then Prime Minister did not introduce the Bill although he was Treasurer. When Mr. Fisher gave sympathetic treatment to the States under his 1910 Surplus Revenue Act he was wholly in command. He was Prime Minister not only in name but he was in command completely. But the other little gentleman afterwards got to work and did work with a certain amount of underground engineering until he had virtually displaced Mr. Fisher from the Prime Ministership, and it is very significant that the Income Tax Assessment Bill was introduced into the Federal Parliament in September, 1915, and Mr. Fisher resigned in October, 1915. Personally, I do not think Mr. Fisher had any sympathy with the idea, but Mr. Hughes, foreseeing this and realising that the Federal Government must have something to hand to the State Governments when they did away with the per capita system, favoured the system very strongly and ultimately brought it about. If the Premiers' Conference made an agreement with the Prime Minister for a period of five years, there is nothing to prohibit the Federal Government afterwards entering the field of income taxation again, although I do not think such a proceeding would be very popularly received. But this I do say: that the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth kept back the company taxation so that at the end of five years he would have something to hand to the States.

Mr. KERR: Do you think Queensland was better off under the Surplus Revenue Act of 1910 than under the Braddon section of the Commonwealth Constitution?

Mr. FERRICKS: The position is much the same. Time will not permit me to go into the Braddon section, but under that section three-fourths of the customs and excise revenue was returned to the States.

Mr. KERR: We have lost nearly £1,000,000 per annum in Queensland.

Mr. FERRICKS: The State Treasurers in those days made names for themselves as Treasurers because they got that extra revenue, with the result that they had huge surpluses, and built up their reputations accordingly. I think it has dawned upon hon. members and upon the community generally that, since the commitments of the Commonwealth have become so great, quite apart from the war expenditure, the abolition of the per capita system is inevitable, and this Parliament would do the right thing in grappling with the situation which now devolves upon it. Queensland is in a better position with respect to the terms than any of the other States for this reason—that the incidence of income tax in Queensland is more just to the majority of the people. It is one-sided in many of the other States, with the result that the other State Governments, if they resort to increasing taxation, will have to hit some of their own friends. In illustration of what I mean, I would point out that a person earning £200 in salary or wages a year would pay this income tax in the various States—

	£	s.	d.
Queensland	Nil.		
South Australia	1	6	0
Western Australia	2	3	4
Tasmania	2	18	8

A person earning £4 a week—that is, £208 a year, would pay in income tax—

	£	s.	d.
Queensland	0	5	0
South Australia	1	10	0
Western Australia	2	5	0
Tasmania	3	0	0
Victoria	0	14	6

So hon. members will see that Queensland is in a much more favoured position, owing to the more just incidence of its taxation, to accept this agreement than the other States mentioned. That is why we see the opposition from the Premiers of South Australia, Western Australia, and Tasmania particularly, because, if they have to depend upon income taxation as a result of the abolition of the per capita system, then they will have to hit some of their own friends because they cannot put any more on the man underneath; and conservative little Tasmania will be driven, in the absence of more special advances from the Commonwealth, to her most dreaded fear—that is, the imposition of a land tax, which should have been imposed years ago and which would have been for the benefit of that State. So that we see that these conditions, while they may be a bit irksome for State Premiers for the time being, should be reviewed from a national aspect, and I feel quite sure that the Treasurer, in his capacity as Premier, will view these questions from the Australian standpoint. I feel quite sure that he will agree that a change must come when the States of Australia will undergo a devolution with a lesser expenditure and a lesser responsibility.

There are one or two other matters to which I desire to refer, but realising that these, to me, are of paramount importance, and believing that they are of some interest, I thought I would briefly present my views regarding the things at present under observation. I was particularly pleased during the discussion to hear the opinions expressed by hon. members on the other side as to the wrong attitude now being adopted by many

Mr. Ferricks.]

people and by the daily papers in the endeavour to create an atmosphere favourable for bringing about another war. It is too bad when, at the present time the tears of bereaved widows, mothers, and sisters are hardly dry, when crippled soldiers are out of work and impecunious, that we should have people who are so qucerly constituted that they seize every opportunity to ventilate their opinions—their desires almost—although they are not expressed as desires—on this question. In the last short session of the Nationalist Parliament hardly anything was talked about except the next war, and this is given undue publicity under glaring headlines in the Press. Were we not told that the last war—the world war—was a war to end all wars—that there were to be no more wars; and yet we have endeavours being made to build up public opinion to be ready for the next war? While aspersions may be cast on the Queensland Government for having gone to America, or for having accepted a loan from America when Great Britain refused to grant a loan, we owe a debt of gratitude to America from another aspect. It was due to the intervention—the subterranean intervention, if you like—of America that the second war which had been virtually declared by Mr. Lloyd George, and actively supported, so far as Australia was concerned, by Mr. Hughes just prior to the last Federal elections—it was owing to the intervention of America, not on the surface, but underneath, and through the financial pressure that the Lausanne treaty was made and that the world was not thrown into another turmoil to decide who should hold the oil wells in Mesopotamia. No public man or public institution or journal should be given the least encouragement to proceed on those lines. It is time that Australia and the world should devote all their energies, not to the promotion of war, but to the promotion and prosecution of peace. Australia does not want another war, and the world does not want another war. The workers do not want one, and should not take part in it if it comes. As I said during the height of the war, when I was before the electors seeking their votes, I would ask those who want war to go and fight in it themselves, and then there would not be any more war.

HON. J. G. APPEL (*Albert*): After listening to the fulminations of hon. members opposite, I almost came to the conclusion that members of the Opposition who have criticised the administration of the Government were really not justified in doing so; in fact, I almost came to the conclusion that there are a shocking lot of men sitting on this side—men who have no interest in their fellows, and who are absolutely bound up with profiters and those who seek to sweat their fellow men. I had almost decided not to speak in this debate, but those fulminations caused me to seek to discover whether there was any justification on the part of Opposition members for their criticism. I decided not to consult what hon. members on the Government benches term the columns of the capitalistic Press, as I thought it would be far better to discover what the feeling of any paper which supported the present Administration was on the subject, and in my search I came upon the "Patriot," a paper which has consistently supported the present Administration for many years, and whose proprietor and editor is a man who has been trusted by the Labour movement.

[*Mr. Ferricks.*

In its issue of 12th August last I find the following article:—

"TALKING DOWN TO THE PUBLIC.

"The underlying vice of politics consists in playing the game on too low a standard. What we really lack is faith in the willingness of the people to follow a bold and determined programme.

"Politicians and newspapers are talking down to the public. They are telling the voters what they think the voters would like to hear. They are thinking and saying one thing in private; they are printing and saying another thing in public. There never has been a time in this generation when there was a greater contrast between what the insiders say and what the outsiders are allowed to hear.

"The insiders have got into the habit of regarding the public as a sort of dangerous baby, which has to be kept in a good humour by a diet of predigested half-truths and lies.

"Because this habit of not telling the truth exists, the people have never been allowed to hear what their leaders really think about the real position of things as they exist at present.

