

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

FRIDAY, 5 SEPTEMBER 1924

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

QUESTIONS.

STATE DRAUGHT STALLIONS.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*) asked the Secretary for Agriculture—

“1. How many mares were served by each State draught stallion during last season?”

“2. What was the total amount received in fees for service on account of each stallion?”

“3. What was the expenditure on each stallion for the season?”

“4. What is the total expenditure to date, including cost of purchase and keep, to 1st September this year?”

“5. In what districts will the stallions be located this season?”

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. W. Forgan Smith, *Mackay*) for the SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Eacham*), replied—

	Number of Mares.
“1. Baron Again	46
Bold Wyllie	60
Fabric's Heir	59
General Wallace	57
Glenalla	57
Premier Again	54
Total number	333

	£	s.	d.
“2. Baron Again	96	12	0
Bold Wyllie	126	0	0
Fabric's Heir	123	18	0
General Wallace	119	14	0
Glenalla	119	14	0
Premier Again	113	8	0

£699 6 0

“3. Total cost of stallions for season was £1,264 0s. 6d., which gives an average of £210 for each stallion.”

“4. Total payments to date, including purchase, all charges, and keep to 1st September this year—£4,979 19s.”

“5. No definite answer can yet be given. The inspection of mares for the service of which application has been received has not yet been completed, and the result of that inspection may alter districts provisionally arranged.”

FRIDAY, 5 SEPTEMBER, 1924.

The SPEAKER (Hon. W. Bertram, *Maree*) took the chair at 10 a.m.

PAPERS.

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

Report from the Engineer for Harbours and Rivers for the year ended 30th June, 1924.

Fourth report on the creation, inscription, and issue of Government inscribed stock under the provisions of “The Government Inscribed Stock Acts, 1920 to 1921.”

Fortieth report on the creation, inscription, and issue of stock under the provisions of “The Queensland Stock Inscription Act.”

Report of the Chief Inspector of Machinery, Scaffolding, and Weights and Measures for the year ended 30th June, 1924.

RELIEF OF SUPPOSED SURVIVORS OF S.S.

“DOUGLAS MAWSON.”

Mr. RIORDAN (*Burke*), without notice, asked the Premier—

“In view of the Press reports regarding the ‘Douglas Mawson’ survivors, and seeing that it is alleged that the two women who are supposed to be held by the blacks were seen a week ago, does he think it is now possible to do anything in the direction suggested by the hon. member for Cook and myself in previous interviews with him on the matter?”

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

“The hon. member for Burke and the hon. member for Cook waited upon me some time ago in connection with this matter, and asked that some relief should be sent to Normanton, the locality in which the ‘Douglas Mawson’ was supposed to have been wrecked. At that time it was stated that the Government

had no vessel available, and no vessel could be hired suitable for despatch on such a voyage. The only vessels available were motor launches of very small capacity. The Commonwealth Government, having the major responsibility, seeing that the survivors were supposed to be in their territory, sent a relief party, but, unfortunately, a considerable time elapsed before it was despatched. The relief party are now in the district in which the survivors are supposed to be, and not much can be done from here to assist them. If it were necessary to send further relief, it is possible that arrangements could be made with Thursday Island, or perhaps the Commonwealth Government could despatch one of their warships which is somewhere north of Cairns."

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*), without notice, asked the hon. member for Nundah—

"1. Is it a fact that certain ladies approached him yesterday with regard to some action being taken in the interest of the women wrecked from the 'Douglas Mawson' and who are now supposed to be in the hands of the blacks?

"2. What action did the hon. gentleman take?"

Mr. KELSO (*Nundah*) replied—

"I was approached by a certain number of ladies whose minds were considerably exercised by the statement in the Press yesterday with reference to the unfortunate women in the hands of the blacks. I had an interview with the Premier yesterday and placed the matter before him, and he agreed to meet a deputation of ladies at 11 o'clock this morning in order that they might discuss the matter with him and place certain suggestions before him for consideration."

SUPPLY.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE—FOURTH ALLOTTED DAY.

(*Mr. Pollock, Gregory, in the chair.*)

HOME SECRETARY'S DEPARTMENT.

OUTDOOR RELIEF.

Question stated—

"That £29,166 be granted for 'Outdoor relief.'"

Mr. W. COOPER (*Rosewood*): When the House adjourned yesterday I was drawing attention to the differentiation in treatment between agriculturists and swagmen when applying for relief. I hope, Mr. Pollock, that you will bear with me while I make the suggestion that hon. members to-day should consider this Chamber as a church. In a church there are very few interjections, and the truth that is told, whether it be uttered by a politician or a clergyman, should have the respect that it justly deserves. It is necessary to place a certain amount of money on the Estimates to relieve those people who are unemployed or not able to work, or who have been unfortunate enough to be placed in a state of poverty. Most people look upon the man who carries his swag as a person of no importance. It has been said more than once in this Chamber that unemployment is caused through the fault of the persons

[*Mr. W. Cooper.*

concerned. I disagree entirely with a statement of that kind, because a man who can find work and will not work is liable to be prosecuted as a vagrant; and one of the reasons why the Act dealing with those persons has not been strictly administered is because, if such persons are placed in custody—whether it be for their own safekeeping or because of the crime of poverty—they have to be kept by the State.

It has been said that the drink traffic is one of the greatest causes of poverty, and poverty is the cause of men having to apply to the Government for outdoor relief. If that is so, all Governments up to the present time have neglected their duty in not endeavouring to remove the cause of the State having to pay such vast sums of money in outdoor relief. I hope, Mr. Pollock, that you will bear with me for a little, because what I am going to state are some of my own experiences with men of a nomadic disposition. Some years ago a man came into a shop where I was working. He was carrying a swag that would do credit to the best camel in the Sahara Desert. He had no soles on the boots that were on his feet. He said to me, "Look, I am hungry." I said, "Yes, my friend, I can relieve your hunger." At that time I was performing the work of shoeing horses, and he asked me whether I could shoe him. I had a look at his boots and said, "I do not know about that, I am not a bootmaker; but I can relieve your hunger." He replied, "My belly never touches the ground, but my feet do; and, if you can relieve me by giving me a pair of boots, I will certainly go on my way."

Mr. F. A. COOPER: You did not "shoo" him off the premises?

Mr. W. COOPER: No, I did not do what my hon. friends on the other side of the Chamber would have done.

Hon. W. H. BARNES: That is unfair.

Mr. W. COOPER: I gave that man a pair of boots and an order on a boarding-house to get a week's supply of provisions. The last time I met that man I found that his cheque for cream alone was £560 a month. I mention that incident to show the necessity for kindness to be handed out to these unfortunate men out of work. For the benefit of hon. members who have never heard it, I will quote a little verse and ask them to retain it if possible in their memory, so that, if at some future date a traveller arrives at their door, they will not turn him away empty-handed—

"Out in the cold world, out in the street,

Asking for bread from the country police,

A nomad of misfortune sadly I roam,

A native of Queensland without any home."

I am not going to say that the drink traffic is the cause of all poverty; but, if we are going to remedy the condition which necessitates this vote being placed on the Estimates, we must deal as far as possible with the causes of poverty. To deal with the causes hereto-day would take too long, and seeing, Mr. Pollock, the very fine attitude that you have taken up in the chair—an attitude which I admire—of preventing any unwarranted discussion of matters which do not pertain to outdoor relief, I shall not attempt to discuss them. The ordinary man in Queensland does not realise what it is to be without work and to have to tramp the vast distances of this great State looking for the means to provide

himself with the necessaries of life. If that is so, we have to deal with the question not merely from a financial point of view, seeing that a number of hon. members in this Chamber and people outside are advocating the principles of Christianity. If those principles do not apply to finance generally, they apply to the attitude we are going to take up from a humanitarian standpoint. If we are going to cavil at the comparatively small sum that is to be expended by this State for the relief of these unfortunate men, then I say there is very little Christianity in the State, and it is nearly time that our churches took up a very different attitude from that at present adopted. I am not going to say any more on the subject because I know that, if I started to give the causes and effects necessitating the placing on the Estimates of certain sums of money for the relief of these unfortunate people, you would pull me up, Mr. Pollock.

The Unemployed Workers Insurance Act did a great deal to relieve plenty of men who would otherwise have to go cap in hand and beg from the police for sustenance to keep body and soul together. I hope that, in the near future, we shall devise a means by which these men will not be classed as undesirables. When the Great War broke out and the country was appealing to men to save the property, the money, and the people of Queensland, Australia, and the British Empire generally, there was no inquiry as to whether the recruits were nomads asking for relief or otherwise. The appeal was that every man should put a gun to his shoulder and fight for the wealth and welfare of the nation, therefore these unfortunate men have a perfect right, as people born on this earth, to ask for and receive relief when poverty strikes them.

Mr. WRIGHT (*Bulimba*): In the first place I desire to endorse the remarks of the hon. member for Kelvin Grove regarding the salary paid to the chief officer of this very important sub-department. Probably I have come into contact with that officer just as much, and perhaps more than any other hon. member in this Chamber. I do not say that because there may be more applicants for relief from my electorate, but, taking the law of averages and considering that I am responsible for a greater number of electors than any other hon. member, it is only reasonable that I should come more in contact with that officer than other hon. members.

I have found this officer to be a very capable man. He is courteous, sympathetic, obliging, and, to my mind, he has all the necessary qualifications needed by an officer in charge of such a department as his. When the necessity arises, as I know it does sometimes arise, he can always take a definite stand. Those occasions are, I believe, few in number. Considering his difficult duties—and I know they are not altogether pleasant at times—I ask the Home Secretary to give favourable consideration to an increase of the remuneration of this capable officer.

I am pleased to see that the expenditure on relief generally has been less than it was a few years ago, but at the same time the expenditure for the year was considerably above the estimate provided for the year. So long as we are doing the right thing to the people of this State I have not very much to say with regard to the expense. Further, I notice in the annual report that there has been a remarkable reduction in

the assistance granted to able-bodied men, and in order to illustrate my point I shall give the figures for the last four years—

1920-21, monthly average of able-bodied men receiving relief,	1,017.
1921-22, monthly average of able-bodied men receiving relief,	758.
1922-23, monthly average of able-bodied men receiving relief,	233.
1923-24, monthly average of able-bodied men receiving relief,	45.

Mr. KERR: Do you know the explanation?

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes, and I wish briefly to refer to the explanation. Further, to illustrate my point, I wish to point out that, for the seven months prior to June and including June, the total number of able-bodied men who received relief was only thirty-one. That satisfies me of the success of that other scheme for which this Government were responsible—the Unemployed Workers Insurance scheme, which was dubbed by the friends of hon. members opposite, and by some hon. members themselves as the "Loafers' Paradise Bill."

Mr. KERR: The explanation is that they cut out the single men.

Mr. WRIGHT: That is not the conclusion to which I have come—the hon. member will have the opportunity of giving his version of the affair afterwards. I am quite satisfied that the explanation is that the able-bodied men who, through unfortunate circumstances, have been thrown out of employment and are not able to keep themselves, have received the allowance which is theirs by right, as they have contributed their share towards it, and they have not been compelled to go to the Relief Department and ask for rations. In the past the workers have always contributed to the relief which they may have got, as the cost of relief is paid out of consolidated revenue, and therefore every person in the community contributes a certain amount to this vote.

There is another interesting table in the report headed "Adults." So that there shall be no misunderstanding, I wish to make it clear that I am referring to the table giving the metropolitan figures alone. The average number of adults per month who received relief in the metropolitan area during the past four years were—

1920-21	2,541
1921-22	1,868
1922-23	824
1923-24	268

There again there has been a remarkable reduction in the number of adults receiving relief. There is one pathetic feature in the report, and that is the reference to those people who, through being slightly mentally deficient or physically deficient, are unable to take their place and compete in the industrial world. They are catered for, I take it, under the qualification as "Adults," the figures for whom I have just given.

I know that this is one of the problems which it is very difficult to solve. I have in my own electorate quite a number of cases where the husband and father—and unfortunately in some cases the father of an ever-increasing family—through some little deficiency is unable to compete successfully for the employment which is offering. Consequently there is great hardship in store for families which are being reared under those conditions. I ask that, when such

Mr. Wright.]

cases come before the officer in charge very favourable consideration will be given—and I know he gives that consideration—to those people because they are in a most unfortunate position and largely unable to help themselves. It is only casual employment, in addition to this particular allowance, that enables them to live at all. They are responsible for bringing families of young children into the world, and they should be given every consideration. I would suggest that the Minister should consider the adoption of some method whereby the State children's allowance could be extended to cases like these. These men require more than they can earn from casual employment to enable them to bring up their children so that they can compete with their neighbours' children on equal terms. I realise that a certain number of these cases are always inevitable. I hope that some better way will be found to assist these people than the present system. This is not a vote on which there should be much criticism though probably hon. members opposite will find quite a lot in regard to which they will criticise the expenditure. There is a reduction in the vote this year, and I hope that next year we shall have a further reduction, and thereby show that we are on lines of progress and that the poverty in this fair State is definitely on the decline.

HON. W. H. BARNES (*Wynnum*): The hon. member for Rosewood started off by making the suggestion that the vote was such a serious one that for the time being this Chamber might be made a church. He had not proceeded very far before he threw out an insinuation against hon. members on this side in connection with relief, that, while hon. members opposite would be prepared to grant relief to needy people, on this side there would be a refusal because of want of sympathy. I say emphatically that whether in connection with Government relief or relief that one gives through his own home, the man—whatever his political or religious creed may be—who turns away a needy man deserves to be kicked.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear hear!

HON. W. H. BARNES: There are some things that are bigger than our political differences. The duty of every man as I know it—and it is followed and practised by hon. members on this side—is to see that those who are in need get help. Can you conceive, Mr. Pollock, a man coming to your door and telling you he needed something to eat, and you turning him away? The instructions in my home are very definite—it may be that money is refused to an applicant, but no one is ever turned away.

MR. GLEDSON: You are putting too liberal an interpretation on the remarks of the hon. member for Rosewood. He did not mean what you say at all.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I do not know what the hon. member for Rosewood meant, but I see, Mr. Pollock, that I have just gone as far as you are prepared to allow me to go in that connection. There is no question that men who want work and cannot get it are deeply to be pitied. There are many factors to be considered in connection with unemployment, and it is our duty to face them. If I stood on my feet and said that unemployment was not rampant, I would

be saying what I do not believe. It is rampant, and a great majority of the men who are unemployed want work but cannot get it.

[10.30 a.m.]

MR. WRIGHT: Do you suggest that is our fault?

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am not suggesting that. I want to deal with the question in a way which will help those men, because I recognise that, although I do not often run wild myself, there is nothing more calculated to make a man run wild than to have nothing to do, and I say that the position of a man wanting employment is a condition of things which we have to face. I am not going to argue here about the basic wage, but I ask: Is not something wrong when you find the father of a family of five or six children getting only the same rate of wages as a single man? I am prepared to admit that the single man has to make provision for his own home, but there is not sufficient difference between the wage of the single young man and the man with family obligations. However, we are face to face with the fact that for some cause or other there is a great number of unemployed in the State. I have been permitted this morning to see the "Hansard" proof of some remarks made by my friend, the hon. member for East Toowoomba, last night, in which he said that he did not think that this year the vote would be sufficient. I do not think it will be sufficient. The Government themselves have had to admit that they must go slow on account of the paucity of loan money. Will not that mean that men will have to be turned down when they ask for employment? What is the attitude in commercial circles? Every business man is trying to cut down his expenses as much as possible for the same reason which operates in connection with Government work. Therefore I say, particularly in view of the amount spent on outdoor relief last year, that the amount of £29,000 will not be sufficient this year. Happily it does seem that in some directions there is hope; but we all know, for instance, that the money available for workers' dwellings is so limited that applications are being turned down. That means fewer labourers in itself, and, generally speaking, the trend to shorten the hands required for the services of the State. Let there be no doubt as to the attitude of hon. members on this side of the Chamber. I think I can speak for them, as well as for myself, when I say that every provision should be made for men who are out of employment. Whilst they should be encouraged in every possible way to work, and, whilst the man who will not work does not deserve relief, on the other hand, if a man has done his best to get work and has failed, we should not be deficient in meeting our obligations to him on behalf of the State.

MR. HYNES (*Townsville*): The most gratifying feature of this vote is the large decrease on the amount expended since 1923. For the year 1922-23 the amount expended on outdoor relief was £55,799 8s. 11d., whereas for the year 1923-24 the amount had been reduced to £29,300 11s. 3d. That indicates that closely associated with the problem of outdoor relief was the problem of organising labour on a sounder and more scientific basis in dealing with unemployment. The major portion of the people who are receiving outdoor relief in Queensland are the unemployable

[Mr. Wright.]

class. They are the orphans, the widow mothers, and the old men who cannot be absorbed in industry. Do hon. members opposite mean to suggest that this Government should refuse to feed those people who are unable to work?

The hon. member for Nanango spoke in a rather contemptuous and disparaging manner of what he termed a "swagman." Some portion of the relief which was distributed last year went to the people who were carrying their swags in the State. The man who carries his swag about the State has in the past formed one of a class that did the pioneering work of this State. One must take into consideration that the whole of our primary industries—Queensland depends almost entirely on her primary industries—depend for their labour on the nomadic worker, who occasionally, owing to bad seasons, is obliged to carry his swag and get Government relief. The hon. member for Nanango suggested that we should go back to the pernicious, debasing, and despicable system that obtained under the old Tory regime. That is, that the men who were obliged to ask for relief should have the humiliating task of cutting wood or doing some non-productive toil imposed upon them in order to secure those rations. If there is one stigma upon past Administrations in connection with the distribution of relief, it is the fact that they compelled men who were looking for relief to perform some unproductive humiliating task in order to qualify for that relief. I would not stand for any Government going back to that debasing and inhuman system.

Mr. MAXWELL: Is work debasing?

Mr. HYNES: We have been able to reduce the amount of this vote by organising labour on a more scientific and sound basis, and the result has been that there are very few able-bodied men to-day applying for relief. In 1914, prior to the Labour Government coming into power in this State, the number of unionists who were registered as unemployed, according to the Commonwealth Statistician's figures, was 17.7 per cent., and the number last year was 5.5 per cent. We have been dealing with the question of relief, and at the same time we have pretty effectively tackled the unemployment problem. I repeat that the greatest portion of the relief which is distributed at the present time is distributed to the unemployable—to the men who are too old or too infirm to work, to widowed mothers, and to children. I am surprised to know that in this age we have hon. members opposite—members who are evidently wallowing in the last stage of conservative atrophy—who would suggest that we should take from these people the wherewithal to keep them alive.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): The hon. member who has just resumed his seat made some most astounding deductions.

Hon. M. J. KIRWAN: Not so astounding as the statements you made the other day.

Mr. KERR: In another part of the Estimates which we are discussing a sum of £181,000 is provided to carry workers over their period of unemployment. If that amount is added to the vote we are discussing it will be found that the amount for the relief of unemployment in Queensland is higher this year than in any previous year in the history of Queensland. That is the

position. This difficulty has not been overcome by the Government. It is a wrong deduction to make to state that the difficulty is being overcome by scientific means when the Government are subsidising compulsory levies on the employers and employees for the purpose. The Commonwealth Government provide for infirm and old age pensions. I do not want to discuss that subject, but I venture to say that no hon. member in this Chamber can quote a legitimate case for the invalid or old-age pension that has been turned down by the Commonwealth.

Mr. HYNES: What rot!

Mr. KERR: It is no use hon. members attempting to deceive this Chamber on the unemployment problem, as the hon. member for Townsville has done. Such statements are only an attempt to deceive the Committee on the real state of affairs. I rose purposely to ask the Minister in charge of this vote to give some information with regard to the recent allegation made in the Press that the Government are sending unemployed to New South Wales.

Hon. M. J. KIRWAN: There is no truth in it.

Mr. KERR: At the time the allegation was made the Government in their denial stated that the funds to provide for the fares did not come out of the Unemployment Insurance Fund. While I am prepared to accept that denial, I would like to know whether those fares were paid out of funds appropriated by the Home Department.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowong*): I did not intend to address myself to this vote until I heard the speech of the hon. member for Townsville. I want to say to that hon. member, as I say to other men of his calibre, that there has been an attempt in this Chamber on various occasions by hon. members of his mentality to try and bring to the mind of the people outside that hon. members on this side of the Chamber look upon a man who carries his swag as a person who has to be eliminated altogether, and that we do not stand for anything in the cause of humanity and that we do not seek to uplift.

Mr. HYNES: You stand for perpetuating the system which makes him carry his swag.

Mr. KERR: Rubbish!

Mr. ROBERTS: We stand for providing employment for him.

Mr. MAXWELL: Hon. members on this side of the Chamber do not stand for any particular section of the community. As I said yesterday the record of those Governments who administered the affairs of State long, long before Labour came into power, give an emphatic denial to the statements which are continually being made by hon. members opposite. I wish that, instead of some of the hon. members we have on the opposite side, we had in their place some of the gentlemen who formerly occupied their positions. I say that in all sincerity. Hon. members on this side do not stand for perpetuating any system that is injurious to the community.