"As for Labour leaders, such as we have had in the past—with the exception of T. J. Ryan—they have been singularly wanting in the qualities of true statesmanship. They recognised evils which their class suffered under, and the only remedies they could suggest were shorter hours, better pay, and control of the public purse, which would enable them to subsidise industries sufficient to pay the basic wage; and yet they advocate the cessation of public borrowing, especially from 'Isaac Bull'; but when they got into power they repudiated that plank in their platform and supported it with another which said 'for reproductive works only'; and when 'Isaac Bull' looked at their performance after seven years of government and turned a deaf ear to their requests for more money, they cursed him for being a usurious money-lender, and turned to Uncle Sam for relief, which was granted, much to the relief of a party that still desired to pose as an example for other countries to follow. Those leaders talked down to the people and are still talking down.

"The habit of misleading the public by talking down to it is reinforced by unworthy fears. Leaders of thought and action tremble at words; many of them hesitate to tell the truth about economic principles for fear that some silly ass will bray the word 'Renegade' at them; and many of them are afraid to call their souls their own through fear of losing their jobs.

"What is wanted in Australian politics to-day are leaders of thought and action, who will not tremble at the thought of losing their jobs or positions when straight talk is demanded of them; not party allegiance men, who will talk up, not down, and immune to fears of being deposed by ambitious rivals—such as we see in our Federal Parliament to-day—and invincible to social or blatant pressure, and loyal to traditions of British

honesty, for if there is one thing that should make us proud of the old country it is this: She has never been known to 'scale' or repudiate her just obligations in the world of commercialism.

"Politicians will make mistakes—such are unavoidable; but they should not play a double game, and if wealth is anathema to their supporters, to whom they owe their positions, they should either discard their wealth or their positions.

"The politicians and the leaders of thought who cater to the different parties now in existence may clutch their jobs and their successes. These are empty things and transient things, leading nowhere in the end. But direct and honest speaking, judged not by the temporary ups and downs of popularity but by the longer consequences, leads to the kind of confidence on which real leadership in action and opinion rests."

At 8.28 p.m.,

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

HON. J. G. APPEL: Having read that, I decided to pursue the matter further in the columns of that paper, which, as I have already observed, has been a consistent supporter of the Labour movement. I find that on 26th August last another article appeared—

"Curses, like chickens, come home to roost. That is how the Government feels the falling due of £25,000,000 of loan money.

"The only solace for a defeated Opposition is to sit and grin and bear it, or to indulge in disorderly conduct that one might expect from a corrobberie of blackfellows.

"In the Federal House, Labourites are squealing at being subjected to the gag; while in the local House, they laugh as they apply it.

Then again I read further on—

"Thanks to an increase of something like £127,000 in taxation, £87,156 in land returns, £100,320 in the railways and sundry other things, Queensland only shows a deficit of £184,979 for the year instead of an estimated half a million. Hurrah! We shall soon be able to live on the interest of what we owe.

"From State enterprises there was a revenue of £881,657, against an expenditure of £1,034,881. Frenzied finance!

"Mr. Theodore considers that the handing over of the State Government Savings Bank to the Federal Government, was a fine stroke of business. Mr. Barnes says 'No!' To us it looks like a piece of insanity turning up creditors who loan us money at 5½ per cent. and borrowing at 5½ per cent. and perhaps 7 per cent.

"If employees' control means what we see in their representatives' control of the public purse, then we know where we are. No increase in expenditure is opposed by the party in the matter of allowances to members, and no curbing of extravagance in the shape of joy trips. It is nothing but an orgy of

spending; and while the money lasts the present system of government will last. And to the disgrace of the Opposition, its condemnation of same is only lukewarm. It might be interesting to our readers to know that when an increase of wages was introduced into the Lower House during the term of the last Government, Opposition members who opposed it earwigged Legislative Councilors to let the Bill pass.

"A great State! Last year the revenue of Queensland was £12,599,403, and the expenditure was £12,784,382.

"Next year Mr. Theodore expects to make revenue and expenditure meet by the imposition of a tax on bookmakers. Punters view the position with dismay.

"Why not an afternoon tea tax? This would be a national service in nipping a lot of scandal in the bud.

After perusing the columns of that paper, which has been such a consistent supporter of the present Administration, I concluded that the Opposition were absolutely justified in criticising the administration and legislation of the Government.

I quite realise the feelings of the leader of the Government when he penned the opening remarks of his Financial Statement—

"Few people, and certainly not those who understand anything about public finance, will envy the Treasurer his position at the present time."

I can have sympathy with the hon. gentleman in the position in which he finds himself to-day, for he has to deal, not with the taxpayers of the State of Queensland, but with persons whom he cannot dominate and who have loaned the State the funds which have enabled it to carry out its many public works. I am one of those who are of opinion that any member of the community who belittles

the State, or who will endeavour [8.30 p.m.] to hamper the leader of the Government when he is attempting to make the best terms he can for the renewal of those loans, is a traitor to the State. Whilst as a member of the Opposition I may from my own standpoint criticise the administration and legislation of the Labour party who at present control the affairs of the State, I say that every member of the community should do his utmost to preserve the fair name and credit of the State, and, despite what he may consider absolute extravagance and misuse of public funds, he should endeavour to do everything in his power to see that the Government are upheld and that the application which the hon. gentleman is about to make in the old country is a success.

There is one point to which I would like particularly to draw the hon. gentleman's attention. He speaks about the embarrassment which has been caused by the fact that these large loans fall due within such a short period. It is quite possible that the Treasurer of the day in which they were arranged was in the same position in which the hon. gentleman will find himself when he attempts to renew them, because he will have to act under the advice of the financial advisers of the Government; and possibly some future Treasurer will find himself in a similar position to that of the hon. gentleman, although perhaps not so favourable, because although these loans were floated at under par, they were floated at a very low rate of

Hon. J. G. Appel.]

interest—which, unfortunately, we cannot obtain upon their renewal.

The hon. gentleman and others who have spoken on the Government side pride themselves on the fact that the deficit, instead of the estimated amount of £576,240, has amounted to only £184,979. I confess that I cannot follow the hon. gentleman or anybody else who has professed to regard with satisfaction that result of the year's operations. I would like to draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that the deficit on the operations of the State enterprises for the year amounts to no less than £203,224, or actually £18,245 more than is disclosed by the Financial Statement as the deficit in the ordinary accounts. In common with other members of the Opposition, I have protested from time to time against the advisability of any Government embarking upon trading operations, because they are opposed to the opinions of all political economists, and whenever they have been attempted they have resulted in loss and failure. Certain undertakings, such as great public utilities like our railways, can be more effectively carried out in a State such as Queensland by the Government, but to undertake the business of cattle stations is ridiculous. They are not a public utility. It is one of the most hazardous undertakings, as has been proved from time to time, in which anyone can embark. It has, in fact, been proved by the actual results of the State stations undertaking of the present Administration.

Mr. KELSO: What about the fish shops? You do not like to talk about them.

HON. J. G. APPEL: I do not; one is an example of them all. Here we had the State in the first instance embarking a large amount of capital—at first without parliamentary sanction—in an undertaking in the face of the protests of the Opposition, and I have no doubt against their own judgment in some instances, and in the result we find that those protests and the advice then given have been amply justified.

The unfortunate part is that the capital which has been invested in these trading enterprises would have turned the deficit into a surplus of £18,245. I notice in connection with the expenditure that a saving was effected in the votes granted to the Department of Public Works and Department of Public Instruction. That is a fact which we all deplore. Different speakers—I am glad to say some from the Government benches—have spoken about the urgent necessity for the construction of schools in our country districts. We find to-day in many instances that development and settlement in our country districts is delayed and retarded owing to the fact that it is impossible to obtain schools. As has been pointed out by different speakers, the Department of Public Instruction and the hon. gentleman administering that department are invariably sympathetic to the requests of those who desire this necessary accommodation for the sake of the children; but, unfortunately, one or two years may elapse after the approval for the erection of a school before that school is erected. Even in the district which I represent, owing to the nature and the natural features of the country, settlement is retarded and delayed because of the impossibility of getting schools in the different sections of the electorate. That applies to many other electorates. I would like to impress upon the hon. gentleman who controls the public

purse that it lies entirely with him to say whether a sufficient amount of money shall be provided for these necessary works or not. There are schools in the Logan portion of the Albert electorate which were constructed fifty years ago. They were constructed to meet the requirements of those days, and they were considered proper buildings as schools in those days. To-day they are out-of-date. They are insanitary, and the lighting is such that it has affected the eyesight of the children. The buildings are absolutely unsuitable for present-day requirements.

The TREASURER: The schools are in a better condition now than when you were in the Administration.

HON. J. G. APPEL: The hon. gentleman is absolutely incorrect when he says that, and it is just as well, in view of that statement, to point out that, when the Government claim that they have spent more on the erection of schools than any other Administration, that the cost of construction has been increased owing to the conditions under which those schools are constructed. It is absolutely incorrect for the Government to claim that they have constructed more schools. I admit that they have spent more on the construction of schools, but the construction of one school now costs as much as the cost of erecting three schools in 1914. That is due to the Government's method of carrying out the work.

Mr. HARTLEY: We have built four schools where you built one in 1914.

HON. J. G. APPEL: That does not apply so far as my electorate is concerned.

Mr. HARTLEY: You want a school near every cow-bail.

HON. J. G. APPEL: That possibly applies in electorates represented by Government members, but, unfortunately, it does not apply in connection with electorates represented by the Opposition. Why should the children in the electorates represented by members of the Opposition be penalised because they are represented by members of the Opposition?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Do you suggest that they are penalised?

HON. J. G. APPEL: I hope they are not; I ask why they should be.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I say that they are not. The children in the electorates represented by Opposition members have more need of schools. (Government laughter.)

HON. J. G. APPEL: I cannot follow the hon. gentleman in that, because the electorates represented by Government members contain a smaller population than the electorates represented by members on this side. There are electorates represented by hon. members opposite which contain only 4,000 people. I do not know of any electorate represented by hon. members on this side in which the population does not exceed 8,000. I consider that the argument of the hon. gentleman, if it is an argument, is absolutely founded on a false basis.

The TREASURER: Do you not see the necessity for greater enlightenment in Opposition electorates? (Government laughter.)

HON. J. G. APPEL: I think there is considerably more necessity for greater enlightenment in the electorates represented by Government members. Whenever hon. members

[Hon. J. G. Appel.]

on this side plead the necessities of the children they are met with these cheap jibes that have fallen not only from members of the front Government bench but also from the lips of other Government members. I appeal once more to the Treasurer to attend to this urgent work in connection with the construction of new schools and in the remodelling and rebuilding of the old schools in my electorate and others that I have indicated. I appeal to the Treasurer as leader of the Government, and to the Secretary for Public Works, who has charge of the administration in connection with the erection of schools, the former to make available the necessary funds, and the latter to see that the schools, that are approved of by the Department of Public Instruction, not only in my district but in all other country districts, are carried out at the earliest opportunity.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: My department is spending more money in your electorate than in any other five electorates.

HON. J. G. APPEL: You are making a very good profit out of it.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: No.

HON. J. G. APPEL: You are getting profit that the department knew nothing about and which I brought under its notice in connection with that particular land.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I do not refer to that particular job; I refer to other jobs.

HON. J. G. APPEL: Which other jobs?

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Road jobs.

HON. J. G. APPEL: I hope that is so.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I say that we are spending more money in your electorate than in any other five electorates in Queensland.

HON. J. G. APPEL: Through the Main Roads Board.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Out of the Commonwealth grant. What are you growling about?

HON. J. G. APPEL: I am very glad to hear that, and I thank the hon. gentleman for coming to the assistance of the local authorities who have made these requests and in whose areas these works are urgently required.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It shows that the Government are not actuated by a desire to spend money only in electorates represented by Government members.

HON. J. G. APPEL: I am not suggesting that, but urge that there should be no discrimination.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You did a few minutes ago.

HON. J. G. APPEL: I said I hoped that it was not so. On the assurance that the hon. gentleman has given, and if I can get some schools constructed which have been approved, I shall be perfectly satisfied that it is not the intention of the Government to spend all the money in electorates represented by hon. members opposite. I am only pleading that consideration be given, because I take it that the leader of the Government is naturally desirous of seeing settlement in our country districts. He knows as well as I do that the lack of school accommodation has in many instances retarded such settlement. I am simply pleading for those settlers and

for those children to whom it is so necessary that educational facilities should be afforded. The Treasurer states that savings have been effected in several departments, and one saving effected is in connection with the subsidy paid to the Ambulance Brigade. It is to be regretted that the Treasurer has found it necessary to decrease the subsidy paid to the Ambulance Brigade, because, in our country districts, the ambulance has done great work indeed so far as the selectors are concerned, especially those who are living far away from railway communication, in many places in almost inaccessible situations. The knowledge of the existence of the Ambulance Brigade has been a matter of great moment and comfort to them. The work that has been carried out efficiently by the brigade in every centre of the State justifies an increase rather than a decrease in the subsidy.

HON. F. T. BRENNAN: If they have all they want, why give them more?

HON. J. G. APPEL: That is the same old answer that is always given by the present Government.

HON. F. T. BRENNAN: The hospitals want money more than the Ambulance Brigade.

HON. J. G. APPEL: The hon. gentleman has always claimed for his Government and party that they, above all other things, consider the interests of the poorer members of the community.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. F. T. BRENNAN: The hospitals want money more than they do.

HON. J. G. APPEL: Then the hon. gentleman does not propose to do what is necessary for the hospitals.

HON. F. T. BRENNAN: Yes.

HON. J. G. APPEL: When the present Administration were in opposition, the hospitals and schools were always kept up to date, but they criticised the Government of the day and said they did not do enough. They were sent to the Treasury benches, according to their own showing, to do better than was ever done before, yet they have not done so.

HON. F. T. BRENNAN: Look at the conditions of the nurses as an example.

HON. J. G. APPEL: You have also effected savings in the Police Force and in the staff of the prisons. The hospitals are understaffed; the police and prison services are undermanned.

HON. F. T. BRENNAN: There are less criminals about.