Since the advent of Labour to the Treasury benches we have had a very considerable system of unemployment and outdoor relief prevailing. To me it is a most reprehensible state of affairs, particularly after hearing speeches made by hon. members opposite,

Mr. Maxwell.]

that even one man should have to seek relief. Hon. members stated that it is a menace to the community, and that unemployment generally is a scandal.

Mr. HYNES: Can you explain the fact that in 1914 17.7 per cent. of the members of unions were unemployed?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MAXWELL: There is no necessity for me to explain anything to the hon. member for Townsville, because the hon. member is so permeated with certain ideas that my explanation could not penetrate his hide.

Mr. HYNES interjected.

Mr. MAXWELL: While hon. members on the other side of the House prate about the reduction in the unemployment vote my friends, the hon. member for Wynnum and the hon. member for Enoggera, drew attention to the vote of £181,800 which appears in another sphere of activity by way of unemployment insurance. The hon. member for Townsville stated that this outdoor relief is only given to sick and infirm people. I think the hon. member does not know what he is talking about when he makes such a statement. I have seen instances of able-bodied men who have found it absolutely impossible to find employment in our city and suburbs. I have seen most pitiable cases where the women-folk are prepared to go out to work and cannot get it, and where the boys in the family cannot get work.

Mr. HYNES: And you stand for perpetuating that system.

Mr. MAXWELL: I will not listen to such twaddle.

Mr. KERR interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask hon. members to cease their interruptions. An interjection is permissible when an hon. member has ceased speaking and while he is preparing to continue his remarks; but I feel sure hon. members do not desire me to tolerate any continued interruption during a speech by an hon. member. I ask that it be discontinued.

Mr. MAXWELL: Thank you, Mr. Pollock. I sympathise with the officers who have to distribute this relief, and I appreciate the difficulties under which the officer in charge of the sub-department labours. Although he wants to be fair and reasonable, he must find it very difficult to act in that way. I only rose to say that after nine years of Labour administration we find this amount of money placed on the Estimates to continue outdoor relief and at the same time £181,800 is provided for the payment of unemployment insurance. To me that is a standing disgrace, and it bears out exactly the arguments put forward by hon. members on this side when certain measures were introduced.

Mr. WRIGHT: You stated that the measure you refer to was a "Loafers' Paradise Bill."

Mr. MAXWELL: It is all very well for hon. members opposite to talk about the conditions obtaining when the Treasury benches were occupied by anti-Labour forces, but never at any time have such conditions prevailed as exist at present through the mismanagement and misgovernment of a Labour Administration.

Mr. WARREN (*Murrumba*): I have not the slightest doubt that there is every reason why we should sympathise with those who

[*Mr. Maxwell.*

have to administer this vote. I do not think there is a more difficult problem to deal with than that of the outdoor relief of the State. I have approached the department on several occasions on behalf of unfortunate individuals, and I know the difficulties the officials have to face. Those difficulties are great, no matter which Government is in power, and occasionally there must be some hardship to applicants.

I say emphatically that I think the administration of the Unemployed Insurance Fund is most unsatisfactory. I am quite convinced the amount would be £200,000 if the fund had been properly administered, which clearly points to the fact that the men are not being treated as well, from a financial point of view, under the Unemployed Workers' Insurance scheme as they were under the old system of relief. It also proves conclusively that there are more unemployed to-day than there were previously.

I particularly rose to take exception to the statement made by the hon. member for Townsville—that it is a mean thing to work. I never knew that it was a mean thing to work. I have always been of the opinion that it was a very honourable thing to work.

Mr. HYNES: It depends a good deal on the conditions attaching to the work.

Mr. WARREN: Nothing appeals to me so much as to see a man with horny hands. I would far sooner see a man who is able to work willing to work than see a man shirking work.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. WARREN: I am following exactly the same lines adopted by previous speakers. I want to make this point: Men would be far better receiving money for work done than receiving money as a dole. I can quote one case that proves this conclusively. Some little time ago two men in my electorate had a conversation on the question of relief. One man said, "The old sergeant is a cruel man to deal with." The other said, "I was quite prepared to do the little work that he gave me." That was a little wood-chopping in return for the relief. That conversation was an instance of two distinct dispositions. I do not think those remarks apply at the present time, as there is a new sergeant there. The man who is willing to give a little work for that which he receives is an honest man, while the man who is not prepared to give a little work but is prepared to accept as a gift that relief which he is not entitled to, in principle is not honest. I do not care how many hon. members get up and deride the manner of payment for that which a man receives, but I say the principle is absolutely wrong, and the sooner these gentlemen recognise it the better. I have no complaint to make in regard to relief matters, but I wish to say that the Unemployed Workers' Insurance scheme has to find its level. We could not expect a new scheme to work smoothly straight away. My complaint is not against the system, but I do wish to emphasise the point that the longer we have people receiving money for nothing the worse it will be for the State. Unfortunately that is one of the biggest troubles we have to face in connection with the Australian Imperial Forces, as a percentage of the men expected to get something for nothing. It was wrong in principle, because those who were in ill-health should have been

a charge on the Commonwealth. I take this opportunity of saying that in almost every case that I brought under the notice of the Commonwealth authorities, whether it was an application for the old-age pension, the invalid pension, or a soldier's pension, full and favourable consideration was given, and in every genuine case the relief asked for was given. I consider that we have only touched the fringe of this question of relief, but at the same time I am of opinion that the solution of the problem is that men must work for that which they receive. We must provide the right to work. That is the most important thing. Work does not demoralise a man, but makes him better and makes him happier.

Mr. BRUCE (*Kennedy*): The question of the right to work has been introduced. Under the present social system unemployment must exist. That is evident to every hon. member who has studied the economic problem. Unemployment has existed under all Governments. Men have walked Queensland and every other State in Australia with their swags ever since Australia has been discovered. But this is the point: The Governments of those days overlooked the fact that men were unemployed, and they neglected their duty to supply them with the means of living. The Labour Government have incurred a very large expenditure in supporting them when they were unable to get employment. Men in the different towns left their families and walked into the country looking for employment, but were unable to get it. Any Government who stand up to their duty must keep those men and those dependent on them from starvation. That was the system for some years, and the Government saw the necessity for a more improved system. The amount of money which is made available in the relief of unemployed under the present system is a form of insurance, just as a man may insure his home, business, or anything else against loss. That is not open to criticism. That is not the form of dole which used to be received by the unemployed prior to the inception of the system. As Labour men, we would like to delete the provision on the Estimates for unemployment doles, because there is not one worker in a thousand who does not prefer to earn a living per medium of work instead of per medium of doles. The greater the unemployment the greater will be the injury to our people. If a man is unemployed for twelve months or two years, his moral fibre may be largely destroyed, because he then becomes hopeless, and once a man becomes hopeless he ceases to be the value to society that he was before. So long as the system which exists to-day is in operation there must be unemployed workers. The more machinery for productive purposes created by inventive genius the more men there will be thrown out of employment. The question is not one of production. We hear the question of production continually emphasised, and the statement made that, if it were increased, every man would be employed. The question is one of distribution. Until we get a more equitable form of distribution we shall not come to the conditions that we on this side, and probably some hon. members of the Opposition, desire that we should come to as a State. I would like to see the amount on the Estimates for unemployment doles absolutely abolished, provided there was no necessity for it, because I would like to see every man in Queensland employed in labour profitable to himself and the State.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*): The hon. member who has just resumed his seat has put this matter in a correct light. We are not blind to the knowledge that most countries of the world are likely to have unemployed workers from time to time; but when we hear hon. members opposite showing by their utterances that they are ignorant of the conditions which exist to-day, we must protest and point out that the kerosene-case oratory that may be used in and around their electorates to enable them to secure their seats will not go down in this Chamber. (Laughter.)

The hon. member for Townsville refers to the amount of £27,500 set aside for outdoor relief as the only amount to be spent on the relief of unemployment during this coming year, but if he will look at page 111 of the Estimates he will see that there is another amount of £181,800 to be provided this year under Unemployment Insurance, making the total for unemployment £209,300.

Mr. HYNES: I was speaking of relief.

Mr. CORSER: Yet the hon. member would have the audacity to say that his Government had done more in the way of wiping out the necessity for unemployment relief than any previous Government.

Mr. FOLEY: What is the amount in Great Britain?

Mr. CORSER: There is a Labour Government in Great Britain, and there is more unemployment now than there has been for many years. But I am not going to be drawn from the point. The hon. member [11 a.m.] for Townsville has shown that he is ignorant of the facts regarding unemployment, the necessity for the appropriation of money to relieve it, and the immediate actual necessity for the distribution of these moneys. I would like the hon. member to go and hear the remarks of those men who are receiving these doles and are threatened that they will be stopped if they allow certain of their comrades to address them. They have actually been told recently in Brisbane that the doles will be refused to them if they allow a certain individual to address them. If the hon. member were to hear those remarks, and not look for some political significance in them, or try to blame the Opposition for something that might have been done in the time of their grandfathers in politics—

Mr. HYNES: I have been personally associated with the problem for the last forty years.

Mr. CORSER: I am afraid that the hon. member's association with the problem was an association with the "King Pins" who are in the good jobs to-day. We do not want to look and listen only to the "Kings" of industry. We ought not to listen only to the worker who has a job; we ought to consider also the individual who is craving for assistance in the way of work and not for doles. When the Government were in opposition and claimed the right to govern the country, partly because of the unemployment which they alleged to exist, they said that they would institute such conditions and pass such laws as would wipe out unemployment altogether. Yet here we have a total amount of unemployment exceeding that which existed under all past Governments.

Mr. HYNES: The union rolls don't show it.

Mr. CORSER: The hon. member knows perfectly well that the regulations of the

Mr. Corser.]

urions are so conservative in some cases that they have acted detrimentally to the unemployed. They are privileged organisations in some cases, and many of these unemployed men are not allowed to get within them.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. CORSER: I am not going to allow the hon. member to draw me off the track. We know that under the Government's scheme of provision for the unemployed certain farms which were called "unemployed farms" were to be established. We had beautiful pictures drawn for us of the unemployed getting up early on the farm and wiping the frost off the handles of the plough and of then going ahead to produce. But we find that these were only deceitful attractions held up to this unfortunate section of the community. They have not come to light, like many other ideas which are very useful when promulgated from the kerosene case at election time, but have no use for the man who wants a job after they have served their purpose. The statements that the fares of certain persons whom the Government wished to remove from the State or to encourage to leave the State were paid out of the Unemployment Insurance Fund have been denied, but there has been no denial of the statement that they were paid out of the vote which we are considering now, and I contend that we must come to the conclusion that the fares of these people—who were practically deported from the State by the encouragement of an offer of free fares to Sydney—were paid out of the vote last year; or rather from the amount of £35,000 which was expended last year under this heading.

Mr. FOLEY: Can you give any specific cases?

Mr. CORSER: The hon. member will find the specific cases at the Home Department. One hon. member has practically told us that the progress of Christianity and the application of science and education to industry are responsible for unemployment. I cannot hold with that. I admit that where gangs of men were once working, but machinery has come into use, fewer men are engaged—that is, as a result of science as applied to industry—but as science is applied to industry so is the standard of living of mankind increased, and we gradually reach a higher plane of living conditions. We have only to cast our eyes to the conditions which exist in other States in the world. The Government here refer to a better standard of living as a result of Labour administration, but that is not so. The greater the conveniences that people demand, the more work for labour engaged in the manufacture of those articles, and the worker is getting the money all the time. As we can secure the assistance of machinery so we desire increased facilities, and so we create greater avenues of employment as we go along, and the worker is getting the benefit all the time. After nine or ten years of Labour government we find more unemployment. The unfulfilment of their promises only goes to show that past Governments were further ahead in their desire to do their best for all sections of the community than the present Administration.

HON. J. G. APPEL (*Albert*): I was in the Chamber yesterday when the hon. member for Nanango was speaking, and I confess I did not hear him refer in contemptuous terms

to the man who carries his swag. In fact, he referred to his own early troubles in life. I am aware that it has come to the knowledge of the authorities that there is a certain number of men who are not really looking for work but who go about the country, calling at one police station after another and asking for relief. During my regime I never gave any instructions that they were not to be supplied. Apparently that policy has been continued, and I do not think any very serious objection has been made to it, yet I have seen men going round drawing these rations at police station after police station. In one case two men had a remarkably good sulky with a good horse and good camping outfit, but that was not in evidence when they drew the rations. Presumably they are sometimes referred to because it is owing to such cases that frequently a man who genuinely requires relief perhaps has to go without. The hon. member for Townsville spoke of the system under which men were required to do a certain amount of work for the rations given by the State. No Government with which I was associated ever made that request. For the information of the hon. member let me say—this is where hon. members who are new to this Chamber oftentimes make a misstatement of the case—I do not say wilfully—that under a previous Administration, which was a composite one, including certain Liberal members and supported by a very large majority amongst whom were members of the Labour party, the Home Secretary required the men who received that dole to go down to the Botanic Gardens and do a certain amount of work. Probably the Labour party of that time who supported the Government, and the Home Secretary, who was a member of that party, thought it was quite a justifiable thing to do. That is a matter of opinion. I do not propose to criticise it, but for hon. members to condemn it and cast the whole onus on hon. members on this side I think is not really the correct thing, when it was carried out and continued by a member of the Labour party who occupied the position of Home Secretary. The question of unemployment has been discussed on this vote. We quite realise that under the most prosperous condition of any country there is bound to be a certain percentage—smaller or greater—who will be unemployed. There are various reasons for that, but where the affairs of the State are so administered that progress and advancement are in evidence unemployment is at its minimum. During my time at the Home Department, I think approximately £5,000 a year covered the whole of the requirements of the department in that respect. I can assure hon. members—and I think they will give me credit for this—that no one who required assistance went without it. Another matter has been raised in that connection, and that is the giving of passes to the unemployed to go to another State. I confess I did it. When an unfortunate came to me and made out a good case that he was unable to obtain employment here and had friends in New South Wales or elsewhere, and that if he got the pass to there he would be able to find employment, I did not hesitate to give him the pass. I do not adversely criticise the Home Secretary who gives an unfortunate man who cannot obtain work in Queensland a pass to go to another State where he has friends and can obtain work. I think it is quite a proper thing for him to do.

[*Mr. Corser.*]

Hon. M. J. KIRWAN: Has that not been the general policy of the office?

HON. J. G. APPEL: That has been the policy. The policy of the office is that it is there to assist—having due regard to all the aspects of the case—anyone who is in an unfortunate position. That was the policy of the department when I came there. A certain decision had been made by the hon. gentleman who administered the affairs of the department, and who was a member of the Labour party, requiring a certain amount of work to be done by those obtaining relief. That was his matter. He considered that it was a proper thing and should be done. I have nothing to say about that. I did not think it was necessary to do that. The policy of the department has been a generous one. If it was broken or departed from by any hon. member who occupied the position of administrator, whether a member of the Labour party or this party, it would be disastrous and justly condemned, because this department of all others is one to which every hon. member in this Chamber looks for assistance to be given to those who require it, or whose necessities demand it. I only regret that this amount is so large, not because it is large, but because it is required. As to the causes of unemployment I would say that the able speeches which were delivered in this Chamber by the Premier and the Secretary for Public Lands gave fully and completely the causes of unemployment. In their speeches they set out those causes. It is unquestionably by reason of excessive taxation that our industries have been circumscribed and development and progress in our industries have not taken place. We could have no better evidence or no more complete answer or reason for unemployment than that which was contained in the speeches delivered by the Premier and the Secretary for Public Lands.

Mr. FOLEY (*Leichhardt*): No doubt the hon. member for Albert by his remarks has taken quite a lot of sting out of the remarks made by the hon. member for Burnett and other hon. members opposite. He has practically made what might be termed a Government speech on this question. He has agreed that unemployment is practically certain under the present system of society, and that, no matter how prosperous a nation may be, unemployment will exist, and necessarily it is the duty of the State to look after those unfortunates who are affected possibly through no fault of their own. The hon. member for Burnett and other hon. members opposite have taken up the attitude that because unemployment exists this Government are responsible for it. I would refer them to New South Wales. There they have a Nationalist party in power with practically the same policy as that adopted by the Opposition in Queensland, yet we find unemployment to a greater extent in that State than exists in Queensland to-day. We find further that New South Wales unloads a great number of its unemployed and unfortunates on to Queensland, because of the fact that our Government, recognising their duty to the unfortunate citizens who are affected by the system, give out relief, and as a consequence the influx of unemployed from New South Wales to other States is greatest in the case of Queensland and makes the difficulty much worse for Queensland. Although I may be transgressing a little, I would like to refer to the institution at Dunwich. The conditions created by this Government for the aged

individuals at Dunwich compared with those obtaining in New South Wales really stamp Dunwich as a paradise, with the result that administrators find that where it is possible for aged persons or those needing to go to a home of that description to find their way to Queensland they invariably do so. I am just using that argument by way of comparison.

Hon. M. J. KIRWAN: They also sent patients to our sanatoria.

Mr. FOLEY: If the Government of every State in this Commonwealth were to recognise their duty to those unfortunate people who are affected by the system as we know it to-day and gave some relief, no matter how small it might be, we would find that Queensland would not be affected to the same extent as she is to-day, and the amount of the vote which we are discussing to-day would not be required.

I wish to get back to the question of unemployment because it has a bearing on this vote. The Government have endeavoured, and rightly so, to relieve the position by passing what is known as the Unemployed Workers Insurance Act. This Act gives the right to every worker to contribute to a fund so that when, through no fault of his own, he is thrown out of work, he shall receive the money due to him under that Act. The same system is in operation in practically every country in the world. We find it existing in such countries in Europe as Denmark, Sweden, Germany, and Austria. They each have a system of coping with the unemployment problem, which is really the cause of this vote. Why are hon. members on the opposite side of the Chamber endeavouring to place the blame for the existence of unemployment in Queensland to-day on the party to which I belong? Their contention is ridiculous. Any student of economics knows that so long as the capitalistic system exists as we know it to-day and so long as there is production for profit instead of for use, we shall have unemployment, and it will be necessary for this Government to vote money for its relief, as it is required, no matter how large the vote may be.

Mr. BEDFORD (*Warrego*): The contribution of the hon. member for Burnett to the solution of the unemployment problem was mainly an attack on the Government for not having carried out the whole of the Labour programme in the few minutes or few hours, comparatively speaking, that they have been in power. The reasons for the existence of unemployment in Queensland are natural, particularly when it is borne in mind that all our primary production gives employment which is mostly seasonal. The intelligence of the hon. member has not been sufficiently brought to bear on that point. The conditions which produce unemployment are a matter quite outside of this State and are really ones for the Commonwealth Government to solve once and for all. Some of the unemployment in Queensland is owing to sabotage by capital. For instance, selectors must crutch and jet in season, and, if they do not work on their flocks, some of the best men herding sheep fall down. Some of the wealthy pastoral companies in good seasons employ less labour than in bad seasons. On at least one of the stations out in the Warrego there has been no attempt to crutch and jet the sheep this season, the idea being that it is cheaper

Mr. Bedford.]

in a time of plenty to take the loss rather than employ labour to obviate the loss.

HON. M. J. KIRWAN: Is that really so when wool is the price it is to-day?

Mr. BEDFORD: Yes. Further, there was one act of gross sabotage last year. It was in the refusal by the owners to skin or permit to be skinned, even though they were offered a fair price for the dead sheep, 800 sheep which died near Quilpie. Those sheep must have been worth 7s. or 8s. in wool. Then again another factor in the unemployment problem is the fact that shearing contractors in the South bring shearers to my electorate to do their work. After their work is completed, they take their cheques and the first train back to New South Wales. Under the Commonwealth agreement there is no power to interfere in such cases. Therefore the only possible scheme to alleviate unemployment is to see that neither this State nor any other State provides work for the people oversea. Primary industries are seasonal, and it stands to reason that the only possible way of wiping out unemployment absolutely is to foster secondary industries by preventing one article coming into this country which can be manufactured here. That would mean wiping out preference to Great Britain or any other country. It might also mean in bad times—and this country is still feeling the results of the war—that this action would have to be supplemented by the prevention of the importation of certain articles of luxury which are not necessary. The duty of wiping out unemployment comes only within the ambit of one authority, and that is the Commonwealth Parliament. Its duty is to consider not Britain or any other country, but to wipe out preference tariffs to Britain or any other country in order that every article that can be manufactured is manufactured and every stroke of work that can be done in this country is so done. I am quite sure that the vote for the distribution of relief of unemployment will decrease if we consider Australia only in the matter of industry arising from production.