HON. J. G. APPEL: The Government were sent there, on their own showing, to see that such savings should not take place. The line of argument adopted by the hon. gentleman does not appeal to me. I cannot see the reason why, in connection with these matters where the health and comfort of the poorer and humbler members of the community are concerned, this economy should be practised. The Government have always claimed that they are above every other Administration, in the care of that class representing the workers and humbler members of the community, yet, when a reduction is to be made, that is the class which suffers. I can only regret it, and hope wiser counsels will prevail.

The Treasurer speaks in connection with the Loan Fund of the amount of money invested over the counter in connection with the issue of debentures. While I am glad to

Hon. J. G. Appel,]

see evidence of confidence in the State, it is not a good thing that such a large amount of capital should be withdrawn from the commerce, business, and industry of the State and so invested, because with our limited population it naturally follows, when such an amount of money is invested in a State loan free of taxation, that money is withdrawn from our industries and business and from the business of the State. The policy of the present Administration has resulted in the building up of large monopolistic concerns, the wiping out of the smaller business man, and the throwing of the whole of the business into the hands of the larger concerns, which are able to obtain large capital. If we take Brisbane, for instance, we find evidence of that. The smaller man with a staff of two or three is disappearing, and has disappeared in many instances. We find large concerns, with a large amount of capital, building up story on story, and increasing their stocks. The whole of the business is being centred in the larger concerns, with the result that the opportunity is being taken from a large number of smaller men of rising from the ranks. That is a fact to be deplored. The effect of the State enterprises has been to shut up a large number of the smaller concerns which could not carry on business in competition with the State. Many men who otherwise would have every opportunity of improving their position, eventually becoming able to carry on business on a larger scale, are to-day simply acting as assistants in those large concerns in which the whole of the business in different lines is being centred. It is a matter to be deplored, more especially when it is the effect of the administration and the legislation of a party who, above all others, claim not to represent the wealthy and the monopolist, but the humbler portion of the community. I have no hesitation in saying that by this administration and legislation they are building up those large monopolistic concerns which to-day we have in evidence in nine, and probably very shortly twelve-storied, buildings in Brisbane.

There is a lack of breadth in connection with the provisions of obtaining advances under the State Advances Corporation Act. I will cite a case which I desire to bring under the notice of the leader of the Government. It is a case that occurred on the Currumbin. A company was registered in Queensland, with its office in Queensland, and its shareholders residing in New South Wales, for the purpose of cutting up and selling an area of land on the Upper Currumbin, which was purchased on time-payment by a number of small men, with the object of putting it under banana and fruit cultivation.

At 9 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Kirwan, *Brisbane*) resumed the chair.

HON. J. G. APPEL: They cleared and planted the land and made other improvements. They now find that there is no possibility of their obtaining titles from the vendors. Inquiry shows that the vendors, a public company, have gone into liquidation, and that the property is held by one of the banks in New South Wales for advances made. These unfortunate men, owing to the smallness of their holdings and to the fact that they are unable to obtain their titles from the bank in New South Wales, are unable to obtain advances from the State Advances Corporation, and they do not know where to

HON. F. T. BRENNAN: It is an Australian bank. Won't it give them a chance?

HON. J. G. APPEL: That is what I am endeavouring to arrange. There should be a broadening in connection with our own State Advances Corporation whereby a matter like this could be dealt with and settlers like this could be benefited and allowed to get their living. The settling of these small areas of land is going to solve our problem of land settlement, and people should be able to obtain assistance from the Government, and should not have to crawl round and appeal to a monetary institution. I desire to bring this under the notice of the present Administration. Possibly any big man would receive assistance from the State, but because these men are small men they are left destitute. I am pleading—not accusing the Administration—that they should broaden the provisions governing advances, so that in a case of this kind these unfortunate men will be able to go to the State and obtain the necessary assistance to enable them to secure these holdings on which they have settled, and which they probably stand to lose if no assistance is forthcoming. What better settlers can we have than those on the land?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Was not the slump in prices responsible for this distress?

HON. J. G. APPEL: I know that the Secretary for Agriculture is always sympathetic to the small man; I am indebted to his services in finding water for the small settlers in my district. The fact that these holdings are so small and that these men have not their titles is the bar which stands in the way of their getting advances from the State.

Dealing with the question of immigration, we all admit that it is absolutely necessary that this great State of ours should be increased in population; but I trust that the Premier will use the greatest discrimination in choosing the persons he brings here so that we shall not bring in men to compete in trades which are already overcrowded, but men who are prepared to go immediately on the land.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Hear, hear!

HON. J. G. APPEL: We do not want to add to the congestion of our cities and centres of population. We want men who will go directly to the land and start operations. In this connection I wish to draw attention to the following report which appeared in the "Courier" this morning:—

"A TOUGH LOT.

"IMMIGRANTS WITH A BAD NAME.

"What the 'Hobson's Bay' is Bringing.

"Perth, 27th August.

"Some of the passengers by the 'Hobson's Bay,' which arrived here yesterday, are a strange-looking crowd disguised as immigrants. Respectable passengers say these creatures had most dirty habits, deplorable table manners, and generally must have been 'dragged up' from birth. There had been an unprecedented amount of thieving on board the 'Hobson's Bay' during the voyage, and, rightly or wrongly, this particular contingent got the full credit for it. This morning a number of them had black eyes, evidently having had a free fight last night before becoming Australians. At Colombo several were arrested on charges of stealing from the natives, and it is believed that the captain paid the fines. None of

{Hon. J. G. Appel.

them were for Western Australia, and local shore officials heaved a heavy sigh of relief on learning the fact that Queensland will have its hands full for the while, as some of them intend to land at Brisbane."

I take it that that is not the type of immigrant or settler who will be of any benefit to our community. I urge the Premier to see that whoever is responsible for the selection of immigrants of this class will take care that in future a different type is selected—a type prepared to go on the land and assist in the development of the State. Reference has been made by different speakers to our railways. I have always contended that our railways should, as far as possible, outside of the question of policy, be left entirely under the administration of whoever may be appointed for that purpose; that no political interference should take place, and that such head should be permitted to have the full control and management of the railways. I admit that what fell from the lips of the hon. member for Bremer this afternoon was a disagreeable surprise to me, and, I take it, to hon. members on both sides of the House. I refer to the statements he made as to the way operations are being conducted in our railway workshops. I take it that, coming from a supporter of the Government, due weight will be placed upon those statements. Possibly, had they come from members of the Opposition they would have been discountenanced. I regret very much indeed to hear them, because, if the business is conducted in that way, it is certainly not to the advantage of the department or of the State. It has been stated that the condition of the primary producers in connection with the carrying of their produce is better now than it was under the previous Administration, but there is one thing I should certainly like to have an explanation upon. I find in the last report of the Commissioner for Railways, on page 215, that in the year 1913-1914 the amount of produce, including sugar-cane, carried by the Railway Department totalled 830,738 tons, and the freight revenue which was received on account of that produce amounted to £244,890, or an average rate of 5s. 11d. per ton. I looked this matter up, in view of the fact that hon. members sitting on the Government side of the House had stated that no increase in freights had been made in connection with primary produce.

The TREASURER: No increase since when?

HON. J. G. APPEL: Since they came into power, or only a small increase.

The TREASURER: That statement has not been made from this side—a smaller increase than in the other States.

HON. J. G. APPEL: I wanted to ascertain what the increase was. I followed the thing out, and I found that for the year 1920-1921 the amount of produce carried, including sugar-cane, totalled 843,925 tons, and the freight charged and received by the Railway Department amounted to £421,912, or an average rate of 9s. 11d. per ton.

The TREASURER: There may have been a longer haulage in that year.

HON. J. G. APPEL: That is an increase of 4s. per ton—nearly double—since the present Administration came into power.

The TREASURER: What is the use of those figures without taking the average haulage?

HON. J. G. APPEL: I give the figures in the Commissioner's report.

The TREASURER: In the last year the average haulage may have been much greater than in the first year.

HON. J. G. APPEL: I cannot go outside the report. The Commissioner averages the whole, and that is how it works out. Under the previous Administration the average rate was 5s. 11d. per ton, while under the present Administration, who claim they have made but a slight increase, the average rate is 9s. 11d. per ton, or 4s. per ton increase.

The TREASURER: The Commissioner also gives the percentage increase.

HON. J. G. APPEL: Strange to say, he did not give it in the last instance.

The TREASURER: He gives it in his report.

HON. J. G. APPEL: Apparently he did not feel sufficiently proud of the large increase.

The TREASURER: What is the hon. member's assertion—that there has been a 50 per cent. increase?

HON. J. G. APPEL: I say that is the average increase, according to the Commissioner's report.

The TREASURER: You must take the average haul.

HON. J. G. APPEL: All I know is that the train miles run in the year 1913-1914 totalled 11,346,354, while in 1920-1921 the train miles run amounted to 10,735,723, or a decrease of 610,611 miles.

The TREASURER: That is not all agricultural produce.

HON. J. G. APPEL: There is really a decrease in the train miles run, but an increase in the freight rate of 4s. per ton.

The TREASURER: The hon. member should get the average rate charged to-day, as compared with the rate charged in 1914. Supposing there were 500,000 tons of cane hauled 50 miles further than in 1914, that would affect the average.

HON. J. G. APPEL: I would be very glad if the hon. gentleman could show that the difference has arisen in that way. I am taking the figures as they appear in the report, and we cannot get away from the fact that the average increase since the present Administration have been in power is 4s. per ton.

The TREASURER: Not a less haulage. The train miles include passenger trains.

HON. J. G. APPEL: We cannot get away from those figures, which amount to this—that the men who grew this produce have had to pay 4s. per ton more than they paid when the previous Administration were in power.

The TREASURER: I defy you to show or prove that we have charged 4s. per ton more on any kind of agricultural produce.

HON. J. G. APPEL: We can only take the average. The Treasurer may try as much as he likes to discount these figures, but they are the figures given by the Commissioner for Railways.

There is another matter to which I would like to draw attention. We hear a great deal about what the present Administration have done in connection with the construction of railways; but, after all is said and done, what have they done? They have been carrying out a policy which was laid

Hon. J. G. Appel.]

down by the previous Administration. How does their construction of railways compare with the construction of railways under the previous Administration? Taking the report of the Commissioner for Railways once more, we find that in the year 1913-14 there were new sections of railways open for traffic amounting to 287 miles, while in the year 1920-21 there were new sections opened amounting to 67 miles. That is the great increase in construction of railways by the present Administration that we hear so much about. I am quite willing, as I have indicated on different occasions, to give any Administration full credit for what they are doing for the benefit of the community and for the advancement of the State. But in reply to hon. members who go round and claim credit for all that has been done, I ask this: Who established the University of Queensland? Who built the Technical College in the grounds adjoining Parliament House? Who carried out and constructed the many great scholastic buildings in the State?

The HOME SECRETARY: We did it. (Laughter.)

HON. J. G. APPEL: At one centre in my electorate I was handed a list of enactments which it was stated had been brought in by the present Administration. They went back for a period of twenty years, and amongst them was nearly every measure that I had introduced myself. It appeared as if no Administration prior to the present Government had done anything for the community—had done nothing for suffering humanity. All I can say is that, on the same ratio, the present Administration are doing less than past Administrations, and I am sorry for it.

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

Mr. WINSTANLEY (*Queenton*): It is quite evident the hon. member who has just resumed his seat would not have had anything to criticise the Government about had it not been for the fact that he has been reading the "Patriot"; and, had he not read the two articles from it, even the minor criticism we have had from him to-night would have been impaired. If what we have listened to during the present debate is the most severe criticism that can be urged against the present Government, no one need lose any sleep on that account. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate, and it seems to me that, instead of criticising the administration of the Government, quite a number of hon. members opposite have been endeavouring to try to convince the public that, instead of being in opposition, they ought to be on the Government side of the House. There has been quite an array of figures quoted to show that they, and not members on this side, are the representatives of the people. There have been quite a number of "figure-fakers" who have dealt with election results, and have endeavoured to prove that, if everything was as it ought to be and as they would like it to be, they would be on this side in possession of the Treasury benches while we would be in opposition. After all that has been said and that can be said, the fact remains that under the Constitution of Queensland there are seventy-two constituencies in the State, and the constituencies have returned a majority of members to this side. After all that has been said about figures and about the juggling which hon.

members opposite allege took place in connection with the redistribution of seats, the fact remains that the Labour Government are on the Treasury benches, while members opposite are sitting in the cold shades of opposition, where they are likely to remain for some time to come. There will certainly have to be radical changes in their platform as well as in their methods before they are likely to get on this side of the House. Hon. members opposite stated that but for the redistribution of seats many hon. members on this side, including myself, would not have been returned. You never know what the result of an election is going to be until the figures are up, and I appreciate the fact that I am still the hon. member for *Queenton* in spite of the prophecies which were made and of the efforts that were made to prevent me from coming back. One of the reasons why hon. members opposite are in opposition and are likely to remain there is because they have really got no principle—they have got nothing worthy of the name of a policy—and, instead of being a United party, they are the very opposite. It is not necessary to take notice altogether of what is said on this side, but this is what the hon. member for *Dalby* said about some Opposition members during the election campaign, as reported in the "Brisbane Courier" of 11th April last—

"Mr. Powles briefly traced the history of the party, which was formed in 1920, and added: 'We have had additions to and defections from our ranks during the past few months. For one session Messrs. Green (*Townsville*) and Jones (*Kennedy*) of the Northern Country party, joined up with us on a common platform. Messrs. Peterson, Fletcher, and Elphinstone renounced their parties to join forces with us. It was soon very evident that the acceptance of some of these newcomers to the ranks of the Country party was a mistake. The tranquility of the party was constantly disturbed by studied effort to undermine its principles, and the climax arose when a party known as the United party was brought into being, composed chiefly of the disgruntled members of the Country party and the whole of the Nationalist members in the House. Some of those who have seceded from our ranks have had the decency to resign. Others hang on, including one who was requested to send in his resignation as a member of the Country party, and they now pose as "the Country party wing" of the so-called United party. I refer to these matters in order to enter my protest against their action and to let the people of Queensland know that the only true Country party representatives are those contesting this election with the endorsement of the Primary Producers' Union.'"

I think it must be patent to anybody with half an eye that, if that kind of [9.30 p.m.] thing goes on, hon. members opposite will really not deserve the name of a party at all; the unfortunate thing about it is that the public of Queensland, instead of being wide awake to their manœuvres, may be led astray. Fortunately, at the last election they were wide awake, and they returned this party with a further indication of their confidence.