HON. M. J. KIRWAN (*Brisbane*): I do not wish to allow the opportunity to go by without making some reference to the allegation made in the New South Wales Parliament by a responsible Minister that the Government in this State have been dumping the unemployed on to New South Wales. Realising my responsibility as a Minister I am prepared to make this definite and clear statement: The Government are quite prepared to bill New South Wales, Victoria, and the other States for what they are doing for their unemployed and allow those Governments to do likewise to this Government. I am prepared to say that, if this is agreed to, Queensland will not have to send a cheque to the other States, but that a cheque—and a pretty big one, too—will be received by us from them. I know as a private member from my own personal experience, and hon. members on both sides of the Chamber also know, that people come to Queensland from the other States to enter our sanatoria.

Mr. KERR: I suppose that is on account of our climatic conditions.

HON. M. J. KIRWAN: Why then should there be all this talk of putting our unemployed on to the New South Wales Government when the other States are sending their unfortunate and afflicted people to Queensland?

Mr. COOPER: Are they?

[*Mr. Bedford.*]

HON. M. J. KIRWAN: The Home Secretary, as a sympathetic administrator, has never turned an unfortunate sufferer from consumption away if he can get relief in the sanatorium at Dalby. I knew a young man who came from New South Wales suffering from rheumatism in its first stage. He had been strongly advised to get to Muckadilla, if possible, and told that if he did so he would undoubtedly be cured. If the disease had been allowed to develop he might have been a cripple for life. Hon. members know that rheumatism is an uncomfortable complaint and is the cause of considerable suffering. I approached the Home Secretary in reference to this man, told him that he was prepared with the money that he possessed to pay his board if he only got a railway pass. The Minister kindly enough gave him a pass. Some time afterwards this young man called on me at Parliament House to express his gratitude. It was quite a pleasure to see the difference in his physical condition, and to know that he was able to go out into the world and earn his livelihood. I am quite sure that any other Home Secretary would have acted in a like manner. Other men have come to this State in the hope of obtaining relief from certain complaints and have received sympathetic consideration. Frequently applications are received from men who have travelled from other States to be admitted to Dunwich. Very often those men have only been two or three weeks in the State when they made their application.

I have just been informed by the gentleman in charge of the Relief Department that only this morning he was approached for assistance by a new arrival from Adelaide. We know that whether the Home Secretary, the Assistant Home Secretary, the Under Secretary, or other responsible officer of the department, is concerned these cases are considered on their merits.

I wish to give the facts particularly regarding the individual whose case was specifically mentioned in New South Wales, and whose case was taken—unfairly I say—by the Southern Minister as an evidence in support of his attempt to lead the people of New South Wales to believe that the Queensland Government were unloading their unemployed on New South [11.30 a.m.] Wales. I shall not give the name of the person publicly but it may be obtained by any hon. member privately. This person was in Brisbane for some considerable time—about two or three years. He followed the calling of a bookseller's assistant, and refused point blank to look for work in any other direction than as a bookseller's assistant. There is not a large demand for such a calling in Queensland, and the man was unable to get work. He then secured the intervention of a gentleman, who called at the Home Office and explained that, if this man were able to get to Sydney he would give an assurance that he could get employment there. This assurance was taken by the Home Secretary, and it was agreed to give the man the necessary pass to New South Wales. I think the hon. member for Albert, the ex Home Secretary, will admit that in taking that action this Government merely showed a continuance of the hon. gentleman's policy.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: Hear, hear!

HON. M. J. KIRWAN: There was another case where a woman with a young family made representations to the Home Secretary's Department to the effect that her husband was in Sydney working, but, owing to shortage of funds, he was unable to pay the fare of the family to Sydney. She appealed for assistance. What could be more right than for the Home Secretary's Department, after satisfying themselves as to the correctness of the facts, to issue a pass to enable that woman and her family to rejoin her husband? We merely enabled them to be re-united and live together again, and enabled the woman to have the care and protection of her husband.

HON. J. G. APPEL: Quite correct, too.

HON. M. J. KIRWAN: It is only in cases like that that assistance is given. I can assure hon. members that the Home Department—whether the Minister himself is concerned, the Under Secretary, Mr. Gall, or Mr. Chuter, or any other officer chosen to investigate the matter—do not like to issue passes. They are issued only after the fullest inquiries have been made and the department are satisfied that everything is correct. When they do issue the passes they are only doing a right and fair thing, and have in many instances assisted unfortunate and deserving people.

As I indicated in my opening remarks, the Home Department are quite prepared to open up an account and charge up to the other States the keep of their sick and unfortunate who happen to be in this State. In turn we would allow them to charge us with similar disbursements. I am quite satisfied that I know which office would receive the cheque at the end of the financial year.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): I raised this question and I think we must all agree that the hon. gentleman made a very frank statement with regard to the matter.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KERR: Why was it, when the statement was made by a responsible Minister in New South Wales, that the Queensland Government saw fit to publish a denial of the occurrence? That fact requires investigation and explanation.

HON. M. J. KIRWAN: Who denied it?

Mr. KERR: It was denied in the daily Press.

HON. M. J. KIRWAN: I would like the hon. member to quote that statement and not to make wild statements, as he did the other day with regard to adulterated milk.

Mr. KERR: The Secretary for Public Works published his denial in the daily Press, yet to-day the Assistant Home Secretary acknowledges frankly that the statements made by the New South Wales Minister were correct.

HON. M. J. KIRWAN: I acknowledge nothing of the kind.

Mr. KERR: The hon. gentleman said that an able-bodied man who would not look for work other than in his particular calling received a passage to New South Wales.

HON. M. J. KIRWAN: I did not say that. Do not misquote me.

Mr. KERR: I would not misquote the hon. gentleman. Does the hon. gentleman now deny that the man received a pass to New South Wales?

HON. M. J. KIRWAN: No.

Mr. KERR: Well, that is the position. I will not be browbeaten in the matter.

HON. M. J. KIRWAN: And I will not be misrepresented by you.

Mr. KERR: I have not misrepresented the hon. member. That man was an able-bodied man and he would not look for work in this State except in his particular occupation. He desired a pass to New South Wales to enable him to seek work.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: Not to seek work. To go to a job.

Mr. KERR: According to a further statement by the New South Wales Minister that man is unemployed and did not receive employment when he reached New South Wales. I say the time is ripe when we should take exception to the Railway Department having to carry the burden of these passes.

HON. M. J. KIRWAN: That is another misstatement.

Mr. KERR: The Railway Department have to carry the loss if the man went by the railway. No money passes in any way.

HON. M. J. KIRWAN: It did not.

Mr. KERR: The man might have gone by boat.

Mr. FARRELL: Did the man not request a pass?

Mr. KERR: Any man could make a request for a pass. I say if that man were in Queensland and would not work, he should not receive a pass to New South Wales.

Mr. FARRELL: Does the hon. member know that the man was suffering from hernia when he received that pass?

Mr. KERR: I do not know that that has anything to do with the question. Could he not get rid of his hernia in Queensland just as well as in New South Wales? I do know that he would not look for work other than in his own calling, and the Government gave him a pass to New South Wales.

At 11.38 a.m.,

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

Mr. KERR: The New South Wales Minister made a statement and it was denied by the Secretary for Public Works. Was that denial justified? This morning the Assistant Home Secretary verified the remarks of the Minister in New South Wales and I think it is only right that we should voice our condemnation of such a system.

Mr. FARRELL: You are kicking up a fuss over nothing.

Mr. KERR: This is the right place to kick up a fuss. The question of the various institutions is outside the issue altogether. We know that people from all over Australia come to our beautiful climate and they are entitled to do so. In cases where they may have a disease or some illness necessitating some other climate it may be justifiable to issue a pass. The same thing is applicable where Queenslanders require to go to a cold climate such as Tasmania. However, that is a side issue.

Then we have another example of an able-bodied man who was working in New South Wales. His family happened to be in Queensland and applied for a pass to join

Mr. Kerr.]

him. That pass was given. I do not think that a justifiable charge on our revenue.

Hon. M. J. KIRWAN: You are pretty hard to please.

Mr. KERR: It is not a question of pleasing me. If this were made a general principle, the Government would be spending thousands of pounds and hundreds of people would be only too willing to take advantage of the privilege.

Mr. POLLOCK (*Gregory*): I want to make my position quite clear in regard to the relief question. There is no doubt that this expenditure is being very carefully scrutinised everywhere in Queensland to-day. I believe that, so far as it is humanly possible, very little is allowed to get through that is not justified. I know that in those places in which I have personal experience the police controlling this vote are very, very careful to see, in so far as they possibly can see, that relief is only granted in bona fide cases. More than that, I think cannot be done by anyone.

I have no wish to transgress the Standing Orders, but I would like to refer in passing to the fact that the vote for outdoor relief would be very much greater than it is were it not for the Country Women's Association and the good work they perform in assisting necessitous cases in this connection.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. EDWARDS: You would not allow me to say that yesterday. (Laughter.)

Mr. POLLOCK: As I said, I have no desire to transgress the Standing Orders and I am merely doing what I permitted every other hon. member to do yesterday when I occupied the chair—that is, to deal with that association in so far as it relates to the particular vote under discussion. (Hear, hear!) This association in Winton not long ago gave several amounts extending from £10 upwards to families in very necessitous circumstances. In some instances these families had had their bread-winners taken from them, and the association was able by that means to save this department a similar outlay, if not a greater outlay, and for that reason the thanks of the State are due to these women, who in many cases have gone out of their way to assist people who deservedly need relief. While it is not permissible to discuss their politics, if they have any, anybody who does anything in the shape of assisting those who are down and out deserves the commendation of the community, and I disagree entirely with those who say this body has not its uses. It has its uses, and in the Western districts it is proving a very very useful body in the matter of saving the giving of relief by the State. Of course they can handle these matters in a very much better manner than the average policeman or State official can handle them, particularly when it comes to dealing with women who require relief. (Hear, hear!) There is no doubt they can do very much more, and in a very much more satisfactory way to the recipient of relief. After all, the average woman, who perhaps has lost her husband and is left with a large family, does not like to go along to the police station looking for relief. Most people consider it degrading. I remember many years ago, through no fault of my own, I had to go and get relief, and I can assure hon. members that I did not appreciate it at all.

Mr. CORSER: Was that in the time of the Tory Government?

[*Mr. Kerr.*]

Mr. POLLOCK: Yes. (Laughter.) I must say the treatment was very different then to what it is now. The rations then were, "Ten, two, and a-quarter."

Mr. CORSER: It went further then.

Mr. POLLOCK: As a matter of fact it did not go any further. A $\frac{1}{4}$ lb. of sugar and 2 oz. of tea did not go any further in those days than it goes to-day.

Mr. CORSER: You are cutting it down.

Mr. POLLOCK: I can assure hon. members that those were the rations given in those days. I received them, and I have a very fair idea of what they were. No one desires to go for relief if it is possible to avoid it, and it is only those who are chronic "out of works" and "won't works"—who have no feeling of honour at all—who will go along for relief unless it is absolutely necessary. As I say, women find it very difficult to approach the officer in charge of police in the search of relief. It is much easier to go to a body such as the Country Women's Association, for they then have to deal with their own sex, and I say they have received sympathetic treatment from the members of that association, and I hope they will continue their operations, and that the Government will give them every credit for what they are doing. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): I was very pleased to hear the remarks of the Chairman of Committees, the hon. member for Gregory, with regard to the Country Women's Association, particularly after the attack that was made on that association in the Committee yesterday. The hon. member, I take it, spoke with an inside knowledge of the work that that association is doing. Immediately that association becomes political—I hope it will not—then its sphere of usefulness will be absolutely gone, but so long as it continues its present programme and carries out the ideas placed before the country women of Queensland, then it will be of very great benefit to country women throughout Queensland. As I said yesterday the women in our outback areas are thoroughly deserving of the very best that we can give them as a State.

There should be some different system in operation as between the States in the matter of passes issued to certain individuals. If a man can come along to the Home Department, as we have been told by the Assistant Home Secretary this morning, and can convince those in charge of that department that he has a position to go to in a neighbouring State, then that State should pay his fare. That is the view I hold in regard to that. When a man comes along and puts the position before the department, such as was put by the Assistant Home Secretary this morning, I do not think that this State should be called upon to pay the expense of removing him out of the State. I suppose it would be difficult to apply a very hard and fast rule in regard to the matter. There has to be a considerable amount of sympathetic administration in connection with that department, and there is no doubt that occasions will arise when the department will be misled even after it has made most careful inquiries into the case brought before them.

Hon. M. J. KIRWAN: Hear, hear! Hon. members are taken down every week.

Mr. TAYLOR: Exactly. I can fully bear out what has been said this morning that the most careful inquiries apparently are made

by the police before outdoor relief is granted. Quite a number of us know that because people come to us and ask us to go to the department with regard to their particular cases. My experience is that they only tell you really about a quarter of what they should tell you, and when we go to the department and inquire as to what has been done and the officials turn up the records, we find that a lot more information should have been given to us by the individuals applying for relief before we approached the department at all. The police evidently make the most careful inquiry. I have had occasion to go to the department in regard to quite a number of cases—and in not one single instance have I been able to find that the information which has been supplied by the police to the department can be upset in one single degree. It is borne out entirely by the persons themselves when you come to question them. I think, therefore, that every care is exercised in that direction.

I was rather surprised to hear certain remarks made in connection with this vote by the hon. member for Kennedy, who said that under the present capitalistic system—as he called it—unemployment would always exist. Probably a certain amount of unemployment will exist, but under an Administration such as we have got now we have absolute proof of its existence, and it is likely to continue to exist for quite a long time. The hon. member made the remarkable statement that inventions and machinery of various kinds create unemployment. I cannot follow the hon. member's line of argument at all in that matter. I might mention one industry in connection with that matter—for instance, motor cars. Unfortunately they are not made in Australia. Can anyone say that because the building of buggies and sulkies practically has gone out of existence there are less men employed in industry to-day? There has simply been a transference of men engaged in building sulkies and that kind of thing to the motor industry, which has gone ahead by leaps and bounds. Hundreds and probably thousands of people to-day are running motor cars who previously had no buggy or sulky. A considerable amount of revenue is coming to the Commonwealth Government on account of the duties in connection with motor cars, and a considerable sum comes to this Government to enable them to carry out their main roads policy, in the shape of the tax imposed on motor cars, which did not exist previously. All these factors have to be taken into consideration, if you intend to offer any kind of intelligent criticism.

I was rather surprised at the remarks of the hon. member for Townsville when he said that to ask a man to do a certain amount of work for a certain amount of pay was degrading and debasing. I always thought work was honest and honourable. We hear a lot about honest toil. As the Chairman of Committees pointed out, the true worker does not like to ask for doles—he would rather be given a job. There is nothing more pathetic in our civilisation to-day than that an able-bodied man with dependants should be out of employment. The greatest possible effort should be made by the Government to create employment as far as they possibly can. We have an Unemployed Workers Insurance Act in operation in Queensland, which no doubt has conferred a great benefit on quite a

number of people, but I consider that in a magnificent State like Queensland, with its huge undeveloped resources, it is a slur upon us as Queenslanders that it should have been necessary to pass such a measure.

Mr. EDWARDS (*Nanango*): I want to flatly contradict a statement which I understand was made by the hon. member for Townsville, to the effect that I had made an insinuation, or a definite statement, against the unemployed or the workers. When I was speaking yesterday, I stated definitely that there was in the State of Queensland a percentage of what we can safely term professional swagmen, and I suggested to the Home Secretary that every effort should be made to see that these professional swagmen earned the rations that they got from the State. That is the statement I made, and I made it absolutely clear that, in my opinion, it should be the duty of any Government, as the hon. member for Windsor stated, at all times to see that, as far as possible, work is given to the man who is willing to accept it. I think that a Government should assist the unemployed to find work, but to assist men to carry their swags about the State asking for rations is simply degrading to the men. The Government should see that no able-bodied men, particularly in a State with the resources of Queensland, should be out of work. There is no occasion for them to be out of work. There is work for everyone who is willing to do it.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: I hope the hon. member will confine his remarks to the vote for "Outdoor Relief" which is before the Committee.

Mr. EDWARDS: Work should be given to the unemployed, and if work cannot be found for them they should be provided with food.

I was pleased to hear the statement made by the hon. member for Gregory that the country districts associations, such as the Country Women's Association, should be assisted in every way possible. The subject of the vote we are discussing this morning is the very thing that this association is giving attention to in the country districts. They have been largely responsible for a great deal less money being required for relief during the last financial year. In many districts they have not only assisted in the feeding of children, but have also seen that the children were clothed. I congratulate the hon. member on the statement he has made about the assistance which the Country Women's Association so willingly give to the needy people in Queensland. I think that every encouragement should be given to the association in their work.

Mr. W. COOPER (*Rosewood*): The hon. member for Nanango gave credit to the Country Women's Association for the manner in which they have assisted those who are in need in the country. Every Government which has been in power in Queensland since the inauguration of self-government has endeavoured, as far as its lights would permit it, to help those who were in need. While I commend the Country Women's Association for their attitude towards those who are in need in the country, I want to point out that there is an avenue by which necessitous people may get relief, particularly those who have been left widowed when the breadwinner has gone.

Mr. W. Cooper.¹

The State Children Department provide a certain amount of relief to these unfortunate people. It has been stated that it is necessary for a strict supervision to be exercised in regard to the money expended in this direction, and I think that the Government have endeavoured to see that no one imposes on the State by receiving relief to which they are not justly entitled. We know from experience that the human race is prone to look upon everyone with suspicion. We find that disabilities have been placed upon men who have made application for relief. A vast number of questions are being asked. We know that they are mostly honest men who apply for relief, and that they would not do so except through necessity. As the hon. member for Nanango said, it is almost a matter of impossibility to find work for all. I have never met a man who has applied for relief—and I have had a great deal of experience in regard to men applying for relief—who has not been willing to do a certain amount of work in return for the food or other requisites given. As a case in point, a man came along and asked me whether I could give him work. I said, "Yes, come along, I have a wagon-load of wood. If you will cut that wood up, I will pay you for it. That is practically what you ask." He went to work and cut up the wagon-load of wood, and it took him four and a-half hours. When he came to me I said, "Well, you have finished your job?" "Yes," he said.

I asked him what he wanted, and he said, "I want 4s. 6d." The rate of pay fixed by the Arbitration Court is infinitely more than 1s. an hour, and I told him and I gave him 100 per cent. more than he asked. I mention this to show that all men who carry their swags are not bad, and that one act of kindness may lead a man into some better position; and I am sorry that hon. members in this Chamber have endeavoured to belittle the efforts of the Government to carry out the humanitarian policy which they have adopted for so many years. I remember very vividly what happened under previous Governments, particularly at the time of the bank crisis in 1895, when hundreds of men in New South Wales and Queensland and every other State were cast out on to the streets. Bank managers were even compelled to go out as navvies on the road. The Government erected soup kitchens in the streets, causing them to be exposed to the public view and practically making paupers of them. Our system to-day is infinitely better than it was in the good old Tory days when every man was considered to be fair prey for an employer. The Government have done a lot more towards relieving the distress of the poor and unemployed than was ever attempted before in Australia; and we must go on.

I agree with the hon. member for Windsor that secondary industries are of the utmost importance. If we could establish secondary industries in Queensland, it would not be very long before we would solve the unemployment problem. We could reduce the number of unemployed in Queensland by at least 75 per cent.—I am not sanguine enough to say that we could supply work for everybody. The casual employment of men in the sugar and other industries causes some of them to be thrown out of work at different times, whereas, if they had any say in it, they would be employed all the year round. A man is born on to this earth with every

right that any other man possesses—I am not going to say that he is born equal with every other man—and, if men are thrown out of employment, then that is the fault of the capitalistic system which we enjoy—that is, if we do enjoy it. For my part, I do not.

Mr. BRAND: It is the fault of the Government.

Mr. W. COOPER: The unfortunate thing is that the hon. member did not happen to be a member of a Government party in the past, and, judging from his remarks, I do not think that he knows anything at all about this Government's system for the relief of the unemployed. We have to deal with unemployment in the way which appears to us to be best, and the Government have established an unemployment insurance scheme which has relieved many men. I hope to see it go on. It is the most equitable system I can see just at present; but we have to advance, and we may in the near future provide some scheme under which we shall have no unemployment. No hon. member can tell me that every man is bad. Every man who carries his swag is not bad. I have known men who have carried their swag reach the highest rungs of the ladder, not only in the professions but in politics, as well. If we are going to be a great nation, we have to carry out the dictates of Christianity, and, unless we do that, then the prayer which the Speaker reads every morning is hypocrisy. I hope that hon. members opposite will realise that they are men, and that they have many friends amongst the people of Queensland whose welfare is in their keeping; and I hope that this great State will provide, so far as is possible, relief for every unfortunate man who cannot find employment.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*): All along the Opposition have done all in their power to point out to the Government the necessity for taking the action which the hon. member who has just sat down claims that they have not taken. Right along we have tried to bring home to the Government the necessity for realising the condition of things. Hon. members opposite have stood up in their places and quoted the amount of this vote without knowing that a considerable amount was also being provided for unemployment on page 111 of the Estimates, under the Unemployment Insurance Office, which with this vote makes a total of over £200,000, instead of the £28,000 which they thought was sufficient, and which they used in their comparison of this Administration with previous Governments.