The leader of the Opposition on one or two occasions has had something to say in

[Hon. J. G. Appel.]

reference to the weakness of secondary industries in Queensland, and has lamented the fact that Queensland is so far behind the other States. As a matter of fact, Queensland has always been a long way behind. She is more a primary-producing State than a State with great secondary industries, for the simple reason that she was later in the field, and is a much younger State and has a smaller population scattered over a wider area than other States; consequently primary industries have been more productive and generally more beneficial than manufacturing industries. When we get more population, no doubt secondary industries will follow in their natural order. The hon. member who has just resumed his seat expressed the opinion that it was much better to settle people on the land than to have them congested in the city. I quite agree with him. The factory system is not an unmixing blessing. When you know the conditions under which factory workers have been reared in the past and the kind of life that they have led, you have some hesitation in desiring to bring that system into Queensland. I know the disabilities and disadvantages and disagreeableness under which many of the people work in factories compared with the lives of people who work in the open. There is no doubt that during the war they got a better class of soldier in the country districts of great Britain than in the industrial centres, where everybody was living under congested and insanitary conditions, just as for a similar reason the men from Australia were infinitely better than men from older countries. Victoria, to which we are often pointed as a kind of model, has had its population in the rural districts gradually dwindling and concentrating in the big cities. Because people want to live in the cities they enter secondary industries; but, after all, city life is not so wholesome or so beneficial in the long run as life in the country. The total urban population of Victoria amounts to about 990,753, or 64.7 per cent. of the total population—of which 51 per cent. is in Melbourne—whilst the rural population is 540,927, or only 35.3 per cent. In 1911, 187,773 persons were working in secondary industries in Victoria, whilst in 1921 the number had increased to 235,245. In 1911 the number engaged in primary industries was 144,384, and in 1921 147,000, an increase of only 3,000 in ten years. What has been responsible for those facts? The real cause at the bottom of that state of affairs is the land monopoly which has taken place to a large extent in Victoria. During the past thirty years there has been such an aggregation of land into large estates that quite a number of Victorians have come to places like Queensland, where land is available and they can get an opportunity of doing something for themselves. From an all-round standpoint, I think that the Government, in taking steps to settle people on the land in the Burnett and Callide valleys, and even on the Palmerston lands of which we have heard so much, are doing infinitely better for the country and the people who are here and the people who are likely to come here than by letting others go tax free in order that they may start industries practically before they are wanted. There seems to be an idea that, although we are a federation, and although we pose not only as Queenslanders but also as Australians, we nevertheless ought to endeavour to show our superiority to and get the better of other parts of the Commonwealth.

After all, if our secondary industries are centred, as they always will be centred and must be centred, in the large centres of population—that is to say, if all the things we need are manufactured in Sydney or Melbourne—then good luck to them for the present. With the population in Queensland, scattered as it is over such a large area, it is not reasonable nor could it be expected that we could produce all we need from the manufacturing standpoint. I doubt whether it would be profitable for us to do so at the present time. I do think that what the Government are doing in the direction of making land available in the State for the people who want to go on that land is infinitely better and wiser than trying to foster secondary industries, which, according to hon. members opposite, have to be held up and propped up because they are not able to stand on their own feet. For that reason I think the Government are to be commended for their action in attempting to settle people on the land and increase production in that direction which will benefit not only individuals themselves but will benefit the whole State.

I listened to what has been said by hon. members opposite in reference to the administration of the Government and to the Government proposals as set out in the Financial Statement. Amongst others I listened to the hon. member for Enoggera, who seems to have the idea that it does not matter very much what he says, but that, so long as he says it in a loud enough tone and makes enough noise, it must carry weight. I am not sure whether he is really able to distinguish sense from sound or not. It seems to me that, when he is speaking, very often he is not able to do so. I would remind him that the most powerful forces are not the noisy ones, but the most powerful are the silent and quiet forces. He made quite a number of statements in his speech the other night; but, when you come to look into them and make a few inquiries, you can only come to the conclusion that they are not true. I have no objection to a person having a simple mind if it is a good thing.

Mr. FRY: You should have Christian sympathies.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: A man with a simple mind should have some regard for the truth. Quite a number of statements that the hon. member made will not bear analysis. There are a number of members opposite who are not very much concerned about whether a thing is true or not, so long as they get something in.

Mr. EDWARDS: That applies to hon. members opposite.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: They think that when it goes out to the public the public will read it and say that it was not contradicted, and, therefore, it must be accurate. The hon. member for Herbert had made an exceptionally good speech, and had made some reference to income tax. The hon. member for Enoggera, in replying to that particular matter, said—

“The hon. member for Herbert used it as a good argument that this State is progressing under Labour administration. If that argument holds good, why is it that Queensland to-day is spending

Mr. Winstanley.]

per head of the population a lesser amount of loan money—in some instances 50 per cent. less—than the other States? For the simple reason that the Government have recklessly spent money and put it into non-returning investments."

You would naturally expect that a Government who are spending recklessly would spend more rather than less than other States.

Mr. KERR: Not at all.

Year.	N.S.W.	Vic.	Qld.	S.A.	W.A.	Tas.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
1916-17	3 12 0	1 14 9	3 6 11	4 2 0	2 15 9	2 8 8
1917-18	2 6 9	1 7 3	2 13 2	3 11 0	3 8 9	2 12 5
1918-19	2 0 0	2 0 10	3 17 7	4 7 8	3 7 8	2 16 8
1919-20	4 6 4	5 1 2	6 11 0	7 3 2	8 2 8	6 11 1
1920-21	7 0 7	7 5 2	5 13 0	3 14 4	7 16 4	12 5 11
	£19 6 6	£17 9 2	£24 1 8	£22 8 2	£25 13 3	£26 14 9

In this respect let me say that during the year 1920-21 New South Wales spent £2,758,000 loan money in repurchasing estates; Victoria spent £6,894,557; Queensland spent £1,017,534; South Australia spent £15,344; Western Australia £1,527,664; and Tasmania £1,146,985. It will thus be seen that in practically every year Queensland spent more loan money on reproductive works than any other individual State. The statement made by the hon. member for Enoggera is therefore not correct and will not bear examination. He evidently made the statement without having verified it and without looking at the actual facts.

Mr. KERR: Did you examine the figures for 1922? Those are my figures; you are wrong.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: The hon. member for Enoggera, like the hon. member who has just resumed his seat, claims credit for everything that was done previous to the Labour party coming into power. He said that his party had established the University. The University was not established by the party to which he belongs. The late Mr. Kidston was Premier when the University was established and he was supported for a time by the Labour party in this and a number of other things that the hon. member's party had nothing to do with. The hon. members opposite usually claim credit for everything that was brought about prior to the advent of this Government, but disclaim anything to their discredit which was done in the same period. The hon. member for Enoggera has said on the floor of this House when challenged on a particular matter, "What has it got to do with me?" or "What do I care about anything previous to my coming into the House?" The hon. member for Enoggera stated that the Public Curator's Department has been in existence for twenty-five years, but his saying so does not make it a fact, and his making that statement does not prove it is true. Almost every hon. member of the House knows it is not true. There was not a Public Curator in existence previous to the Labour party coming into power, and the office was established in order to be availed of by the people who had to spend a good deal of money at times to get their rights.