The hon. member for Rosewood talks about the Christian spirit. It is the Opposition who have endeavoured right along to show the Christian spirit—(Government laughter)—who have by their criticism sheeted home to the Government the necessity for making adequate provision for the unemployed; and now the hon. member for Rosewood has made an apology on their behalf to this Committee by asking the Opposition to do what they can to help the Government to provide that assistance which is the due of all the unemployed.

Mr. PAYNE (*Mitchell*): To me there is nothing more deplorable than to see an able-bodied man roaming about and seeking work and unable to get it. There is nothing in creation more calculated to degrade a man than that. I agree that everything should be done to solve this vexed question of unem-

[Mr. W. Cooper.

ployment. The unfortunate thing—and I suppose it applies to other States in Australia as well—is that our industries are in many cases only seasonal. Take the shearing and sugar industries or railway construction work, which is all temporary work. A man gets work at one or the other, and is employed for a time, and then he is turned out into the wilderness, so to speak, looking for work. The hon. member for Warrego hit the nail right on the head when speaking on a solution of the unemployment problem. That is a matter to which I have given a good deal of thought. There is only one Parliament in Australia to deal with this question, and that is the Federal Parliament. Until we can have the secondary industries started in Australia, and started in such a way as will give permanent employment to a large number of men and women, I do not know how we are going to solve the unemployment question. As a practical Australian who has travelled about Australia in a practical way, it has appeared to me for a number of years that a country like Australia, which is teeming with national resources, offers opportunities in advance of other countries of the world in establishing secondary industries.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. gentleman to connect his remarks with the vote.

Mr. PAYNE: I was only dealing with the question that was raised.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. PAYNE: The only way that we can avoid unemployment in Queensland is to start those secondary industries, and the only way to do that is to have a national Government in power which will bring in a protective tariff.

Mr. KELSO: A Nationalist Government?

Mr. PAYNE: No; a national Government—an Australian Government. This question should agitate the minds of all hon. members. The hon. member for Warrego hit the nail on the head when he said the only way to solve the question was to start secondary industries.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: That is exactly what we have preached for years.

Mr. PAYNE: Until we have a Parliament to do what I have suggested we shall always have unemployment.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: It is not a matter for Parliament; it is a matter for private enterprise.

Mr. PAYNE: I believe that there would be no unemployment in Australia if secondary industries were established in the way that they should be. I believe that millions of pounds would come to this country to start secondary industries if there were a Government in the national Parliament to give them protection and enable them to start. That is the only way to solve the unemployment question. Some people might say that we would be doing an injustice to the motherland by creating unemployment there. Let the people in the motherland come out here—we want them here. Let us create a new England here. With our wonderful resources we could carry millions and millions of people if the right policy were adopted. I agree with the hon. member for Warrego that the only way to permanently solve the unemployment question is to have a national Government in

power in the Federal Parliament which would give protection to capital coming here to start secondary industries.

Mr. ELPHINSTONE: Does the hon. gentleman say that there is no protection now?

At 12.13 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*): I have listened to the remarks of hon. members opposite.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. gentleman has exhausted the time allowed him under the Standing Orders.

Mr. KELSO (*Vundah*): It is most interesting to hear the remarks of the hon. member for Mitchell that the Labour Government are now beginning to see that what has been suggested for years from this side should have been adopted.

Mr. PAYNE: I have been here for twenty years and I have not heard it suggested from the Opposition.

Mr. EDWARDS: Why do you not listen?

Mr. KELSO: It was rather refreshing to see the statement in the paper this morning that the future policy of the Government, according to the Secretary for Agriculture, in the South, was to be no State enterprises.

Mr. FARRELL: That is the "Courier" report.

Mr. KELSO: I think the report coming from Melbourne will be found to be correct. I do not know if, when the Secretary for Agriculture arrives back and gets hauled over the coals by caucus, he will reverse what he has said. The Secretary for Mines comes back from the old land with fresh ideas. The very first thing he said on arrival in Australia was that there was nothing that impressed him more than the fact that we must have secondary industries if Australia was to be populated and go ahead.

Hon. M. J. KIRWAN: That is not new. I have heard him saying that for years.

Mr. KELSO: Evidently the policy adopted by the Government has not given sufficient protection to encourage capital to come here. The hon. member for Mitchell says that we must have secondary industries, and he cannot understand why we have not got secondary industries. Hon. members on this side have contended that the very finest thing that could happen for the farmers would be to have a large number of men employed in secondary industries consuming the farmers' products.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. gentleman to connect his remarks with the vote.

Mr. KELSO: I am trying to connect them in this way: If we had a large number of secondary industries to absorb the people in remunerative employment, there would not be very much necessity for money for outdoor relief.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: They have unemployed where they have secondary industries.

Mr. KELSO: Hon. members opposite if they are honest must admit that the reason why we have no secondary industries in Queensland is because taxation drives away the man with capital.

Mr. PAYNE: I have sworn evidence to the contrary.

Mr. KELSO: The hon. gentleman may have sworn evidence to the contrary. At the

Mr. Kelso.]

present time I know of a friend who has admitted to me that he received a very considerable income, and he spreads that capital over the States of Australia, the majority of it being invested in Victoria. Why? It is only human nature to invest money where one has to pay the least amount of taxation.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have allowed the hon. gentleman a considerable amount of latitude.

Mr. KELSO: Following the remarks of the hon. member for Mitchell I want to point out that if secondary industries were established, there would be very little unemployment, and, therefore, very little need for outdoor relief. It would be an ideal State if every man in the community who wanted work could get work. We know, unfortunately—I agree with the hon. member for Mitchell—that one of the most pathetic things in the world is to have able-bodied men looking for work and unable to procure it. The policy adopted by the Government up to the present has driven capital away, and there has been no chance of encouraging the establishment of secondary industries here. Queensland grows the very best wool in the Commonwealth. Look at the prices that are being realised. We have the vessels taking the wool away from Queensland, and taking it down to Victoria to be worked up into manufactured articles, and those goods are then brought back to Queensland. The men who ought to be here developing our State are employed down South.

Mr. FARRELL: The Prime Minister sold the woollen mills owned by the Commonwealth, and blankets have gone up since then.

Mr. PAYNE: Taxation is very high in Great Britain.

Mr. KELSO: I am not talking about Great Britain; I am talking about Australia. It is a very fair argument to compare the conditions obtaining in Queensland with those obtaining down South, and statistics show distinctly that the taxation paid in Victoria is only half of what is paid here.

Mr. FARRELL: On what salaries?

Mr. KELSO: The people will not invest their money in secondary industries here, when they can obtain a considerably bigger return on their capital in Victoria. The same thing applies to a lesser extent in New South Wales.

Have hon. members opposite or the Government ever given any encouragement to immigration during the last nine years? They know perfectly well that it does not suit their book to have immigrants coming here.

Mr. BRUCE: To relieve the unemployment in Great Britain?

Mr. KELSO: If the Government went in for an active scheme of immigration, they would lose the control that they now exercise. How is it that at the present time Canada is getting three times the number of people to go there than come to Australia?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I would remind the hon. member that he is getting a long way away from the vote under discussion.

Mr. KELSO: I do not want to disagree with you, Mr. Pollock, but it is a fair argument to point out the reason why the amount of outdoor relief is so large, and to suggest a method by which that amount can be reduced.

Mr. FARRELL: Your only suggestion to reduce it is to adopt a system of immigration.

[Mr. Kelso.

Mr. KELSO: Hon. members on the opposite side of the Chamber are annoyed because I am putting up an argument which they do not like. It is very easy to discern when they do not care about an argument, because they immediately squeal. We have the example of the United States of America, who for fifty years was willing to take immigrants from anywhere in order to build up her population.

Mr. BRUCE: They have now found out the results of that policy, and have shut their doors to immigration.

Hon. M. J. KIRWAN: You try and enter America now and see the result.

Mr. KELSO: The facts are that America for fifty years was prepared to take any person who liked to go there. They wanted to fill up their empty spaces, and it is most peculiar that even the polyglot races have turned out splendid citizens there.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I was not present when the hon. member for Mitchell was speaking.

Mr. KELSO: I can see, Mr. Chairman, that you do not like my argument, and I do not want to go against your ruling. I felt that it was only my duty to reply to the hon. member for Mitchell, who apparently wanted to know certain things. You allowed him to discuss this matter.

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

Mr. F. A. COOPER (*Bremer*): It seems to me that hon. members on the opposite side of the Chamber have lost sight of the fact that relief is for indigent persons. In all the arguments—or rather wanderings—that they have advanced I have not heard from them of any country in the world where there are no indigent persons. It is useless to attempt to make comparisons between various countries and this State in order to point out that conditions are better somewhere else. It is absolutely futile for the hon. member for Nundah to say that the Government have done nothing for immigration. It does not solve the relief question, nor is there any moral in it.

Mr. KELSO: Unfortunately you did not hear my argument.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: The facts are that, while the Government may have done nothing to encourage immigration, the figures of the Commonwealth Statistician show that their work has been so effective that it has attracted more people to this State in the last few years than any other State in the Commonwealth.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. F. A. COOPER: Relief does not enter into the question of immigration. I defy any hon. member to point to any country, no matter if the greatest autocratic or the highest form of socialistic government prevails there, where it has been found that relief is not necessary? It is useless for hon. members opposite to say that there is some form of government under which relief is not necessary. Even under the highest form of socialistic government relief will be necessary for those people who have not the capacity to look after themselves. In every organised society there must be a certain number of people like that. Unless the philanthropists of these days are going to smother the incompetents and inert,

they must still be fed. The State recognises its responsibility to those people who are unable to look after themselves. It is the bounden duty of the State to do that, no matter whether it costs £100 or £10,000. The amount of money paid for relief is merely indicative of the necessity for relief. A year or two ago we spent £170,000 for relief. The same amount is not now being spent because there is not the necessity for it. Twenty or twenty-five years ago, or when the hon. member for Albert was the guardian angel of the Home Office, the genius who distributed the relief handed out to each person 2 oz. of sugar, 2 oz. of tea, and so many pounds of bread and meat, but, owing to the advanced state of the legislation of this Government, which has increased the comforts of the people, it has been found necessary to increase that ration scale and give a better and bigger supply. Consequently expenses have gone up. It is useless for hon. members opposite to try and blame the Government for that fact. These are things of which the Government are proud. All the talk of establishing secondary industries will not solve the question. Secondary industries have not been established in this State because the capitalists are provided with a much better return in the 6½ per cent. free of income tax bonds in addition to being saved the anxiety and worry they would be subject to if they had their money invested in industries.

Mr. KELSO: Are not secondary industries increasing in Victoria?

Mr. F. A. COOPER: Statisticians in the different States give different interpretations of what secondary industries are. We do not want this State to be a State of cheap manufacturing lines. We do not want this State to get down to the level of many of the countries of the old world, which are great manufacturing centres. We want this State to be developed on better and higher lines than that.

Mr. KELSO: How then are you going to give employment to the people in the towns?

Mr. F. A. COOPER: This Government I am sure will not employ them as they were employed for many years past and make physical wrecks of them. The idea that this country cannot live and obviate the necessity for relief without pulling things off a ship and putting things on a ship, and without putting things in and pulling things out of a factory is ridiculous.

Mr. KELSO: You would not be game to tell the people of Ipswich that?

Mr. F. A. COOPER: I can assure the hon. member for Nundah that I have never been afraid to express my opinions, and I have never, if he has, hid my light under a bushel. Relief cannot be obviated in that way. We must meet the exigencies of the situation no matter what we do, and all the talk in the world will not remedy the situation. The whole question is: Are we doing enough for those people who are in need, and are we attempting to remedy the position quickly enough? I believe that the officer in charge of the relief is doing his work efficiently and sympathetically. I only hope that he has always before him the words, "He gives twice who gives quickly." I know that the work of the department is performed in a satisfactory manner, that the police are very careful in

their inquiries, and appear to me to exercise due care in giving where it is necessary to give, and in withholding where it is their duty to withhold.

HON. M. J. KIRWAN (*Brisbane*): I have just a few words to say in closing the debate. They are in the nature of supplementing my previous remarks in replying to the statements of the hon. member for Enoggera. The hon. member, in attempting to reply to my statements, endeavoured to create the impression in Committee that the Secretary for Public Works had made an entirely different statement to the one that I made this morning. That is incorrect. As a matter of fact, the reference that was made by the Secretary for Public Works, in replying to certain statements, was to an altogether different case. I do not know that I am justified in taking up a great deal of the time of this Committee in replying to an hon. member who stated that hydrometers, egg-noodles, vermin destroyers, and butter preservatives had been found by the Government Analyst in milk. (Laughter.) Regarding the man who was given a pass to Sydney, as a matter of fact, his first application was for a pass to England. [12.30 p.m.] He spent no little time worrying

Mr. Gall, the Under Secretary, for that pass. Eventually, on the representations of several prominent men of this city, and on the distinct statement made by him that he could find employment in Sydney, he was given a pass.

I wish to add that the statement of the hon. member for Enoggera, that the Railway Department bears the cost of those passes, is incorrect. The hon. member ought to know, and I give him this information for future use, that when any department issues a pass, whether to an officer of the department or in such a case as has been quoted, that particular department is responsible to the Railway Department for the value of the pass, whether it be 3s. or £3.

Generally speaking, the Relief Department have not received criticism of an unfavourable character. I think it will be admitted by hon. members who know the officers in charge of that department that, so far as the regulations allow them, they carry out their duties in a sympathetic manner. Generally speaking, the officer in charge of the department is a success, and has acted wisely in the administration of his duties.

Question put and passed.

POLICE.

The ASSISTANT HOME SECRETARY (Hon. M. J. Kirwan, *Brisbane*): I beg to move—

"That £427,757 be granted for 'Police.'"

This vote involves a net increase of £4,539. For the information of hon. members, I might point out that the increase is partly covered by fifteen extra constables, involving £1,919, and by ten additional recruits, £1,813. It is also partly absorbed by increases to the members of the staff, and by the usual classification increases.

HON. J. G. APPEL (*Albert*): Before entering into the vote in detail, I would like to express my thanks and gratitude to the members of the police force, to the Commissioner, officers, and rank and file of the force for the invariable courtesy which they

Hon. J. G. Appel.]

have shown to me, not only when I was the administrative head of the Home Secretary's Department, but as a private member. Wherever I have been in Queensland they have been invariably courteous, so much so that I feel compelled to state publicly in this Chamber that I thank them for it.

I think it will be admitted that this is one of the most important branches of the services of the State. It is by means of our police force that the protection and safety of members of the community are assured. I can say, after a considerable personal acquaintance with the police forces of South Australia, Victoria, New South Wales, and Queensland, that no finer force exists than that in the State of Queensland. Members stationed in our country districts have also proved of material assistance to those settled in such districts. I know, as one who resided for a number of years on the Beechmont Plateau, where there is no police station, that we all looked forward with pleasure to the monthly patrol of one of the police officers from the neighbouring police stations. Those officers, from the head of the station to the trooper, are men whose advice is sought, and who are always willing to give advice. It was a comfort to have them with us.

That is the way in which we in the country districts view the members of this great force. Consequently, as I have already said, this is possibly the most important branch of the Queensland State services.

We all know that the police force have exceptional duties to perform. They may be limited to an eight-hour day, but whether that is so or not their services are continuous. They are liable to be called upon morning, noon, and night. I am proud to be able to say that they are always willing and ready to respond to such calls. Their responsibilities are great, because they practically have the safety of the lives of the community and the charge of our property in their hands. Their own limbs and lives are subject, as we know, to assault by malefactors and evil-doers, and unquestionably, since the abolition of the death penalty, the risk to the lives of members of the police force has become greater. Although I was one of those who did not oppose the abolition of that penalty, I realise to-day that, with that abolition, the dangers to which the police force are subjected are greater than heretofore.

HON. M. J. KIRWAN: According to your argument there ought to be no crime in Melbourne to-day?

HON. J. G. APPEL: Possibly that police force was subjected to treatment similar to that meted out to the Queensland force under the Labour Administration. However, the hon. gentleman led me into a line of argument that I did not intend to pursue.

HON. M. J. KIRWAN: And very wisely, too.

HON. J. G. APPEL: If the hon. gentleman desires me to enter upon that phase of the discussion I am quite prepared to do so, and to point out to the hon. gentleman and to this Committee the injustices that are being done to the police force to-day by the hon. gentleman's Administration—an Administration professing to be the friends of that force, and who pretended that they would put the force in a better position than

[Hon. J. G. Appel.

that occupied by any other Police Force in the Commonwealth.

HON. M. J. KIRWAN: What did you do for the police force?

HON. J. G. APPEL: I shall tell the hon. gentleman. I will preface my explanation by quoting from an article in the "Queensland Police Union Journal" of 25th August, 1924. I think we may presume that any article appearing in that journal represents the genuine and bona-fide opinions of the police force.

This article is headed "Misleading Leaders" and it says—

"Quite true the wages and certain allowances of the Queensland Police Force have been increased in the manner stated by the member for Rockhampton, but in case he and his colleagues are not aware of the fact, we take this opportunity of stating that the police wages and allowances in New South Wales, South Australia, and Victoria, have advanced to considerably higher levels than those in Queensland, although before the war the police of this State compared favourably with the highest in Australia."

That is my answer to that interjection, and that emanates from the members of the police force, who, I take it, are the best judges of their own case. I endeavoured always to place them on an equality with the police force of New South Wales, which has always been considered to be the force which has received most favourable consideration. I would like to have gone further than I did because the conditions in Queensland are far more onerous and arduous than those imposed upon members of a similar force in that State.

The question of the value of the pound sterling is a matter that we have to take into serious consideration. In the year 1914-15 the pound sterling had a certain purchasing value equivalent, within a very small percentage, to the purchasing value of 30s. to-day. We have to realise that fact when considering the pay of the members of the police force. Then there is the question of the undermanning of the police force, and I have no hesitation in saying that any hon. member who is prepared to say that the police force to-day is not undermanned is speaking without a knowledge of the facts. That undermanning imposes still more arduous duties upon the members of the force. For the year 1914-15—the last year of the late Administration—the percentage of police officers in Queensland was one officer to a little over 450 of the population, while to-day it is one officer to about 675 of the population.

HON. M. J. KIRWAN: That proves that the people are more law-abiding to-day.

Mr. FARRELL: The percentage is better in Queensland than in the other States.

HON. J. G. APPEL: If the Minister is going to give that reply to the members of the police force he is going to give them a Barmecide feast—that is, a stone for a loaf. I am not adversely criticising the Minister. I am criticising the policy of his Government, a Government which has made certain promises that improve the conditions in the police force and which has failed to carry out those promises. I have no doubt, if it lay with the Minister, that he would

not hesitate to honour the promises which have been given.

HON. M. J. KIRWAN: What promises have been given that were not honoured?

HON. J. G. APPEL: The pay of members of the police force should be placed on an equality with that received by members of the police force of New South Wales.

HON. M. J. KIRWAN: Who gave that promise?

HON. J. G. APPEL: I want to show further the injustice that has been inflicted on members of the police force in Queensland in that they are paid less than the award rates paid to men engaged in our industries. According to the Estimates, constables are paid 15s. 11d. per diem, 15s. 5d. per diem, 14s. 11d. per diem, 14s. 5d. per diem, 13s. 11d. per diem, and 13s. 5d. per diem. A constable has certain duties placed upon him and he is responsible for the fulfilment of those duties. In carrying out these duties, which affect not alone the safety of the life and limb of the community but also the safety of their property, should he not be placed in such a position as to be raised above the risk of temptation?

Mr. FARRELL: You paid the same men 8s. 6d. a day.

HON. J. G. APPEL: Yes, but compare the conditions. I have already quoted what the "Police Journal" states. In those days the pound sterling was equivalent to 30s. to-day. Hon. members who interject are striving to justify the injustice that is being done to the police force by taking up that attitude. In all cases where there is a risk of temptation an increased reward for the services rendered is given, and it is justified by reason of the fact that the increased reward puts them above the risk of temptation. It is no good hon. members supporting the present Administration turning round and saying, "You only paid them a certain rate," because they are the men that said that they were going to do justice to the force. It is no excuse for them for not doing justice to-day to say that the previous Administration did not do justice and therefore they are justified in the actions that they are taking. Now compare their wages. They are not equal to the wages paid to an ordinary labourer to-day who has no responsibilities and who has fixed hours of labour. As I have already said, a member of the police force may have his 8-hour day, but he is subject to call at any time and there is no overtime. Morning, noon, and night he may be called upon, and he is called upon, and yet the present Administration, who condemn the previous Administration which placed the members of the force in a position comparable with the position of members of the New South Wales force, refuse to do justice to the police. I am only too pleased to see a measure of justice given to the members of the police force, who have done great service to the State of Queensland. I am referring more particularly to the country districts. I will now take the senior sergeants, of whom there are twenty-two at 18s. 11d. a day.

Mr. FARRELL: You paid them 12s. 6d.