[Mr. Winstanley.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: What are the actual facts in this connection? I will quote the figures showing the expenditure per head from loan money in the different States. Let me preface that by saying that, apart from the merits or demerits of loan expenditure, whether it is a good thing to spend much loan money or little loan money is decided very largely by circumstances. Some people do not need to spend loan money, whilst others have the need to spend that money. These are the actual facts in connection with loan expenditure per head from 1916-1917 to 1920-1921—

Mr. KERR: You know it existed, but that it was called by another name.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: The only department that existed prior to the creation of the Public Curator was that which dealt with intestacy, insolvency, and the estates of the insane. The hon. member also tried to convey the idea that the profit of £290,000 made by the Insurance Department was the result of robbing injured workers.

Mr. KERR: I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: The hon. member said—

"Why do not the Government pay the injured worker for the first three days of the period of injury instead of adding that £290,000 to the Government debt by taking out debentures, instead of distributing their profits in the right quarter—to the people who should get the benefit?"

Mr. KERR: Why don't you do it?

Mr. WINSTANLEY: As a matter of fact they do pay for the first three days.

Mr. KERR: Do they?

Mr. WINSTANLEY: Yes.

Mr. KERR: Generally?

Mr. WINSTANLEY: Yes. I think practically everyone agrees that the State Insurance Department is one of the finest institutions brought into existence by this or any other Government. Whatever hon. members may have to say, the people outside are quite satisfied about what is being done by this institution. The political predecessors of the hon. member passed a Workers' Compensation Act which did not provide any compensation for the first fortnight.

Mr. KERR: Before that the injured worker did not get anything at all.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: When the Bill was before the House in 1909 an amendment was moved from the Labour side to provide for payment from the date of injury, but hon. members on the Government side said that, if that was given effect to, the workers would mangle in order to get the three

days' pay, and the statement was made repeatedly that the scheme would break down with its own weight.

At 9.45 p.m.,

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

Mr. WINSTANLEY: That amendment was introduced, and instead of turning out a failure it reduced the period of waiting to its present dimensions and was highly successful. It was not until a Labour Government got into power that such a provision was made, and it has certainly been a great benefit to a large number of persons who previously had to depend on charity in the time of their distress. Statements like those that have been coming from hon. gentlemen opposite do not injure the Government, but they convey a wrong idea and mislead the community as to the actual facts. Hon. members opposite may find some consolation in making those statements at random, but they will find that later they will be discredited, even when speaking the truth. The Government are not concerned about criticism which is not more correct or severe than that.

I want to say a word in reference to the speech of the hon. member for Murrumba. He drew a very gloomy picture regarding the agricultural districts of Queensland, and, if they are anything like he pictures them—

Mr. KERR: You don't care a hang.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: I know and care a good deal more about it than the hon. member. If the hon. member's picture was correct, agriculture would be at an end, but fortunately it was not correct. No Government that ever existed in Queensland, or probably in any country, have ever been as ready or have done as much to help the agriculturist as the present Government. The hon. member let fall one observation that I am thoroughly in agreement with when he said that quite a number of farms were over-capitalised. One of the difficulties under which farmers labour in Queensland is that their land is too expensive. Oftentimes the burden they are carrying in the shape of a mortgage is more than they can bear. I am quite confident that the Government, in introducing the perpetual lease scheme and letting the people get on the land on easier conditions, thus leaving their capital to develop the land, are treating the farmers infinitely better than by giving them freehold. In a great many cases when a farmer gets a freehold he has to mortgage heavily and eventually loses his land. Anybody who looks at the papers knows that, particularly in the districts likely to be prolific in cotton-growing, owners are booming the land for all it is worth, and in a great many instances for more than it is worth, and are unloading on to unsuspecting prospective growers and getting a price for the land that their successors will never be able to pay interest on. There is no doubt about the fact that the farmers earn all that they get; but, at the same time, there are numbers of other people besides them who work hard and who do not get too much as a result of their toil. Even farmers, so far as I am able to gather, are not nearly so badly off as they are sometimes said to be. Anybody can cry poverty or say they have not a shilling to their name, but they may have other assets. They may not have cash, but

they have an estate, and it is worth something to have an estate. On one or two occasions I looked at the paragraphs that appeared in the "Courier" of farmers who have "passed out," and whose estates have been administered, and in the applications for probate I find the values of the different estates were as follows:—

Occupation.	Value of Estate.
	£
H.J., farmer	4,098
A.R., farmer	5,933
J.V.C., farmer	3,818
M.O., farmer	1,239
G.B., selector	2,283
H.H.C., grazier	23,934
M.E., farmer	4,553
C.B.F., farmer	8,401
W.O.W., grazier	42,412

I am well aware that £4,000 or £5,000 is not an exceptionally large sum to the man who has got money, but it is a fairly large sum to the man who has got nothing. The point I want to make is that at the time I saw these notices in the "Courier," I never saw where a labourer, an artisan, or an ordinary working man had an estate that was worth administering. Therefore we see that there are hundreds of thousands of people in the State who work hard and who work long, and yet, when they come to die, have no estate at all, much less one that is worth several thousands of pounds.

Mr. MOORE: Many an artisan becomes an employer.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: You do not talk about him as an employer.

Mr. MOORE: He works, too.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: Yes; but he is not the only individual who works. There are numbers of people in the country who have to work; but because the farmer is working for himself, and because he spends what he earns in increasing the value of his estate, at the end of the year he says he has earned nothing. The only thing I want to see is that people speak the truth and put a correct statement before the House. There is no doubt about the fact that there are thousands of people even in this country who do earn money, but when they come to pass out they have not an estate such as I have referred to. I am not saying that these farmers should not have estates. They deserve all that they get, but there are plenty of people who have the advantages of living in the cities and also the disadvantages, and they have to pay for them.

Time after time the statement has been made by hon. members opposite, and particularly by Nationalist members who belong to the cities, that they are the friends of the primary producers. They remind me of what was said a long time ago, that "Codlin's your friend, not Short." Some people in my district have had an experience which makes it very doubtful whether that is correct or not. I have heard members, who now call themselves Country members, say when they were sitting on this side of the House that people who live in the city took advantage of them, and they went so far as to say that they robbed them. That has been the experience of a number of people at Charlers Towers who are engaged in fruit-growing? The climate there is suitable, the soil is suitable, and the general surroundings make it exceptionally good citrus-growing

Mr. Winstanley.]

country. They can grow oranges and grapes and some other things practically to perfection. When Cloncurry was in full swing there was a market there for all that they could produce, but lately, since the number of orchards has been increasing and the crops have been getting bigger every year, they thought they would try the Brisbane market, and early this year three of them made a consignment of about twenty cases of oranges which they sent down to try the Brisbane market. In reference to that fruit, I just want to quote from the "Queensland Producer." The person referred to is, I take it, a gentleman who is charged with looking over the markets to see what fruit comes in. The "Queensland Producer" says—

"This week I had the pleasure, with others, of inspecting a small trial shipment of oranges from Charters Towers, and amongst the consignment were some Jaffas of special merit, both as regards the flavour and appearance. The fine texture of the skin and quality of the fruit are far ahead of anything I have seen for many years back, and is another striking illustration of what our Northern climate can produce."