HON. J. G. APPEL: The value of money then was relatively greater, as I have previously stated, than it is now, and they were placed upon the same conditions as the mem-

bers of the New South Wales force. I am asking the Government to place them in the same position as I placed them in. Surely it is a reasonable claim on the part of the police force. It is all very well to say that we have opened the Arbitration Court to them. If the Government are genuine, when the matter comes before the Arbitration Court let them appear before the Court and say, "We consider these requests to be reasonable." We know, however, that the Government will oppose the claims, as they did on the former occasion. A senior sergeant receives 18s. 11d. a day, which is less than the pay of a carpenter. We know that a senior sergeant only arrives at that position after many years of arduous work and experience, and he has to be possessed of very considerable capacity. We know that the hon. members who sit behind the present Administration used to complain that the police had to carry out something like thirty-six extraneous duties, but now they have placed something like sixty-eight extraneous duties on the shoulders of the members of the force. That alone should justify a very considerable increase in their pay. I am simply analysing the payments. A senior sergeant occupies a most responsible position, and not alone has he to carry out the duties of his office, but he has to be prepared to carry out sixty-eight extraneous duties apart from his official duties, which shows that he must be a capable man, yet he is not receiving the wages of a carpenter, whose work is largely mechanical, and only occupies eight hours a day. We know that sergeants and senior sergeants in charge of stations are at call day and night. On behalf of others, I have often had to call the sergeant at his station in the middle of the night, and he has always responded. This Government, who were so very tender about the claims of the police force when they were in opposition, do not pay police sergeants the amount which is paid to carpenters. Hon. members opposite have made a great cry about what they did for the police. Before I went to the Home Department, the composite Government, consisting partly of Labour men, and supported by the whole of the Labour party, had refused to give uniforms to the police. I gave them uniforms.

I wish to compare the four years of my administration of the police force with four years of administration under Labour rule. From 1910 to 1913, inclusive, the total increases which I gave to the police amounted to £99,535. Under Labour rule the amount of increases given from 1915 to 1918, inclusive, came to £33,129. In 1919 there were increases given amounting to £66,386, under an agreement with the police. Even taking the five years I have mentioned under Labour rule, the increases only came to £99,515, as against £99,535 given in increases in the four years of my administration of the police force. Then the Government say that they have done justice to the police force.

Mr. FARRELL: Did they not have to provide uniforms under your Administration?

HON. J. G. APPEL: No, I gave them uniforms. Under your composite Ministry, supported by all the force of Labour, you refused them uniforms.

Mr. FARRELL: They were not given until 1912.

HON. J. G. APPEL: Quite so, I could not give them before I had the power. Up to the end of 1908, Labour supported the composite Ministry who refused to give them the

Hon. J. G. Appel.]

uniforms, and refused to give them a decent wage even. I have shown by their own journal, and by the official figures I have quoted, that when I left the Home Department the conditions of the police were equivalent to that of the police force in New South Wales. I have shown that the increases I gave them exceeded the increases which were given by the present Administration. I simply ask, in view of all the circumstances, and the increase in the duties which have been placed on the police force, that they be placed in the same condition relatively to New South Wales that they were in when I was in charge of the Home Department. That is a reasonable request. You, Mr. Pollock, as representing a country district in the far North, know the value of the services which are performed by our police force. You know that the responsibilities cast upon them are far more than those of a labourer or carpenter. Do the public of Queensland realise that a senior sergeant in charge of a station is not receiving anything like the amount that is paid to a carpenter?

Mr. FARRELL: Still you paid him 6s. a day less.

HON. J. G. APPEL: Because the value of £1 was 10s. more than it is to-day. I only ask that the Administration should put the members of the police force on the same basis as New South Wales, as it was when I left the department.

Mr. WRIGHT (*Bulimba*): I desire to say a few words in connection with this vote.

Mr. MORGAN: Let it go through without further debate.

Mr. WRIGHT: I know that hon. members opposite are not desirous of letting it go through without debate. It was quite refreshing to hear the hon. member for Albert saying a good word for the police.

Hon. M. J. KIRWAN: He gave an increase in salary and reduced the rent allowance.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: Yes, and you made them pay for the sanitary service. (Laughter.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. WRIGHT: I want to know why the hon. member when he had the opportunity did not do something that would impress the police force—improve their working conditions and pay them a decent wage. Like the hon. member for Albert, I have travelled extensively in Australia, and I have no hesitation in saying that, in my opinion, the Queensland police force compares more than favourably with any other police force in the Commonwealth. I believe also that this Government have done more to improve the general conditions of the police force of Queensland than any previous Administration. The hon. member for

[2 p.m.] Albert this morning, as other hon. members have done on other occasions, made certain references to what he termed the "composite Government" had done or had not done, when they were supported by the Labour party. I submit that hon. members cannot have it both ways. They cannot criticise the Labour party for supporting that Government's actions whilst other members opposite take credit for what that Government did. Another member of the Opposition, also an ex-Cabinet Minister, the hon. member for Wynnum, has claimed credit for what the

[*Hon. J. G. Appel.*

"composite Government" did in the way of passing the Workers' Dwellings Act.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: That was not the "composite Ministry."

Mr. WRIGHT: I find that that measure was introduced first in 1908 and was dropped and reintroduced in 1909, and "Hansard" shows that Labour members, then in Opposition, substantially supported the Bill. As a matter of fact, as a result of the discussions on the first introduction in 1908 the Bill was remodelled largely on the lines suggested by them.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. WRIGHT: I only want to show that hon. members opposite should be consistent when they make charges as to what Labour members did when they were supporting the "composite Government." The hon. member for Albert has also led us to believe that he did a great deal for the police force during his term as Home Secretary. I do not want to be hard on the hon. gentleman, I want to be fair to him, but in "Hansard" for 1912 I find that when introducing the Police Estimates, he said—

"Hon. members would remember that on the last occasion he proposed the vote he stated that it was the intention of the Government to make inquiries about the pay received by the police force of New South Wales, and, having made that inquiry it was proposed to place the police on the same footing in Queensland.

"Mr. Coyne: You have not succeeded.

"The HOME SECRETARY: In pursuance of that, the Committee were asked to approve of such increases as would place the Queensland police on the same footing as the force of the mother State. An increase of £200 was provided for the Commissioner of Police, bringing his salary up to £1,000, and it would then be more in line with the salaries paid to officers in similar departments in the other States."

That is all right, but I want to go a little bit further and read portion of a speech delivered by the hon. member for Brisbane, Mr. Kirwan, now Assistant Minister, with reference to this alleged increase to the police force. His speech is thus reported—

"Mr. KIRWAN was struck with the increase given to the Commissioner of Police, which amounted to 25 per cent. of the salary he was previously receiving. They heard during the election, as they had heard since, that the Cabinet were determined to place the police force of the State on an equal footing with any force in the Commonwealth. Had they done so? They might have done so as far as the Commissioner was concerned. They might have placed him on the same level as the chief officers of police in Victoria or New South Wales, but what had they done for senior sergeants and sergeants, who were the backbone of the force, and who were compelled to remain in the force, whether the conditions were to their liking or not, because they had been so long there that they were not likely to be a success in any other class of work? A senior sergeant, under the old rate of pay, received 11s. per day, a rent allowance of £1 per week, and fuel and light to

the amount of £10 per annum. Under the new rate he would receive 12s. 6d. a day; his rent allowance would be reduced to 1s. 10d. per day, and his fuel and light allowance would be cut out.

"The Home Secretary: That brings them now to the same level as the New South Wales police."

Actually that section of the police was worse off. It was a case of bringing them down to the New South Wales police rather than bringing them up to the New South Wales police. The report continues—

"Mr. KIRWAN: There was no 25 per cent. increase there. He was not going to question the increases given to the inspectors and sub-inspectors, but he said the increases the Government were giving senior sergeants and sergeants were of rather a questionable kind. A sergeant received, under the old rate, 10s. per day and 2s. per day rent allowance; under the new rate he would receive 11s. 3d. per day, and his rent allowance would be reduced 1s. per day, so that his increase under the new scale practically meant only 3d. per day. It was nothing but scandalous that a miserable increase of only 3d. per day should be given to this body of men, who rendered much better service to Queensland than the Commissioner, who got a rise of 25 per cent."

That is what happened when the hon. member for Albert was administering that department. We know that the duties of the police are on many occasions unpleasant and dangerous. From time to time we are reminded of that fact. Just quite recently there were certain happenings in my electorate which reminded us of what a dangerous occupation the police follow. I am satisfied that anything that can be done by the Government to lighten their burden and relieve the danger of their occupation should be done. In connection with the wages paid to the police, I have made a comparison between the wages paid in 1915, prior to the advent of the Labour Government, and the wages to be paid for the financial year 1925. These are the figures according to the Estimates for these respective years—

	1915.		1925.	
	Per day.	Per day.	Per day.	Per day.
	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.
Senior sergeants ...	12 6	...	18 11	
Sergeants ...	11 3	...	17 11	
Acting Sergeants—				
1915—10s. 4d. per day.				
1925—16s. 11d. per day.				
Constables—				
1915—8s. 6d., 9s., and 9s. 6d. per day.				
1925—13s. 5d. to 15s. 11 per day.				

The amount appropriated in 1915 was £301,182 and for the coming financial year the amount appropriated is £476,757, or an increase of £175,575. Those figures are very striking when one takes into consideration the number of persons concerned in those appropriations. In 1915, the number of persons under this vote was 1,242, whereas to-day the number is 1,267.

The increase in the personnel of the police force over what was provided for in the Estimates for 1915 is fifteen. That small increase to me is significant. It expresses the fact that the people of Queensland during

recent years have tended to become more orderly than heretofore. The statistics in connection with crime and general police court charges will reveal quite a considerable decrease since the advent of Labour to office in Queensland. I am not going to claim any credit on behalf of the Labour Government for that fact, but the fact that there has been no necessity for a large increase in the numbers of the police force gives the impression, as I have stated, that the citizens are becoming more orderly. The hon. member for Enoggera a few days ago, when speaking in this Chamber, said in his usual loud, noisy style, that hon. members on his side were the friends of the police. He practically suggested that if the police wanted to improve their condition they should at the next elections vote Labour out of office, and transfer his party to the Treasury benches.

Mr. KERR: Who said that?

Mr. WRIGHT: I would like to remind the police and the public generally that the police force, during the life of this Government, have not only received large increases in wages, but far more favourable consideration in respect to comforts and enlargement of civic liberty. I have quoted the speech of the hon. member for Brisbane suggesting more Sunday leave for the police. His appeal fell on deaf ears at the time. Hon. members know that the police force are enjoying more liberty and more individual freedom under the régime of this Government than they have ever done previously. What did hon. members opposite say when it was decided to allow the police to form a union?

Mr. WARREN: It has not been much good to them.

Mr. WRIGHT: What did hon. members opposite say when the police decided to approach the Arbitration Court, and when that right was conceded to them?

Hon. J. G. APPEL: And who opposed their claims in the Arbitration Court? (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. EDWARDS: Who reduced their wages?

Mr. WRIGHT: I am not going intimately into the cost of living figures to-day, because the police force might be prejudiced in the application they will make to the Arbitration Court in the near future. I would be the last person in the world to say anything in this Committee which might be used to debar the police from getting due reward for their services. It is quite patent to me that hon. members opposite have not studied the history of the police force of this State, particularly the history under the administration of the various parties that have been in power.

I am satisfied, and I know the police are satisfied, that whilst they may not be able to get 100 per cent. of their desires or demands they have had a fair deal from this Government. They are also satisfied that, so long as they come along with reasonable claims and put those claims in a proper way, they will receive reasonable and favourable consideration from this Government.

In conclusion, I hope that the police will realise, as I know they must realise, the benefits they have received from Labour rule in Queensland.

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): The hon. member for Bulimba stated that he was satisfied with regard to the conditions of the police. I suppose the hon. member refers to the pay also. If the hon. member is satisfied, it is

Mr. Kerr.]

well known that the police in Queensland are not satisfied to-day. It is no good trying to balk the question. The police have definitely asked this Government for similar pay and conditions to those existing in New South Wales.

Mr. WRIGHT: I said I was sure they would get a fair deal from this Government.

Mr. KERR: The hon. member said he was satisfied with the conditions of the police. It is just as well for the police to know that the hon. member is satisfied. The police themselves are not satisfied, and no hon. member in this Chamber can truthfully make the statement that they are. Why are they not satisfied? Because their conditions and pay in Queensland are not up to the rate of pay and standard of conditions in New South Wales.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is questionable.

Mr. KERR: I would like the hon. gentleman to point out to this Chamber where those conditions and pay are equal to those of New South Wales.

The HOME SECRETARY: Why not wait until the Arbitration Court deals with the matter?

Mr. KERR: The hon. gentleman knows that, as well as failing to bring the pay and conditions up to those of New South Wales, the Labour Government were responsible for taking 5 per cent. off their pay.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is not right. The police were the only body of men who were not reduced by the Arbitration Court when the reduction was brought about.

Mr. KERR: It is just as well for the hon. gentleman to say so. Were those in receipt of over £300 a year reduced by 5 per cent.?

Mr. FARRELL: Yes.

Mr. KERR: Then is my statement right or wrong? I say that those police officers who were receiving over £300 a year had their salaries reduced by 5 per cent.

The HOME SECRETARY: Every other worker, barring the police force, suffered.

Mr. KERR: I make the statement that those receiving over £300 a year were subjected to the 5 per cent. reduction.

Mr. FARRELL: So were you.

The HOME SECRETARY: Then why not argue from the standpoint of the restoration of that 5 per cent.?

Mr. KERR: I argue that the police are to-day asking for a rate of pay equal to that of New South Wales. It is ridiculous for us, year after year, to go tub-thumping to the police and talk about their votes. I say the police are not satisfied to-day—

The HOME SECRETARY: They did not have a vote when the ex-Home Secretary, the hon. member for Albert, was in office. The hon. gentleman would not allow them to keep fowls when a horse was being kept for fear they would use the horse feed for the fowls.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: That is a foul assertion. (Laughter.)

Mr. KERR: It is about time that this Government forgot about such trifling things as keeping fowls, and that they recognised the fact that the police would rather have equal conditions and pay to that of New South Wales. They have asked for those conditions. A vote itself does not feed them, and a vote does not give them good condi-

[Mr. Kerr.

tions. It is all very well to "tub-thump" in this House in regard to the police, but we have to face the facts, and the facts are that the police in Queensland to-day are dissatisfied because of their rates of pay. No one can gainsay that fact, and all the camouflage in the world will not get over that position. It is no good trying to mislead the Committee and the people of Queensland into believing that the pay is better in Queensland than it is in the other States. Ask the police! The facts point in the opposite direction. If the hon. gentleman is satisfied, it is time someone else took charge and did the right thing.

I would like to ask the Home Secretary if, when he is replying, he would kindly inform me whether it is the intention of the Government to give warders, who have to travel with patients to a hospital and such like, free passage on the trams, such as the ordinary police have.

The HOME SECRETARY: What have we to do with the trams? The hon. member must know that we have nothing to do with the trams.

Mr. KERR: The Government enforce that in connection with the police, and I think every uniformed man should receive the same concession. The Home Secretary might give the matter his attention.

There is just one other small point that I desire to bring up. I appreciate very much the intention of the Government to increase the numbers of the police force. A deputation from my electorate waited on the hon. gentleman and asked for additional police in that district, and I trust that some action will be taken to give effect to the representations of that deputation. We have a sergeant and a number of constables situated at Newmarket, and they are housed in one of the most dilapidated places it would be possible to find. There are quite a number of nice homes in that centre, and the police buildings are an outrage to the district. I hope the Government will see fit, if possible, to provide money for a new police station at Newmarket, which will be of benefit to that part of my electorate. The present building is a standing disgrace and has been there for anything between thirty and forty years, and I hope the Government will take some action to remedy matters.

Mr. WARREN (*Murrumba*): I certainly think that the police have just cause to complain. We should pay the members of our police force a wage equal to that paid in the Southern States. They have more to do and require to be far better men, as they have so many different matters to attend to.

Mr. HYNES: When your party were on the Treasury benches, how did they treat the police?

Mr. WARREN: The hon. member made a big mouthful about the conditions of the police when he was in the North. He was going to do everything for the police, and to-day when he comes down here he is whipped into line like other hon. members on that side. According to the Press reports the hon. gentleman was going to do wonderful things for the police. They thought they had a Minister in Parliament to plead their cause, but he does not get up and make one representation so far as the interests of the police are concerned.

Mr. HYNES: The intelligent policeman knows that your advocacy in this Chamber is only political limelight.

Mr. WARREN: I have eight policemen in my electorate. I do not know whether they vote for me or not, and I do not care.

Mr. HYNES: You are asking for their votes now, at any rate.

Mr. WARREN: I am not asking for their votes. I am not an agitator. I stand up for principle. I believe that the Government are not doing their duty to these men. We expect them to be men of a high standard. I may say that the men working on the roads in my electorate are getting more than the police, and that should not be so. We expect a lot from the policeman, and if one makes a mistake, we are all down upon him. We should keep up a high standard, which I am sorry to say is not being kept up. It is all very well for hon. members opposite to say, "What did past Governments do?" They could live far better on their pay in 1915 than they can do to-day. The purchasing power of £1 in 1915, according to "Knibbs's" figures, was 10s. more than it is to-day.

Mr. FARRELL: What is the purchasing power of money in New South Wales?

Mr. WARREN: I maintain that the police are better off on the same wage in New South Wales than they are in Queensland.

Mr. FARRELL: You are wrong

Mr. WARREN: Let the hon. member prove that I am wrong. The Government have given the police a chance to go into the Arbitration Court. It is a rotten principle, to my mind. I do not think it is right for these men to have to go into the Arbitration Court. If the Government cannot pay a wage equal to that paid by the Tory Government in New South Wales, it is discreditable to this State. I think the Government are not treating the police fairly. That is why I stand up here to-day—not that I expect any return from the police. The police have made out a very good case, and the Government should meet them more than half way.

The CHAIRMAN: I am very loth to say anything that would do anything to prevent a discussion on any matter that should be discussed in Committee, but I would point out to hon. members that it is a very well established precedent in all British Parliaments that matters such as this, which are under adjudication by a court of law, should not be discussed. "May," on page 248, states—

"A matter, whilst under adjudication by a court of law, should not be brought before the House by a motion or otherwise."

Consequently, the fact that "May" points out that these matters should not be discussed while they are under the jurisdiction of the court, and hon. members' good taste, should be sufficient to induce them to leave the discussion of this matter until after the Court has dealt with it. I hope that hon. members will pay heed to what I have said.

Mr. BRUCE (*Kennedy*): It struck me during this debate that there was a lot of unctuous flattery in regard to the police. A little healthy criticism would do more good than all the flattery which has been placed before the Committee. For quite a number of months there have been safe-breakers in operation on the Cleveland line, and during that time there were no arrests by the police until one of their comrades was wounded in an encounter with a safe-breaker. Although this thing had been going on for months, it is only within the

last three or four days that an arrest has been made. It appears to me that, if the same intelligence and energy had been applied at an earlier date, their comrade would, perhaps, not have been wounded. I am always a believer in the saying that "Prevention is better than cure," and I says it is a remarkable fact that [2.30 p.m.] these burglaries were going on for months before this unfortunate incident without any arrest, but that after one of their comrades had been wounded men were apprehended by the police in a few hours.

I put in many years in the Cloncurry district, where we hear that quite a lot of cattle duffing takes place. I am of opinion that the station-owners look upon the police—and are assisted in that view by various circumstances—as boundary riders. They do not put on enough men to look after their own property, with the result that a large proportion of the police force are continually employed in riding those stations. I am aware that men who should be employed as stock riders do often take to cattle duffing, but if they were employed on the stations and the police were employed at their own work, I do not think there would be much cattle duffing in that district. It might be unfortunate for some of the stock riders, because I know some of them have become station-owners eventually, which is more than they would be able to accomplish on what they could earn as stockmen. It is continually remarked in this district that the police have to ride those stations really as stock riders, and that, if more men were employed by the stations, the police could do work in other directions.

A good deal has been said during this debate about the conditions of the police in other States. If one only reads the newspapers and notices the amount of crime in the Southern capital—which I take it imposes a consequentially additional amount of work on the police of those States—he will realise the happy position we enjoy in Queensland. I understand that, if you happen to catch hold of the wrong end of your pipe in Melbourne to-day, the people near you put their hands up. (Laughter.) At any rate, it is obvious that from what has happened recently the police there must be on the *qui vive* the whole of their time. Anybody who has studied the trend of events here in Queensland must admit that the amount of crime is very small in comparison with that of the Southern cities, and that in any case a large percentage of the criminals who are discovered to be operating here come from other States.

Mr. EDWARDS: Some are born here.