So far so good. Very naturally, when the people who grew the oranges saw that statement in the paper, they were somewhat elated about their consignment, and thought that it would bring them, at any rate, a fair return, if not an exceptionally good one. But when they got the returns back a month after the fruit was sent down, the net return from the twenty cases only amounted to £4 10s. 4d. From the gross return there were 16s. deducted for cartage and 13s. for commission. They also received a letter saying that out of their twenty cases the consignees had only got fifteen cases. What had happened I do not know, but when the cases got to Brisbane it was said they were not full, and that it took five cases out of the twenty to fill up the other fifteen; the consignment was sold as fifteen cases. The growers naturally thought they had not had a fair deal, and the following paragraph appeared in the "Queensland Producer" on the subject:—

"CHARTERS TOWERS ORANGES.

"Mr. W. A. Mann, honorary secretary, Charters Towers L.P.A., writes at length concerning a disappointing return for a consignment of oranges—Jaffa and other varieties—sent to Brisbane and disposed of. Mr. Mann concludes:—'To sum up the position: We sent twenty cases of oranges to Brisbane; we lose five of them; we are charged 24 per cent. handling charges in Brisbane. We receive the reports and results just one month after the sale. The market officer reported favourably upon the fruit, and one report stated that if free from scale and well packed, it would have realised 18s. to 21s. per case on the Melbourne market; yet we receive only £4 10s. 4d. for twenty cases on the Brisbane market. Did we get a fair deal?'"

They may well ask the question as to whether they got a fair deal—especially when the people in the cities profess to be interested in primary producers, and say they want to do the best they can for them. The "Queensland Producer" comments on that, and says—

"We have consulted the markets

[Mr. Winstanley.

officer, who adheres to his favourable comments regarding the Jaffa oranges; his remarks did not apply to the other sorts, which he describes as unripe and carrying scale. He also found that the cases used were not suitable."

If the producers are expected to put oranges in cases which cost 1s. 3d. each, if not more, in which to send oranges to Brisbane, and only get £4 10s. 4d. for twenty cases, business is not likely to mature. I would like to say that, when the market officer is inspecting fruit and finds it of good quality and praises it, if there is anything wrong he should let the growers know at once, and not pass it by and say nothing, as those who grow the fruit naturally think that there is nothing wrong. I think that proves quite conclusively that there is room

[10 p.m.] for improvement in the handling of produce when it is sent to Brisbane, or any other market for that matter, and if these people think it advisable to send another consignment later on, I would like to see them get a fair deal. I hope that something better will be done for them than was done for them on this occasion; at any rate, nothing worse could have been done. I certainly think some better provision could be made, and should be made, not only for the people in the North, but also for everybody who is sending stuff to the markets. What happened is not encouraging to people who want to do something in the direction of developing the resources of the country. There can be no complaint as to the quality of the fruit; it was as good as could be produced anywhere in the State.

I notice that the Government have provided for an expenditure of £21,000 for making additions to the Goodna Insane Asylum. It is not a very encouraging or inspiring subject, but evidently insanity is one of the concomitants of our present day civilisation, and even in this country the strain and stress of life are too much for a very large number of people, and the consequence is that our present institutions are becoming too small and have to be extended. One thing which might be taken to heart by the Home Department is the suggestion that these institutions should be distributed over the State and not be centred in one part. I think some of them might be put in the northern part of the State.

Mr. FRY: Put a big one up in your electorate?

Mr. WINSTANLEY: The people in my electorate are just as sane and of just as high an intelligence as those in any other electorate; but I do say that it is very inconvenient for persons who are unfortunate enough to lose their mental balance and for their friends that they should have to be sent 1,000 miles down to Brisbane to a mental hospital. Anybody in Brisbane can get his friend out on probation and see how he gets on, but that is impossible for people away up in the North. It is impossible for them to know how these unfortunate persons are getting on except from the ordinary circular from the institution.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: Herberton and Charters Towers have both been suggested as sites.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: The probabilities are that either of those places is suitable. The climatic conditions of both are good, but

at Herberton the land is fairly expensive. At Charters Towers there is plenty of land, the climatic conditions are excellent, and there is an exceptionally good water supply, and all the surroundings are good. As the hon. member knows very well, the convenience of residents of the North, of people who have to become patients and of their friends, would be eminently served by the establishment of an insane asylum there. I was speaking not long ago to an individual who was coming up from a town in New South Wales which he had been visiting. He said he asked a resident what kept the town going, and the reply was, "We have a lunatic asylum, a benevolent institution, a big hospital, and other public institutions, and the town practically subsists on these institutions." From some standpoints that may not be a very desirable thing, but from other standpoints it may be an exceptionally desirable thing. Charters Towers is by no means the town it used to be.

Mr. KELSO: Have all the "wild cats" died there?

Mr. WINSTANLEY: Charters Towers is not the only place where "wild cats" have existed. They have existed on all the mineral fields. The people have lived there and speculated their money and lost it there, but I do not think they have very many regrets. They are a good, substantial class of people, and, at any rate, are an infinitely better class than are found in most of the commercial cities. I do not think that anything would benefit Queensland so much as the discovery of another Charters Towers or Gympie. On more than one occasion the mining industry has placed Queensland on its feet when it was in the mud, and I believe it will do it again. At the present time the Government have £60,000 to £70,000 invested in Charters Towers, and, if that town went down—which I do not think will happen—the Government would lose that money the same as other institutions would do. The scholastic institutions have been instrumental in turning out persons of learning equal to any other place. The boys and girls who went to those schools were infinitely better off than they would have been if they had had to come to the southern parts of Queensland. All round, the place is deserving of support, and I think the establishment of any of these institutions at or near Charters Towers or in the district will be helpful. I certainly think that the town has an exceptional claim on the Government. The Government have done all they possibly could to revive the mining industry there. There are people there now who are optimistic enough to think that Charters Towers will come again.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: Look at Clark's show.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: That is still going, with one or two other new shows that are very encouraging and are doing exceptionally well. There is always the possibility of the diamond drill being able to discover something that will encourage the people again to put their money into mining and restore the lost prestige of the place. In many directions the Government have helped the place, and the people appreciate very much that help, but I think that in the direction of establishing more institutions a little more could have been done.

There are many other things that I would like to discuss, but I shall deal with them on

the Estimates. In spite of all the criticism that has been levelled against the Government and all that has been said about their administration, they still hold the confidence of the people. That is the most important thing. The people are the best judges; they know what has been done by previous Governments, and they know what has been done by this Government. They did not accept what hon. members opposite said, but they accepted the word of the Government and gave them a fresh lease of power. I hope that some of the difficulties which the Government are now faced with—over which they have no control—will disappear along with the financial cloud that hangs over some of our industries—particularly the copper-mining industry—and that the sunshine of prosperity will return.

The House resumed.

The CHAIRMAN reported progress.

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

The House adjourned at 10.12 p.m.