Mr. BRUCE: The majority of them come from other States or from other parts of the world. Hon. members of the Opposition, when dealing with the wages of the police and other workers, often emphasise the decrease in the purchasing power of the pound to-day. I would have been very happy if in the past they had taken the trouble and time to emphasise the alteration in its purchasing power. Unfortunately, when workers go into the Arbitration Court that fact is not mentioned. Not only is it not mentioned, but employers very often even try to brush it aside. We had the hon. member for Albert remarking on the probability that, when the police went to the Arbitration Court, the Government would

Mr. Bruce.]

oppose their claim. Does the hon. gentleman suggest that, when workers in the mining, shearing, or the sugar industry go into court, the employers should not oppose their claim? If he adopts that attitude—and to be consistent he ought to adopt that attitude—one would expect to find him on this side and not on the Opposition side at all. If he continues to advocate the things he has been supporting during the early part of the morning, we should be only too pleased to have him here, because it is his opposition to these things which has forced him on to the other side.

That is the difference between Labour and anti-Labour. It is the desire of Labour to-day to do all that can possibly be done for those workers who are responsible for the production of the good things of this world, and that is exactly our position in connection with the police. It is no use discussing what the police are getting in one State or the other. It is just the same as the question of the unemployed. It is no use telling the unemployed in Queensland that there are more unemployed in New South Wales, and it is no use telling the police force to-day, when they want better conditions, of the bad conditions that existed in the past. What they want is a decent rate of pay and decent conditions of employment. They have had their rates of pay and conditions of employment improved by this Government, and I feel sure from what I know of the Government that they will be further improved. Taking them as a whole, there are many classes of the community who are in a worse position than the police are in to-day from the point of view of pay and conditions of labour. I trust that the police will be able to analyse the case put up in this Chamber, and will be able to sift the wheat from the chaff and to know that those who have been so loudly eulogising them, not being in the position of the Government and not having the right to say whether the police shall receive more wages or not will not be able to do anything irrespective of what they say. It is a good thing at times to be on the Opposition benches, and stand up and say that you would do this and you would do that, knowing all the time that you will never be called upon to do it. The hon. member for Enoggera lays down the magnificent conditions that he would offer to the police, but, if he lived for eighty years, he would not have an opportunity of extending those benefits. He will never be on the Government benches. I trust that the police, when they see this matter reported in the papers, will know that what the Opposition have said to-day is what my American friends would call "hot air."

Mr. EDWARDS: You are pretty good at working the parish pump.

Mr. BRUCE: In these modern days of irrigation I thought the parish pump had entirely disappeared. I understand the hon. member for Murilla has a small irrigation scheme, and he might require a pump. Seriously, quite apart from the parish pump question, no man can accuse me of chasing the police force in my district. Like many hon. members, I have always made it my business to keep clear of them, if possible.

Mr. FARRELL (*Rockhampton*): I hope that the ruling that you have given this afternoon will not prevent me from replying

[*Mr. Bruce.*

to some of the statements made by the hon. member for Albert, and the hon. member for East Toowoomba, and the hon. member for Wide Bay. The latter gentleman has apparently fallen down on the job, because during a previous debate he gave it out that he was going to attack the hon. member for Rockhampton in connection with an article which appeared in the current issue of the "Police Journal." In connection with that article I recognised that the police had a claim filed in the court and I recognised that any further increase in salaries depended upon the court, and I had written to the president of the Rockhampton branch of the Police Union. My letter states—

"Dear Mr. Argus.—In the current issue of your 'Police Journal' appears an article criticising my speech in the House. I am enclosing for the information of your members a copy of my speech taken from 'Hansard,' which will show how misleading the article referred to is. I adhere to the statement made by me of increases in pay, rent allowance, plainclothes allowance, leave, etc., since the advent of the Labour Government in Queensland. I made no suggestion that the pay should not be further increased. That is entirely a matter for the Arbitration Court in which a claim for further increases has been filed by your union. Yours faithfully."

So much for the statement which appeared in the current issue of the "Police Journal." On my next visit to Rockhampton I am prepared to express the same opinion in front of the whole of the members of the Rockhampton branch of the Police Union, if they so desire.

The hon. member for Albert made a statement this morning regarding the magnificent work that was done for the police during the time he was in charge of the Home Office. While I am prepared to admit that the hon. gentleman did some magnificent work during the period he was in charge of the Home Office, I am not going to admit that he did anything at all in comparison with what this Government have done for the police of Queensland. I give way to no hon. member in this Chamber in my admiration for the work that has been done by the police force in Queensland, and particularly for those police in the country districts who have had extra jobs loaded on to them year after year. If any branch of the police force should receive consideration from the Home Secretary, it is not so much the policeman who was doing points duty in Brisbane as the policeman who was out in the small outback stations doing the numerous jobs which have been loaded on to him. Far from suggesting that the police should not be highly paid, I am one of those hon. members, and it has been the boast of all hon. members on this side of the Chamber, who have advocated that the workers, whether they be the police or any other branch of the service, should be the highest paid in Australia. I am not going to sit down and allow hon. members opposite, or even the secretary of the Police Union, to say or insinuate that I stand for any other principle. The hon. member for Albert took great credit this morning for things he had done for the police. It is interesting to learn that since the secretary of the Police Union had a brush with our Home Secretary apparently a number of briefs have been

issued to hon. members opposite. Some of those briefs have apparently miscarried. Let me point out that until 1912 or 1913, certainly during part of the time that the Home Office was administered by the hon. gentleman, the police were not given a vote at all. It might also be information to the Chamber to know that a policeman was not allowed to marry in those days unless he submitted the name of his bride, all her relatives, and a certificate of character to the Commissioner. Those were the sort of liberties that the police enjoyed.

Hon. M. J. KIRWAN: In some cases the inspector was sent along to have a look at the prospective bride.

Mr. FARRELL: That was the sort of freedom that was given to the police during the regime of the hon. member for Albert.

Hon. M. J. KIRWAN: If the prospective bride did not pass the inspector, he did not get her. (Laughter.)

Mr. FARRELL: It is also a well-known fact, as the Home Secretary has pointed out, that at certain stations where mounted men were stationed the wife of the constable was not allowed to keep fowls for fear they would "pinch" the feed of the horse. So much for the freedom enjoyed by the members of the police under the hon. member for Albert! The hon. gentleman also quoted figures showing what he considered to be an over-manning of the police in Queensland. I have figures here worked out on the same basis as those quoted by the hon. gentleman showing the exact position of the police force in all the States of Australia to-day. Let us take the position in Queensland. We have one policeman to every 725 of the population.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: I quoted under that.

Mr. FARRELL: The hon. gentleman gave several quotations comparing the States. I am giving a comparison of the whole of the States. It is—

Queensland—One policeman to every 725 of the population.

Western Australia—One policeman to every 723 of the population.

New South Wales—One policeman to 779 of the population.

Victoria—One policeman to every 864 of the population.

South Australia—One policeman to every 881 of the population.

That shows clearly that in Queensland we are in a better position than any other State in the Commonwealth.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: Conditions are absolutely different in Queensland.

Mr. FARRELL: Take the conditions in Western Australia or South Australia; I am sure it is fair to compare them with Queensland. Take Western Australia particularly.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: No. There is not the amount of country settlement in Western Australia that there is in Queensland.

Mr. FARRELL: Those are the actual figures. I do not wish them to be used as an argument later on, to the effect that I mean that the police should not be further increased. I think they should be. I am glad to see that provision has been made in this year's Estimates for the appointment of an additional number of police, so that the conditions may be even better than they are now.

In the article I referred to the secretary of the Police Union stated that it was this Government that prevented the police force from getting the basic wage in the Arbitration Court. As a matter of fact, when the Government took the civil servants to the Court some eighteen months ago, only two unions successfully fought their claims against the Government—the Police Union and the Queensland Teachers' Union. The members of those unions did not suffer from the 5 per cent. reduction. Where does the argument come in that the Government have prevented the police from getting the basic wage? Mr. Talty also says—

"Will the Rockhampton 'Fugleman' kindly tell us whether he stands?"—

Hon. J. G. APPEL: What name?

Mr. FARRELL: I hope the hon. gentleman will listen to what I am reading.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: I am listening, but I did not catch the word.

Mr. FARRELL:

"whether he stands for the police to be placed on the basic wage of £3 17s., while every other worker gets £4?"

I would like the waterside workers in my electorate of Rockhampton to be drawing the same pay envelope as the police in Rockhampton. I am going to make the statement that no policeman in Queensland draws less than £4 13s. per week at present. I defy contradiction. Where does it come in that I am objecting to their getting £3 17s. per week, and the workers outside £4 per week? I would like to see the whole of the workers outside getting the basic wage of £4 13s.

Mr. KELSO: Where do you get your £4 13s.?

Mr. FARRELL: If the hon. member looks up the award, he will arrive at the same amount.

Mr. KELSO: Is that official?

Mr. FARRELL: Yes. It is slightly over £4 13s. The lowest rate is 13s. 5d. per day, calculated on a basis of seven days a week. I admit the police hours are longer on the average than are the outside hours.

The HOME SECRETARY: Only here and there, because they get certain time off.

Mr. FARRELL: As a matter of fact, it works out at about forty-eight hours and a-half a week actual time. To counterbalance that their annual leave is increased from two to four weeks. They have been given an additional six months' leave at the end of twenty-five years; they are given that six months on full pay, which they never received before; and they are granted sick pay conditions which no other public servant in Queensland enjoys, and I say quite definitely that, if anything could be done to increase the pay of the police in Queensland and further reduce the hours of work, it would be a very excellent thing for the police themselves.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I previously ruled that this matter was sub judice, as there was a plaint before the court, and I ask the hon. member to obey my ruling.

Mr. FARRELL: There was nothing further from my mind than trying to get round your ruling, Mr. Pollock, but I am sorry you did not prevent the hon. member for Albert from dealing with this matter.

The CHAIRMAN: I have already allowed the hon. member to reply to the hon. member for Albert; I have only just now received

Mr. Farrell.]

the plaint and I am endeavouring to stifle discussion on those matters which are before the court.

Mr. FARRELL: The hon. member for Albert stated, and stated correctly, that, roughly, it took 30s. to-day to purchase what could be purchased in 1914 for £1, but he forgot to make a comparison for the same period in New South Wales. It will now take 34s. 5d. to purchase in Sydney what could be purchased there in 1911 for £1, showing that in Queensland the position is much better than it is in New South Wales.

I come now to the actual amount expended by the Administration of which the hon. member for Albert was a member and the present Administration. The hon. member this morning quoted figures showing the increases that he had given during the time that he was at the head of the Home Department. Let us look at the exact appropriations during the years he was in the Home Office, and during the regime of this Government and see the difference. In 1910, when the hon. member was in the Home Office, the police vote was £223,814, and by steps it had increased in 1914-15—when the hon. member went out of office—to £275,182, an increase of £51,368 in a little over five and a-half years. The figures since this Government have taken office are—

1915-16	£277,468
1924-25	£427,757

An increase of over £150,000.

Mr. KELSO: Don't you allow for the extra cost of living?

Mr. FARRELL: You have always an excuse.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: Have you not increased the numbers in the force?

Mr. FARRELL: Another excuse. At the present time the Government are paying double the amount to the police force to that which was paid during the time the hon. member was in charge of the office and these figures will prove that assertion.

I had intended dealing with the exact position of the police force, comparing the rates paid now with what they were when we took office, but I realise, Mr. Pollock, that in that connection your ruling is sound. I merely desired to be allowed to reply to the misstatements in the article which appeared in the "Police Journal" and to make my position clear so far as the outside police are concerned.

Mr. HYNES (*Townsville*): I intended to refrain from taking any part in the discussion upon this particular vote, for the reason that the claim of the Police Union is now before the Court, and having had some experience in these matters I always look upon any case which is before the Court and in which judgment has not been given as sub judice. I also realise that any discussion which may be held in this Chamber is sure to militate against the success of the Police Union's claim in the Court. I am rather surprised that, if hon. members opposite are really the friends of the police, they should attempt to drag out a lengthy discussion about the merits or demerits of the claim. It must be obvious to any person who has given the matter any consideration at all that the only reason hon. members opposite have for initiating the discussion is to obtain a little cheap political kudos

[Mr. Farrell.

out of it. The hon. member for Enoggera referred to tub-thumping and soap-boxing.

Mr. KERR: No.

Mr. HYNES: I thought the hon. member did—if not, it was some other intellectual on that side who made reference to it. I certainly have had some discussion with the Police Union in connection with their grievance. The union is similar to any other union in the State in that they have grievances and are discontented. Any body of unionists who are not discontented are not worth their salt and are not making any headway. I believe with Tom Paine that "discontent is the torch-bearer of human progress." If we are not discontented, we are not going to make any progress at all.

I deeply regret that any comparative statements have been put before the Committee touching upon the effective wage of New South Wales and Queensland police forces respectively. Anyone knows that the purchasing power of money in New South Wales is a great deal less than it is in Queensland. The Opposition, in introducing the matter into this Chamber, have not damaged this party at all, but they are damaging the case of the Police Union who have their claim before the Court to-day. I had the privilege of addressing the Townsville branch of the Queensland Police Union at that centre. I always take the opportunity of addressing bodies of unionists wherever I go in the North. I have been associated with the union movement for many years in North Queensland, and can claim individual credit for improving the lot of the workers there. I know what a disastrous effect the discussion in this Chamber to-day is likely to have on the claim of the Police Union, and that is why I regret that the discussion has taken place, and why I intended to refrain from taking any part in it.

There are other grievances in connection with the Police Union which are worthy of attention. One of their grievances is that they are not getting a just or fair spin from some of the heads in the department. They say that, when men are sent away on holidays, they have to work short-handed by reason of the parsimony which is practised by senior sergeants and inspectors in charge of the various districts. That is a great injustice, and I trust that the Minister will provide adequate assistance in these districts when men are going away on escort duty or on holiday. A little more sympathetic treatment should be meted out to the rank and file of the police in the performance of their duties.

I do not wish to speak at any further length, but I take this opportunity of remarking that I sincerely hope that the Police Union will succeed in their claim before the court. I realise that

[3 p.m.] they, like other industrialists, are not satisfied. I should like to say in passing, however, that I am rather surprised that some members of the union, or some members of the executive, have evidently approached members of the Opposition in order to endeavour to get them to castigate the Government. I think it was bad tactics—I have no hesitation in saying so. They should go back a few years, to the period referred to by the hon. member for Rockhampton, when the life of a policeman in Queensland was little better than that of a chattel slave, and the Queensland police force was the worst treated in the

whole of the Commonwealth. Members of the Police Union realise—they have intelligence—that if hon. members opposite were sincere in their advocacy of better conditions for them, then during the fifty years for which they were in charge of the Government of Queensland they would have given effect to some of the things they pretend to advocate to-day.

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): I did not intend to have anything to say on this vote, but some of the remarks of hon. members opposite certainly call for comment. I would like to refer the hon. member for Townsville to one paragraph quoted by the hon. member for Albert from the "Police Journal." I understood the hon. member for Townsville to say that the conditions in Queensland prior to the advent of this Government were worse than in any other State in Australia. The "Police Journal" specifically states in the article to which the hon. member for Rockhampton referred that the conditions of the force prior to the war compared favourably with the best conditions prevailing in any other State in Australia. That is not my statement—it is the statement of the organ of the police force—and I suppose the writer honestly believed it to be so.

I think that, speaking by-and-large, we have reason to be well satisfied with the services performed by the police throughout Queensland. I got into the hands of the force only once, and that was in the electorate of the hon. member for Rockhampton—(laughter)—but I was not in their hands very long, and I think they did me a good service when I did get into their hands.

We find that the Commissioner proposes to increase the numbers of the force. I presume he would not ask for an increase unless he felt that it was absolutely necessary and that the conditions of the State demanded it. It is a difficult matter to compare the conditions of the police force here with those of the forces in other States because of the tremendously long distances over which our police have to operate. We have a State which is very much larger than New South Wales or Victoria. If the figures quoted by the hon. member for Rockhampton are correct—and I take it that he has been careful in his estimate—they show that the force have been doing their work very faithfully and efficiently, because we have a smaller number in proportion to the population than any other State.

Mr. FARRELL: No; a greater number.

Mr. TAYLOR: I accept the correction. As I have already said, however, the conditions in this State differ largely from those of the other States.

As hon. members pointed out, there is a tremendous amount of work to be carried out by the police apart from what we look upon as the ordinary duties of the police. I think the very best treatment that we can possibly give them should be given them.

I am not going to refer to the wages question as that is before the court and the court has to decide that, but there are one or two items in the vote that I would like some information on. During the debate on a previous vote, a statement was hurled across the Chamber that various individuals and parties throughout the State had exploited the aboriginals in the matter of employment. According to the Estimates we have sixty-four native trackers receiving

the magnificent salary of £4 per month. I do not know whether you call that exploitation or high wages.

The HOME SECRETARY: They are "found."

Mr. TAYLOR: I know that; still they only receive a salary of £4 per month. I do not suppose there are many aboriginals working on stations who receive less than £4 per month and their keep.

Mr. BRUCE: You are quite wrong.

Mr. TAYLOR: The transfer expenses are the same this year.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! That is an item contained in the Police Union's plaint before the court.

Mr. TAYLOR: I would like some information with regard to the seventy-seven native trackers employed by the Police Department? I would also like to know whether the trackers are continuously employed when not actually tracking in connection with a case? I take it that we have to maintain them during the whole period they are in the employ of the department.

Hon. J. G. APPEL: They do camp duty about the station.

The HOME SECRETARY: The allowance includes food and clothing for the whole of the tracker's family.

Mr. TAYLOR: I am satisfied with the Home Secretary's explanation.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowong*): My remarks in connection with this vote will be more in admiration of the members of the force. Any consideration that can be given to the police, not only in recognition of better conditions but in improving home conditions and creating better surroundings, should be done. We all realise that these men practically carry their lives in their hands. We had an example of their bravery only the other day. They carry their lives in their hands, not only on one or two occasions, but in every instance. These men never funk their work. We have not arrived at the stage that they have reached in Victoria, where it was stated by one legal luminary the other day that the jury were almost afraid to bring in a verdict of guilty against some of the underworld because they would be dealt with. Owing to the attention and good work by the Queensland police, we have not arrived at that stage, thank goodness. In comparison with the population of the State, there is a falling off in the number of police in 1923-24 as compared with 1914-15. I do not know whether that is owing to the good conduct of the people of the community. In 1914-15 there were 1,242 police and the population of Queensland was 676,707. That means a ratio of one policeman to every 545 citizens, while in 1923-24 we find that there were 1,238 members of the police force and the population 811,168, making the ratio one policeman to every 655 citizens. That is a very fine testimonial to the character of Queensland, but at the same time it seems to me in face of those figures that the police force is undoubtedly undermanned.

Mr. FARRELL: You will find that is general throughout the whole of the States.

Mr. MAXWELL: That may be, but it is not right. That state of affairs ought not to be allowed to exist here, because it has a tendency to encourage a certain class of

Mr. Maxwell.]

individual to come to this State, and that is not desirable. I am not stating that the police force is not well and efficiently manned—they are doing wonderfully good work—but it is absolutely essential in the best interests of the community that the force should be fully manned and not remain in the position I have stated.

I am not going to interfere in any way with the claim that has been lodged by the police in the Arbitration Court. That is a function of the Court, and naturally, being a believer that any claim for altered conditions or increase in wages is a matter for the judges of that Court to function upon, I do not intend to touch upon it. I am very glad that it is not one of the functions of this Committee. I hope the greatest consideration will be given to these men, because, as I said at the outset, they go out in the morning to do their duty and do not know how they are going to come home—maimed, or perhaps brought home on a shutter.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. Stopford, *Mount Morgan*): Representatives of the Government met the officials of the Police Union in conference. No promises were made to the police that salaries would be increased, but a promise was distinctly made that, if the embargo on public servants in receipt of £300 a year and upwards was lifted in a general sense, the police would have an opportunity of going to the Arbitration Court and having those salaries reviewed. It would be impossible for me to discuss this vote without discussing wages, conditions, and other matters in the plaint, and I feel that it would be wrong for me even to reply to the arguments which have been adduced during the debate as the claim is now before the Court. (Hear, hear!)

Question put and passed.

POLICE INVESTMENT BOARD.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. Stopford, *Mount Morgan*): I beg to move—

“That £49,000 be granted for ‘Police Investment Board.’”

HON. W. H. BARNES (*Wynnum*): I would like to ask the Home Secretary the reason why this vote has been increased from £43,000 to £49,000. I presume it arises from the fact that the police force is growing and that a larger amount is required.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes; and possibly a larger amount than that will be required. I cannot tell definitely what situation will arise.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I quite recognise that many of these votes are to some extent estimates. The Minister will have in his possession the amount that was spent last year. £43,000 was appropriated, and I assume that that was found to be insufficient. At any rate, it would be very interesting for the Committee to know what was the actual amount spent last year.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. Stopford, *Mount Morgan*): The amount expended last year was £44,000. There are now further retirements, resulting from the new retiring age of sixty under the amended Act.

Question put and passed.

[*Mr. Maxwell.*

PRISONS.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. Stopford, *Mount Morgan*): I beg to move—

“That £35,147 be granted for ‘Prisons.’”

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): There are one or two items in this vote on which I would like the Home Secretary to give some information. Take the item “Trade instructors.” I would like the Home Secretary to tell us what the trades are, how they are being availed of, and the instruction given. I would like to know whether any of the articles produced by those who are so instructed are being utilised by the Government departments, or whether they are being sold outside.

A little further down I find that the superintendent at the St. Helena Penal Establishment is to receive £365 this year as against £475 last year—a reduction of £110. I would like the Home Secretary to give us a little information upon these two matters.

HON. J. G. APPEL (*Albert*): I wish to say just a word or two on this vote, more particularly in connection with remissions to prisoners. This question was brought up incidentally, but not on this vote. I have been charged with having granted a greater number of remissions than was the case previously or since.

The HOME SECRETARY: That was your own side.

HON. J. G. APPEL: I understand it was the statement of the hon. member for Murilla. I had a definite policy when dealing with this matter. Where there were prisoners who were practically first offenders, or where the punishment they were suffering was the first, in cases recommended by the superintendent of a penal establishment and under certain conditions, I promised to consider the question of a remission. I would like to explain that. On many occasions I practically sat the whole day in the superintendent's office at St. Helena granting interviews to prisoners who desired remissions, or who desired to put their case before me.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is only a fair thing to do.

HON. J. G. APPEL: Quite so; but there is so much misapprehension as to the procedure followed that I thought it necessary to make this explanation. After consultation with the superintendent, where it appeared that there was a possibility of reformation, I undertook to give favourable consideration to the case under certain conditions, and generally one condition was that the prisoner, if he had no trade, would learn a trade, and that when he was pronounced to be efficient, and his general conduct entitled him to it, I would recommend a remission of his sentence. I am very pleased, indeed, to say that as a result of that policy many efficient tradesmen were turned out. These men on release engaged in the trades which they had learned, and I know of some individual cases where the men are doing very well. The whole object of the department has ever been reformation. I have no doubt that the present Administration are following the same policy—that is, to endeavour to reclaim a man who has fallen and bring him once more into the straight path. The only way to do that is to give him a trade. The hon. member for Windsor asked a question as to the trade instructors. There is no doubt that the trade instructors in our

penal establishments are carrying out a great work in the matter of instructing prisoners in the different trades. Hon. members would really be surprised at the work that is carried out now in the different shops—tin-smiths, blacksmiths, and carpenters' shops, cabinet-maker's shop, bookbinding establishment, etc. The greater proportion of the work turned out is supplied to the different Government departments, and the prisoners are kept occupied, which is the only means by which they may be reclaimed. Of course, there are a certain number of prisoners who are hopeless. Attempts have been made at different times to reclaim them, and when these have failed they are hopeless, and nothing can be done. The whole object of the department was, if at all possible, to reclaim a man and restore him again to decent society, and I have no doubt that is the policy of the department to-day. If it was considered that a man was likely to reform, I considered it was my duty to give that man a chance once more to lead a decent life. For the information of members of the Committee, I will instance one case. A very fine young fellow was captured in Toowoomba just after the raid on the Queensland Treasury notes in Sydney, and the police discovered a certain number of stolen notes on him. It was the opinion of the authorities that a larger number of notes were hidden by him. The prison officials failed to melt him, and they asked me if I would do what I could. I went over and saw him by myself, and I succeeded in softening him. He was very hard at first, but the result of my interview was that he disclosed to me where this plant of Treasury notes was. It was in a hotel bedroom in Toowoomba, where he had been captured, and underneath the washstand. He had fastened the packet of notes there, and there they had been for months. When he gave me the information, I advised the Criminal Investigation Department to make an investigation, which they did, and found the packet of notes under the washstand in the hotel as described by the prisoner. He was a very fine young man. He had been a seaman, and then a wharf lumper in New South Wales, and there was in him fitting material for reformation. I told him that if he would learn a trade, and his conduct was entirely satisfactory, I would recommend a remission of sentence. He learnt carpentering, then joinery, and then cabinet-making, becoming an expert tradesman in these trades, and his conduct was of the very best. I recommended a remission of his sentence. We bought him a kit of tools at a cost of something like £30, and gave him a free passage to where he wanted to go. I heard afterwards that he had made a great success of things, was leading a good honest life, and working as a first-class tradesman. I realise that that is part of the work of our trade instructor. I am not saying that it was only under my particular administration that this occurred, because it has been the policy of the Home Department under the administration of whatever political party, and it is evidence of what can be done in the way of reclamation of prisoners.

When I went to the Home Department, being a member of the legal profession, I naturally knew that in every case in which a remission was asked for, the opinion of the Supreme Court justice should be requested as to whether such a remission should be given. I extended that practice and got a similar opinion from the judges

of the District Courts, and I went even further and obtained opinions from stipendiary magistrates, so that on every occasion when a remission was considered we had the opinion of either the justice of the Supreme Court, District Court judge, or of the stipendiary magistrate who had dealt with the case. I only know of one instance where a justice of the Supreme Court—the late Sir Pope Cooper, the then Chief Justice—was opposed to the application for a remission. It was the case of a young man, it being his first offence. He had been guilty of arson, but his conduct was very exemplary, and a reputable firm in Sydney were prepared to start him again in business if a remission was granted. I saw the Chief Justice, but he was opposed to any remission being granted. I was satisfied that it was a case in which the Executive might well intervene. The late Sir William MacGregor, who was then Governor of Queensland, presided at the meeting of the Executive Council at which I brought the matter up for discussion. I asked Sir William MacGregor, in view of the opposition of the Chief Justice to any remission being given, what was his opinion, having regard to the circumstances, and he agreed with me, and a remission was given. I have learned since that this young man profited by the experience that he gained and is doing exceedingly well under his new conditions. I simply carried out the policy of the Home Department. I regret the partisanship shown by some hon. members opposite, who claim that one particular party holding certain political views has done more in this matter than other Governments. That has been the policy of the Home Department under both Squatter and Liberal administrations. It is a humane policy, and the desire is to assist those who have fallen. Those are the lines of policy on which I acted. During my time there were special remissions given on the accession of the Sovereign, which are always given. That has always been done, and there are regulations authorising remissions. The Home Secretary will bear me out that he has a monthly list of net remissions to act upon in accordance with the Prison regulations. That was the policy of the Home Department and the one which I pursued and the policy which I believe is carried out by the present occupant of the office.

I would like to give a meed of praise to the attendants of the prisons, who carry out their duties with a great deal of tact and firmness and yet with kindness. My experience of them, from the Comptroller-General down to the junior warders, is that their whole purpose is apparently [3.30 p.m.] to do the best they can to restore those who are in their charge to a decent mode of life. It is a pleasure to me to know that, and I am sure it is also to the hon. gentleman in charge of the department. This vote has somewhat of a bearing on the police vote and the proposal to increase the number of police, because the warders in the gaols have in their charge some very dangerous criminals who regard life lightly and if opportunity offered would take not one life but more than one life. That being so, it is only right that the warders who have to risk their lives should feel that they have an adequate force to call upon if necessity arose.

Under modern prison methods, everything is done which tends to improve the

Hon. J. G. Appel.]

conditions of the prisoners in the hope of reforming them. The system by which bonuses are given to prisoners for good conduct, the tobacco ration, the lights provided in the cells, the provision for reading matter and allowing them to have photographs of relatives in their cells—these and other things all tend to improve their conditions. In the old days a man who was once convicted was branded as an outcast—at any rate there was that tendency—or as a man who could not be admitted to society again, and his conditions were of the worst. Under the modern policy the whole idea is to endeavour to surround the punishment—of course, it is still a punishment—with all those things which will help to bring him back to a decent mode of life. That is the policy which was carried out under my regime, with the result I have already indicated, that many a young man, who under the old conditions would have been hopelessly lost, acquired a trade, entered into decent life once more, and became a creditable man of society and an asset to the community.

I will say this of the officers of the department and the members of the police force, that they have freely and voluntarily given every assistance in such cases. They have never done anything which would militate against a prisoner upon his release and prevent him pursuing a course of conduct to improve his condition by which, though he was released, he would be branded as an ex-convict. They have given all the assistance to the general object and the general purpose, with the result that many men who have gone into prison as criminals have come out better equipped for the battle of life than when they went to serve their sentences.

Mr. GLEDSON (*Ipswich*): I would like some information on this vote from the Home Secretary, more particularly in connection with the gratuities to discharged prisoners. The sum of £450 is set down here for that purpose, and I would like to know if that is the total amount to be paid to all the discharged prisoners, or if there are other sums given to these men when they leave the institution? I have read the report by the Comptroller-General of Prisons, in which he points out that the value of work performed by the prisoners during the year 1923 amounted to £18,854 3s. 2d. He says that is very encouraging. He goes on to show that carpentry brought in £803, book-binding £108, tailoring £3,550, bootmaking £3,530, brushmaking £485, matmaking £142, hatmaking £39, basket-making £19, and tinsmithing £117. We are told that the tinsmithing shop has been shifted from St. Helena to Brisbane, and that the conduct of the industrial undertakings of the prison has been successful.

I was pleased to hear the hon. member for Albert say that the time has gone when a prisoner was looked upon as a social pariah and was not fit to have intercourse with ordinary individuals. There are some men and women who have made slips, and they have the right to be given a chance to reform and get back into decent society and civil life again, and every opportunity should be given them to get back into that life. It has been said that once a man gets into the clutches of the Prisons Department he is settled for life, as they have his photograph, his finger prints, and know the shape and make of him, and once he gets out of

prison the eye of the authorities follows him continuously, and he does not get a chance. I am glad to hear that that is not so. I would like to know from the Home Secretary if £450 is the total amount paid to prisoners on leaving the prison, or is there some consideration given to them to enable them to start in some business or industry and thus get a decent chance in life? We know that that small sum would not go any distance in helping the men who are discharged. What is the use of turning a man adrift in the streets of Brisbane or any other city without making some provision to allow him to get some employment? It is no use giving him an opportunity to conduct a trade if you do not give him the means to attain that end. I am glad to learn that during the past few years the prison authorities have instituted some reform with a view to giving these men a better deal in life. I am speaking mainly about the men, because they constitute the greater number of criminals, and they will be able to perform useful work if they can be reformed and placed back in civil life. The report goes on to show that quite a number of prisoners have taken up trades or callings and have become industrious while they were in prison. It is only by kind, sympathetic treatment that these men can be reclaimed and made good citizens of our State. That is what we want. Every good citizen is an asset, while every bad citizen and criminal is a drag on the State. If we can only win back to society one man a month from our prisons, then we shall be doing a wonderful work, and a work that will redound to the credit of those in authority.

Mr. WINSTANLEY (*Queenton*): The Home Secretary cannot ever be accused of being unkind or ungenerous to those unfortunate men and women who have fallen from society. On more than one occasion I have been to see the hon. gentleman about people who have been inside the walls of prison. I received consideration from him, and the prisoners always received pretty generous treatment. A good deal of discussion has taken place from time to time in reference to our prisons, and I do object to hon. members sitting opposite throwing out insinuations which have tended to create an impression abroad that the Home Secretary or previous occupants of that office have allowed prisoners to be released from gaol who ought not to have been released. Hon. members opposite have attempted to create the impression that we were either friends of or in league with criminals, and that conditions quite at variance with those obtaining when the hon. member for Albert was Home Secretary now prevail. I am quite satisfied that no individual has been released from prison since the present Government came into power without due thought having been given to all the surroundings connected with the particular case. Just as it has been the case that people who have been in gaol and have been released fall again, so it has happened that some people who have had their sentences remitted have not made the best use of their liberty. There is no doubt that during the last twenty years a great change has taken place in the ideas of society in relation to prisoners. It is a well-known fact that in days gone by offenders for trivial offences received more rigorous sentences than those who committed more heinous crimes. It is also a well-known

[*Hon. J. G. Appel.*]

fact that in older countries people who had the misfortune to be arrested for drunkenness, obscene language, or common assault, received fourteen days' imprisonment with a diet of only bread and water. Those ideas have passed, and not too soon. One individual who served two years in prison some two years ago put his ideas of prison life into verse, which read—

“The vilest deeds, like poison weeds,
Bloom well in prison-air;
It is only what is good in man
That wastes and withers there;
Pale Anguish keeps the heavy gate,
And the Warder is Despair.

“We were as men who through a fen
Of filthy darkness grope:
We did not dare to breathe a prayer,
Or give our anguish scope:
Something was dead in each of us,
And what was dead was Hope.”

It has been said that—

“Hope springs eternal in the human breast.”

I think the result of the changes in prison reform has been to prevent many unfortunate people from losing their ideals and ambitions because they happen to be put in gaol. The desire for reform may be said to cause prison detention to be of a reformatory rather than a punitive character, and I think the reform has been of great advantage. Some people say that we cannot reform those who are unfortunate enough to be inmates of our prisons, but I do not believe that, because quite a number have been reformed, including many cases where there appeared to be little or no hope. There can be no doubt that quite a number of people get into gaol very easily, and sometimes very unexpectedly and for apparently simple reasons. Men will do quite a number of things when under the influence of drink that they would not think of doing when in their sane sober senses.

The hon. member for Albert said that it was good for a man to be employed. It is, but not on some things. Some incentive should be given to the man to work. I am sure it was not good to set men picking oakum. That is not a very inspiring occupation, and it would not tend to elevate a man's thoughts and ideas. I certainly think that a man, say, at St. Helena, if he is given work which he knows and is practically not interfered with, takes an interest and pride in that work. It is most interesting to watch something grow—much more uplifting than chopping wood from morning till night at Boggo Road. These ideas of reform have grown in the minds of the people, changes have taken place, and the results have been very beneficial.

Everybody knows that, when the hon. member for Albert was Home Secretary, he instituted quite a number of reforms which were beneficial and tended to help unfortunate men to make a fresh start in life when they got out of gaol. I know some people talk sneeringly about pictures and other benefits being granted to the inmates of prisons, but I honestly believe the results have justified those experiments. I do not think for one moment that the last word has been said on the question of prison reform or that the last act has been performed. New Zealand has been experi-

menting for the last ten or fifteen years, and it is well worth while pondering over some of their results, and, if we can manage it, adopting some of their methods.

I shall quote from an article on prison reform in New Zealand from “Stead's Review” for 15th August, 1924—

“FARM COLONIES.

“In 1910 the Farm Colony system was inaugurated, on an area of 1,250 acres, afterwards increased to 1,750 acres. This experiment proved so successful that extensions soon followed. In 1914 the Papanua Farm Colony, near Christchurch, was founded. Commencing with 700 acres, this has now an area of 9½ square miles. The land was originally very poor—most of it an old river bed, with 6 inches of soil overlying 30 feet of barren shingle. The buildings and other improvements are all the work of the prisoners, and the value of a property originally worth nothing is now estimated at over £30,000. At present 150 prisoners are employed on this farm. Another farm colony has also been established at Waikeria, near Te Awamutu.”

In this connection they have not only found these men work at useful occupations and at occupations that bring some revenue in, but they give them something for their work. They get a certain amount when they are released, and the amounts now aggregate about £5,000 per year. So you see that, while not making a profit from the labour of these men, they are doing something towards the upkeep of the establishment in which they are situated, and there is something for the prisoners when they get outside to enable them to make a fresh start. This article continues—

“Besides farming, open-air industries are also engaged in by prisoners. Among these are the building of roads and bridges, sawmilling, quarrying, and brick-making. The last is a permanent industry, equipped with a Hoffmann kiln and modern machinery, and having an annual sales income of £20,000. The quarry, at Auckland, is also carried on with up-to-date appliances which, since their installation, have increased the former output six-fold.”

That would be all very well, and if it did not go any further, it might be said it would be all right, but it does not go far enough. The real question of reform of all prisoners is “Do the results justify us in going to the expense of making the experiments?” The results are put down, and in a recent report the Comptroller-General states—

“Every able-bodied man now learns the gospel of hard work, and under the honour system, that is very generally applied on our farms and works, he also learns self-reliance and self-respect.”

If they are instilling into these men the principles of self-reliance and self-respect, they are doing a very good work indeed. The article continues—

“Sir William Sowden, President of the Adelaide Prison Reform Association, who recently made a careful inquiry on the spot into the New Zealand system, stated three months ago, that ‘during the last ten years in the Dominion the proportion of criminals in the population has decreased by almost exactly one-half.’”

That is really the result of the system, and I

Mr. Winstanley.]

think that result is a recommendation of the system, and justifies what has been done. If during the next ten years by a system like that we could reduce our criminal population by exactly one-half, we would be doing a very fine thing indeed. I believe it has been reduced, and it will be further reduced when we are in a position to make this further expenditure. This article goes on to say—

“The New Zealand prison system is attracting attention in other States, as well as South Australia. In Tasmania, the Government is about to start an extensive system of prison reform, and it was reported about two months ago that the Attorney-General, Mr. Ogilvie, intended making a personal and thorough investigation of the New Zealand system, with a view to its introduction into his own State.”

I should like to suggest that, if the Home Secretary can at all manage it, he should go over to New Zealand and have a look at the places established there, and see if something cannot be done in that direction in Queensland. We know quite well that it will require some little outlay in the first instance, but it is a well-known fact that some of the establishments we have at present are not up-to-date, and while a number of improvements have been made, and a lot of changes have taken place in the right direction, I am confident that being cooped up inside four walls, and then placed inside cells, is not uplifting or likely to reform the prisoners. As a result of the changes taking place in this direction, the gaol in England, of which the lines were written, is at the present time being demolished, as the prison authorities recognise that the building was unsuited to the purpose. It is a well-known fact that one of the difficulties people have who are unfortunate enough to find themselves in gaol is to get a start when they get out. Hundreds of men, after having served their sentences, if they were given a fair chance or a reasonable opportunity, would endeavour to make good. The hon. member for Ipswich pointed out that when they got outside again, they were practically branded, and found very great difficulty in getting a footing on the ladder again. A number of prisoners have passed through these farm colonies in New Zealand, and after staying there a little while and doing some work there, they have been found employment in the country, where there are none of the temptations that faced them previously. The same may be said of the William Powell Home in Brisbane.

In a very large number of instances they are making good, and showing that when they get an opportunity they can achieve the very best results from the opportunities which are given them. It is unfortunate that in highly civilised societies the conditions of life should make it so difficult for people to do the right thing and keep on the straight and narrow path; but that is the position, and I think the least we can do is to try and help prisoners when they have finished their sentences. An opportunity should be given to enable them to recover their positions, and to live honest, useful, and industrious lives. When the Government are in a financial position to do so, they should take steps to establish farm settlements, where prisoners would be given a better chance. There is no lack of land for that purpose, as there are 101 places in Queensland where such a farm could be established when funds are available.

[Mr. Winstanley.

Places like Boggo Road Gaol, Stewart's Creek Gaol, and other similar places, which have been built with big high walls around them, should be abandoned, and the prisoners allowed to be out in the open air, where something can be done to rehabilitate them and enable them to go back into the social life which they formerly enjoyed. By doing that, we shall not only be helping the men themselves but helping the community as a whole, because the fewer people of this kind there are to be looked after in our gaols the better it will be. It takes a large amount of money to support these penal establishments. As far as possible these institutions should be made self-supporting, and an opportunity given to the inmates to get back to upright conditions of life.

Mr. WARREN (*Murrumba*): I feel certain that we do not approach the matter of the welfare of prisoners in the proper spirit. The lecture delivered by the Chief Justice recently was nearer the mark than anything I have yet heard. The mentality of prisoners is a big factor which should be taken into consideration, and until we approach the matter from that point of view I think we are not going to get a solution of the difficulty in regard to the treatment of prisoners. I think that most of these problems can only be solved by a process of evolution. Twenty years ago we would not have seen things as they are to-day from the moral, social, and political standpoint. The times have changed greatly, but we still mete out the same punishment to prisoners. A prisoner should be placed out of reach of doing further harm; his sentence should not be looked upon as a punishment. The putting of a man inside four walls, cooping him up in a cell, does serious injury to him, and almost makes it impossible for him to reform. I do not think it would be possible to do anything that would brand him more deeply. It is an admirable practice for the police to keep a strict supervision over these men and keep track of them, and it is their duty to do so, but it does not alter the fact that our system is wrong.

At 4 p.m.,

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

Mr. WARREN: My own opinion is that we should have a farm to put first offenders on. When our soldiers began to come back from the front we were unfortunately faced with the problem presented by a very small percentage of them who got into prison through war disabilities or otherwise, and at one of the meetings of the Council of the Returned Soldiers and Sailors' Imperial League a resolution was passed asking the Government to start a farm on which to put these men. In a very small way that was tried—not in a comprehensive way at all—and I would like to see that farm system tried for prisoners, at any rate for first offenders. These men should not be turned out of gaol penniless. They are almost penniless when they leave our prisons; the few pounds that they have are not sufficient to start them in life again. I do not mean to say that our prison system is not the best that we can do under the circumstances; other countries are doing much worse than Australia, but I do think that we should try to help the prisoners sufficiently to enable them to make a fresh start. So long as a man is making good or appears

to have the desire to make good, he should receive something which, although not in the nature of compensation for his detention, nevertheless would help him to accumulate sufficient to start in life afterwards. Because a man happens to make a mistake, that is no reason why his life should be damned for ever afterwards. A man's chances are very small after he has been in prison, but, if he were sent to a farm where the discipline of the prison would not be so strong upon him and he came into contact with nature, there would be more chance that his good natural instincts would come to life. One must admit that such a man would have a better chance to make good in the country than in the city, because, although we must admit that city life offers more chance of amusement and pleasure, the temptations there are also greater. If a man were sent out from a farm without so much of the stigma of a prison upon him as he would bear if he came out of a gaol, he would have a much better chance, and I think it is up to us as free people to give him that chance. There would be a very big compensating gain to the State. As the hon. member who has just resumed his seat said, if we can reduce the amount of crime, we shall add a big asset to the State. I believe that all our prison officials and all the officers of the department, from the Home Secretary down, are honestly and sincerely desirous of carrying out a reforming policy in our prisons. They know what their object is, and I give them credit for having it, but I think that for financial reasons they have not explored to the limit the avenues open to them in matters of this description. I know, for instance, that years ago in New Zealand they sent their prisoners out on reforestation work, and I should like to see something here which would so improve them that, when they came out, they would not have to go back to the old methods of stealing or other crime. After all, I am of opinion—and I believe that the prison officials will bear me out—that most prisoners are lazy people—people who will not work or do not want to work.

If they were sent on to a farm and were taught to work—there is no place in the world where a person can do more work than on a farm, and there is no better place in the world where a man can take to work than on a farm—they could accumulate a certain amount of money—not a mere pittance, but something substantial—and, if the farm was conducted in a proper way, it could be made a payable proposition. We have millions of acres of land that could be opened up, and they could be given a start. The prisoners could be converted from criminals to highly-respectable producers, and such a scheme would be well worth trying. The Government could undertake the employment of prisoners on reforestation work. In sending men out to do this work they are given a certain amount of liberty; but why should they not have that liberty? If they break faith, they become criminals in a double sense. The men engaged in reforestation in New Zealand were trusted to a great extent. I made thorough inquiries and found that to be the case; and where you give men a certain amount of trust—even prisoners—they will think seriously before committing a breach of that trust. I have been in charge of prisoners in Egypt, and we used

to let a lot of the prisoners out. I know it was a breach of the rules. I am saying that to-day, and my colonel is present. They were often let out, and they went away and came back as docile as lambs. I believe that, if liberty was extended under such circumstances—not on the sly, but openly—great benefits would accrue. My suggestion is worthy of consideration, and, if such a farm were established, it would be a centre of education for a certain class of people who would be a real asset to the State. I would like to say a few words about State children.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. gentleman will not be in order in discussing State children on this vote.

Mr. WARREN: I do not make any complaint against the present prison system, but I consider it could be remodelled to a great extent so as to reform many of the prisoners.

Mr. KELSO (*Yundah*): The salary of the superintendent of St. Helena penal establishment last year was set down at £475 per annum, and this year the salary is £365 per annum. I suppose that has something to do with the classification of the position.

The HOME SECRETARY: The former superintendent died. The Government had kept the salary up to the previous high standard, although the prison had gone back in classification, but the new superintendent is now paid according to the classification of the position.

Mr. KELSO: I want to discuss the desirability of retaining St. Helena as a penal establishment. From time to time this matter is brought up and it has been ventilated in the Press, but nothing has been done, the assumption apparently being that the Government are satisfied that the best place for such an establishment is at St. Helena. What is the effect on visitors coming into Brisbane by steamer? If they have any friends on board and the beauties of the bay are being pointed out to them, they are immediately attracted by a lovely island, and they say, "What place is that?" and the Brisbaneite has to tell them, with shame, that it is the penal establishment of St. Helena.

The HOME SECRETARY: With shame?

Mr. BEDFORD: Would you put the island up country so that it could not be seen?

Mr. KELSO: The hon. gentleman is always saying some nonsensical thing.

Mr. BEDFORD: What is your objection?

Mr. KELSO: Does the hon. gentleman really think that I would be such a fool as to suggest that an island should be placed inland?

Mr. BEDFORD: Yes.

Mr. KELSO: I think the hon. gentleman is only wasting his time here; he is not going to pull my leg like that. I am discussing this matter seriously. Visitors coming here are not at all impressed with the fact that we put our prisoners on one of the most beautiful islands in the Bay. What are the possibilities if the prison was removed to the mainland? I believe that from time to time suggestions have been made to take the prisoners inland. It will be found that the prisons in the Southern States have been established inland, and that the system works well. It has been said that greater facilities for escape would be offered to the prisoners if the prison

Mr. Kelso.]

were removed inland. The same thing might be said about Boggo-road, but opportunities for escape do not arise there. Precautions could be taken so that the prisoners could be kept in safety wherever the prison was established. If St. Helena were converted into a health resort, it would make one of the finest health resorts about Brisbane. The people of Brisbane are very proud of Redcliffe as a health resort, but there is not the slightest doubt that, if the Government decided to cut St. Helena up into building allotments and offered them at auction even under the perpetual lease system, every one of them would be taken up and a very large number of people would go down to St. Helena in the summer time to enjoy their holidays there. I would like the Home Secretary to state whether this matter has had the consideration of the Cabinet. If it has not, I would urge the hon. gentleman to consider my suggestion to transfer the prison to the mainland in the interests of the good name of the people of Brisbane and the State, and at the same time provide an extra seaside resort for the people of Brisbane.

HON. W. H. BARNES (*Wynnum*): Any time that is spent in discussing this vote is well spent. I am afraid that the importance of trying to help those unfortunates who have been in prison and are down and out is not fully realised by the community. Very often a man who is known to some of us is sent to prison. When he is released the sympathy he receives very largely is a sympathy which is not very practical. The average citizen does not like to take the responsibility of giving relief to a man who needs it at a very critical time. There is no question that, when a man has been in prison and is released, if his imprisonment has done any good for him at all, he feels very sorry. If he is very sorry for what he has done, he realises what a tremendous load he has got to carry to make a fresh start in life again. Hon. members would not be disposed to regard a man who has been in prison as a very welcome visitor if, on his release, he came to their home. They would be disposed to let somebody else have the care of him. No one would hesitate to help him in the direction of giving him temporary assistance, but that does not count for very much. It does seem to me, therefore, that there is something wanting in our system in that regard. I am quite prepared to admit that some men who come out of prison have so much evil in them that they have not much chance of making good. There are, however, other men who, when they come out, try bravely to do better, but very often find that everything is up against them, with the result that they unfortunately drift again into bad habits. Never let us forget that it is not an easy thing to try and fight an uphill battle. It is all right when everybody is with you and applauding you, but, when you are fighting an uphill battle with an empty pocket and very little else, it is a hard task, and it takes a very strong man to overcome it.

It is a proper thing that, when men come out of gaol, there should be someone to take them by the hand and assist them to start again. That is absolutely the best thing that can be done for them. Anything that can be done in that direction from time to time should be done by this Committee.

I liked a suggestion that was made to-day,

[*Mr. Kelso.*]

although I recognise that it may be abused, but even if it were abused I think it would be better to help one man to make good even at the risk of making a few mistakes. I think it would be better to give discharged men some monetary assistance to put them on their feet and give them a fresh start.

I want to pay a special tribute this afternoon to the provision which was made some time ago, and which has been in existence for some years—the provision of allowing men to learn trades while in prison. If you give a man a trade you are giving him something that will be of very material assistance when he gets out. I was very delighted to hear the ex-Home Secretary, the hon. member for Albert, make his explanation with regard to the assistance given to men when they were released. If a man has a trade, and is prepared to work, if you give him the necessary tools you are giving him the opportunity of starting a new course—a great advantage to him.

Before sitting down I want to ask one question in connection with the administration of our gaols. I quite recognise, with other hon. members, that the country is very much indebted to the men who are in charge of these institutions. From my own knowledge I know how well they have done their work. It is a very difficult task to control bodies of different types of men and women. The point I want to raise most particularly is whether the “look-out” men have been re-established. I know at one time they were abolished.

THE HOME SECRETARY: They are back again.

HON. W. H. BARNES: I am sure their absence must have made the task of the gaol officials more difficult, and I am very glad to know that the management of the gaol have been relieved in that regard. I can quite understand that in the absence of the “look-out” men there must have been a great deal of embarrassment on the part of the management.

I am quite sure that every hon. member of the Committee feels that an obligation rests upon him to do everything possible to assist, justly and rightly, the man who has been in prison and who has been released. The object of the Administration should be, not to make it difficult for a man starting a new career, but to make that task as easy as possible.

Mr. BEDFORD (*Warrego*): Sentiment and pious aspiration have not done much in the past in the way of prison reform, but it is an excellent thing to congratulate ourselves on that the greater tolerance and the better understanding of human nature have resulted generally in a lower crime rate, considering the increase in population, all over Australia, even taking into account the fact that post-war crime has rather increased than decreased the ratio. The following table gives the number of convictions for serious offences in the different States:—

	1917.	1921.
New South Wales ...	5499 ...	8057
Victoria	2830 ...	3719
Queensland ...	1403 ...	1747

The proportion of the convictions for serious offences per 10,000 of the population was—

	1917.	1921.
New South Wales ...	28.99 ...	38.22
Victoria ...	20 ...	34.2
Queensland ...	20.5 ...	22.8

A good deal of the general decrease of crime may be attributed to the fact that ferocious sentences for offences against property are not inflicted as they used to be. We are gradually beginning to see that the best that can be done in the majority of cases is to inflict a short sentence, for two or three months' imprisonment is reformatory. After that, you only succeed in making the man a confirmed criminal, because so adaptable is human nature that in four or five years he can learn to be quite satisfied with his surroundings, in which case he inevitably drifts back to the gaol from which he has been discharged. All the development and improvement in the knowledge of the world is in the direction of wiping out imprisonment as far as possible within four walls, and substituting convict farms. The Bilibid Prison, in Manila, for instance, is one of the most advanced prisons in the world. It is immeasurably better than any prison in America, because, strangely enough, the Americans in administering Empire gave much greater and more humane and tolerant attention to the conditions appertaining to a very ignorant convict system than happens in the case of the United States itself. In the Bilibid Prison the death rate prior to the Americans taking charge was the highest in the world. It is now the lowest, and it is the only place where a prisoner about to be discharged finds employers in competition for his services, because the training has been recognised to be so excellent that a prisoner is considered to be an employee worth competing for. The main position in regard to crime is that in the case of the grown-up or confirmed criminal there is little chance of being able to actually reform. A better thing than cure is prevention, and the prevention of crowded prisons in the future is the proper handling of the child of to-day, and the discouragement of misfits or unfits to breed.

A more advanced age than our own, while going in for war and sacrificing the best physically in the community, may be so maudlin over its respect for human life that it will allow to live and even give short sentences to people convicted of violent and criminal attacks on children. I say that in the more enlightened times to come, for the benefit of the race the homo-sexual and sex pervert will be wiped out. There are people whose form of insanity is not sufficient to put them into an asylum—because there are many of these criminals whose nervous condition connotes no actual injury to brain, and where the trouble is far more psychological than it is cerebral—and in every advanced penology in the world prisoners are partially under the control of a medical man highly versed as a psychologist. In nearly every case—except such as a youth making one mistake and being punished over it—there is a suggestion of insanity on the part of the criminal who decides that it is good enough to take up arms against society and think that he will win out on that game. The whole condition, then, of reform is based on the fact that crime cannot be cured by the lash, or by the gallows, or by long terms of imprisonment. As the Home Secretary said the other day, it is a fact that the best man makes the worst prisoner and the worst man makes the best prisoner, because he is more adaptable, recognising quickly that anything good that can come to him in the way of remission or better treatment can only be got by knuckling down to authority. During the last few years there have been

convicts in the Queensland gaols sentenced for attacks of sexual perversion on children, and more recently they have been increasingly prevalent. In the case of one beast sentenced in New South Wales to three years' imprisonment for the murder under horrible conditions of a child of five years of age, the judge was wanting in not having given him a life sentence and insisting that not one day of the sentence should be remitted. I remember that the first man I saw hanged—in Ballarat—was one of these homo-sexuals who had been convicted in the first case of a criminal assault on a child and given six months' imprisonment. He had only been out two days when he was in again on a similar charge. That time he got ten years and two floggings. Incidentally he proved that the law did not know as much about the matter as he did, because he was only out three days before he had another two cases to his debit, and that time he was hanged. Here were three children who could have been saved if that man had been sentenced in the first instance to imprisonment for life, with tremendous care that in not one hour of his life should he ever be given freedom again. Yet the other day in Brisbane, in a case in which there was no doubt that the man was guilty, a judge permitted him to be let off with three months' imprisonment on the reduction of the charge to common assault. Subsequently, a man was sentenced by the same magistrate to six months' imprisonment for the grossest form of exhibitionism, although it was shown that he had six previous convictions. These are cases which should be rigidly dealt with for the benefit of the children of our country. There is at least one case which I have mentioned, in which a man should never again see the light of day. If this country cannot be kindly and decent to its children and exercise over them a tremendously more watchful care than it does, it is a country not worthy of its name. We need to reduce the number of criminals in future by increasing and bettering the conditions of the parents of present-day children who are now growing up. That will be attained by the better conditions for which this party have always stood. The other day, for instance, it was stated to be one of the intentions of this Government to enact a 44-hour week during this session.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member will not be in order in discussing that matter.

Mr. BEDFORD: I only allude to it in passing. A bishop—of course, imported—said that the old pioneers of this country did not have a 44-hour week, and he was applauded in the "Daily Telegraph," which gives bad service itself, as will be observed from the fact that nearly all its news columns are headed with the apology, "All this appeared in our columns of yesterday."

Mr. KELSO: What about the "Standard?"

Mr. BEDFORD: They do it, too, but not to the same extent.

Mr. KELSO: They do it, all the same.

[4.30 p.m.]

Mr. BEDFORD: The prisons of the future will be filled or emptied according to the way in which present-day Governments decide on the training and education of the children who will or will not be the prisoners of the days to come. All over the world the

Mr. Bedford.]

tendency is to a greater kindness and a bigger understanding. In most cases it will be found that the problems surrounding crime—or such wilful perversions that they are incurable—are rewarded by either too slight punishments or punishments based on a very rudimentary knowledge of psychology.

Question put and passed.

STATE CHILDREN.

HON. M. J. KIRWAN (*Brisbane*): I beg to move—

“That £194,297 be granted for ‘State Children.’”

Hon. members will notice that the vote shows a net increase of £1,982, largely accounted for by increases to the staff in the head office and the Diamantina receiving depot and infants’ home, an increase in the provision for boarding-out in the Southern Division of £1,000, in the Central Division of £1,000, and in the Northern Division of £200. There are also increases in the sums required for the maintenance of inmates at the industrial and reformatory schools at Toowong of £150; Woolloowin, of £30; and Yeronga, of £180. Those are the main alterations in the vote, and, if any further information is desired by hon. members, I shall be pleased to afford it.

Mr. KERR: (*Enoggera*): The Director of State Children is peculiarly fitted for his position, and is thoroughly imbued with the fundamental principle of giving the very best services to the children, and therefore to the State. At the same time, I do not think it is fair that the Government should retain in one position at the same salary a man who is peculiarly suitable for a job merely because of that fact. He should not be retained in that position indefinitely, and I think that the Public Service Commissioner would be well advised to consider his case.

In 1911 we passed a State Children Act, which was a consolidation and amendment of the law existing at that time regarding State children. To my mind, a better term than “State children” could be applied to children living with their mothers and yet the subject of State aid. I would like to point out that the Commonwealth in cases where children receive allowances describes them under the term “neglected children” in its statistical returns, and I think another term than the one adopted here would not cast upon them the stigma which may exist—I do not say it does exist—under present conditions.

In that category I think there are about 5,000 children, and Queensland could very well adopt another term than “State children,” and still grant them the usual allowance. In every case the children are not boarded out, but are in homes which are the only natural homes they know in this world. I would like to know what is the policy of the Government with regard to foster-mothers. There seems to be some rivalry between foster-mothers and various institutions in securing State children, and it is time that Parliament took into consideration the question of whether it is better for children to be let out to foster-mothers or whether it is better for them to be cooped up in institutions. We in Australia realise more than those in any other country in the world that the home life of the child has an important bearing upon nationhood. It is regrettable that we have somewhere in

[*Mr. Bedford.*

the vicinity of 500 or 600 children being educated in institutions, seeing they have very little opportunity of coming out into the world and seeing anything outside the particular institution. I have in mind two institutions, one having over 200 children, and another with 300. It appears to me that every attempt is not being made by the Government to give effect to the policy of arranging for foster-mothers to take these children.

Mr. FARRELL: Does the hon. gentleman think that they are not well cared for in those institutions?

Mr. KERR: I do not know. I am not making any complaint in connection with that matter.

Mr. FARRELL: Take Meteor Park Orphanage, where the children are under the control of the Sisters of Mercy.

Mr. KERR: That is one institution that I have in mind with 200 or 300 children. I am not complaining about the attention given to those children, but there is some rivalry in this matter. It seems a sad commentary that in Queensland we cannot place the children in private homes. Everybody will agree that in institutions the individuality of the child is lost, and that the child is losing a good deal in life through being confined in institutions. I have seen children in other parts of the world, and I contend that home life in Australia is a very dominating factor from many points of view. I am not speaking of refractory schools, but of the ordinary institutions, and it is for Parliament or the Government to devise some scheme to obviate any rivalry between foster-mothers and institutions. If there is any difficulty in securing a sufficient number of foster-mothers, then the Government can be definitely blamed for not doing the right thing in that regard. The institutional life to a child in Queensland is one of the most unnatural things I know of. They have no mothers, they have no home comforts, they have no schoolmates, and they have not the freedom in the institution that they would have in home life.

At 4.38 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

Mr. KERR: I want to compare the allowances made to foster-mothers in Queensland with the allowances made in other States. I know that there is a difficulty in getting foster-mothers to take the orphan children, but that difficulty exists not only in Queensland but in every other State in Australia. I venture to say that the Government in this State are practically the only Government in Australia that have not handled this situation as it should have been handled. The allowance made in New South Wales to foster-mothers for a child of twelve months is 15s., while in Queensland it is only 10s. The allowance paid in New South Wales is therefore 50 per cent. higher than is paid in Queensland, where a Labour Government is in power.

Mr. GLEDSON: What does New South Wales allow the natural mother?

Mr. KERR: 9s. or 10s., but I am not talking of natural mothers.

Mr. GLEDSON: We are. We say that the natural mother is entitled to as great an allowance as the foster-mother.

Mr. KERR: I am not raising that point. The issue that I have raised is that the foster-

mother in Queensland receives an allowance less than the foster-mother in New South Wales. I want to know why that discrimination has been made. I know perfectly well that the Government were responsible for the payment of a certain allowance to the natural mother. An exemption of £40 a year is allowed for each child under our income tax law, but the Government only provide an allowance of £26 a year, irrespective of whether it is a foster or natural mother. I am, however, dealing particularly with the foster-mother. The allowances paid to foster-mothers by the various States are—

Children under Twelve Months.

	Per Week.	
	s.	d.
Queensland	10	0
New South Wales	15	0
Victoria	11	5
South Australia	11	0
Western Australia	11	0 to 15 0

An allowance of 12s. per week is paid in Tasmania to foster-mothers for all children under two years of age. It appears to me that Queensland has not done sufficient in its payment to foster-mothers, or in making search to secure foster-mothers for orphan children in preference to congregating 500 or 600 of them in an institution. The orphans would be better off in comfortable homes in charge of foster-mothers. Dormitory life is not the very best for our orphan children. If there is a scarcity of foster-mothers, the Government might remedy the position by increasing the allowance. I would ask the Home Secretary to give close consideration to the suggestion I have made. I come in contact a good deal with this matter one way and another, and I am quite satisfied that an institutional life does not give the same satisfaction as life with a foster-mother where the credentials are in order. I do not wish to say that the children in institutions are not receiving excellent treatment; I feel sure they are; but everything depends on the young life of our State, and we should do everything possible to improve the conditions of that young life.

HON. M. J. KIRWAN (*Brisbane*): I promise the hon. member for Enoggera that the representations made by him will be fully considered.

Question put and passed.

STEAMER "OTTER."

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. Stopford, *Mount Morgan*): I beg to move—

"That £5,315 be granted for 'Steamer 'Otter.'"

Question put and passed.

MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES.

HON. M. J. KIRWAN (*Brisbane*): I beg to move—

"That £31,800 be granted for 'Miscellaneous Services.'"

Hon. members will see that there is a reduction in the vote this year, largely due to the fact that there have been no polls under the Liquor Act.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed. The CHAIRMAN reported progress, and asked leave to sit again.

The resumption of the Committee was made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

The House adjourned at 4.50 p.m.